United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2011 No. 115

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 28, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1188. An act to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government.

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the designation of the year of 2011 as the International Year for People of African Descent.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

PAUL CALLAHAN'S LAST DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Paul Callahan, a dedicated staff member in the office of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina. After 8 years in Washington, Paul will be departing the office at the end of this month to return home to South Carolina.

Paul has been a faithful servant for the people of South Carolina's Second Congressional District since November 2003. He has served in a variety of capacities, ranging from scheduler to legislative correspondent to senior legislative assistant. Paul truly fulfills the role of ''dedicated Hill staffer.'' Most recently, Paul's portfolio has consisted of banking and financial services, housing, telecommunications, and foreign affairs. His hard work has been a valuable asset in the office for the citizens of South Carolina.

It is with sincere gratitude that I would like to thank Paul for his expertise and enthusiasm. You will be missed in the office, and I wish you well. I wish you, Jenni, Charlotte, Judah, and month-old Penelope all the best as you enter this next phase of life and move back to Taylors, South Carolina.

MORE TAXES DESTROY JOBS

Mr. Speaker, according to The Wall Street Journal on July 27, Robert Barro correctly argues that raising tax rates on Americans is not helpful in putting Americans back on the path to prosperity. Raising taxes does not present a feasible solution in engineering and economic recovery. The solution is to cut spending, just as has occurred previously in Canada in 1993 and in Germany under Chancellor Angela Merkel.

The reason our country finds itself in this current fiscal situation is due to Washington's out-of-control spending during the last 3 years. A failed $787 billion stimulus package in 2009 led only to a waste of taxpayer money along with a hole even deeper than what it intended to fix. But the current administration moved forward with the belief America can borrow and spend its way out of a recession. That has proved to be false.

Now the President wants to raise taxes as a way to pay for all this spending. This is irresponsible. Higher revenues will only lead to one thing—more government spending. Tax increases destroy jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE VS. INVEST, BUILD, AND GROW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Cut, cap, and balance—that's the Republican economic vision. Democrats should have a different economic vision for America—invest, build, and grow.

Invest: Conservatives say the Federal budget should be like families and businesses, and I agree. But families and businesses don't balance their budgets as Republicans pretend. Families and businesses go into debt by investing rationally in their future. Families go into debt by purchasing homes and cars and sending their children to college. Businesses go into debt to grow their companies. We should invest in things that will put Americans to work in a full employment economy and make America's future bright with balanced economic growth.

Build: We need to put America back to work by building America. The New Deal did not pull us out of the Great

Printed on recycled paper.

Depression; World War II did. The government—not the private sector—the government's conduct of the war and the government's role in steering the economy won World War II and pulled us out of the Great Depression. Government did that. Government stimulated the public and the private economy. If we rationally invest a similar amount of money in our domestic economy as we did to win World War II, we can pull America out of this Great Recession just like we pulled America out of the Great Depression.

Grow: We need to grow the economy in a balanced fashion. Two large tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 to the wealthy and big corporations—the so-called ''job creators''—didn't create jobs in the private sector. Indeed, only 1 million net new jobs were created between 2001 and 2009, all government jobs. The private sector reported minus 600,000 jobs. So much for giving tax breaks to the ''private job generators.''

Some argue against all debt, but all debts aren't bad because all debts are not the same. A $50,000 gambling debt is bad because it has no return. The last decade showed that gambling on tax cuts for the rich to create jobs was bad. Gambling on two wars and not paying for them was bad. Gambling on a new prescription drug law that was unpaid for was horrible. And gambling on unregulated financial institutions that failed was bad. They resulted in a housing market collapse, slow economic growth, high unemployment, and huge deficits and debts—all bad.

So I think we've gambled enough on the theory that budget cuts and tax cuts generate private sector jobs and more taxes. The Laffer Curve is truly a laugher.

One more point, however, Mr. Speaker, where Republicans are right. We do have a spending problem. We spent too little in the economic stimulus package of 2009 and we spent it on the wrong things, one-third of which were tax cuts for the rich that conservative Republicans insisted be included, even though they still voted against it. Rather than spending to create jobs by directly investing in things we need—new schools, new hospitals, new water and sewer systems, public transportation, high speed rail, bridges, ports, airports, and more—Congress passed an economic stimulus package that kept us from falling into a Great Depression. But it was not enough to generate the growth necessary to create the number of jobs that we need. But too many in Congress drew the wrong conclusion.

It reminds me of a man whose house caught on fire, and when he tried to put it out with a garden hose, he concluded that water does not put out fires. Water does put out fires, Mr. Speaker, but you have to have enough of it to fit the size of the fire. You have to put it in the right place.

So, there you have it, Mr. Speaker, two choices for America: Cut, cap, and balance or invest, build, and grow. That's the choice before the American people. Both visions offer constitutional amendments.

Cut, cap, and balance offers a balanced budget amendment that guarantees slow growth and few jobs. But a different vision of invest, grow, and build can be enhanced with a different set of constitutional amendments—education, health care, and the environment, just to name three.

According to the Congressional Research Service, over 51 percent of all jobs in America are tied to the First Amendment—television networks, radio stations, the recording industry, wire services, Facebook, Google, iPad, movie studios, the Internet, newspapers, magazines, and more. In fact, most corporate activity in America is defined as First Amendment activity.

How many jobs would be created if we added an amendment to the Constitution that gave every American student the right to a public education of equal high quality? How many new elementary schools would have to be built? How many old schools would have to be rehabilitated and made modern?

□ 1010

How many teachers and counselors would have to be hired? How much wire installed for the Internet? How many computers built and purchased? How many desks built and bought? That's what H.J. Res. 29, an education amendment, would demand.

How many jobs would be created if we added an amendment that guaranteed every American the right to health care of equal high quality? how many new hospitals built? how many doctors, nurses, dentists, administrators, and technicians trained?

Mr. Speaker, a different vision of America is possible. I am not giving up on our country, and neither should we.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, throughout history, great change has mostly come from steady, determined hard work performed over long, long periods of time. Think of our Revolution. It took years. Think of the war that freed the slaves and the progression towards racial equality. It has taken years. Think of the continued long march against radical Islamic terrorism that continues today.

Today, the challenge we face is a frightening economic challenge. We must put people back to work. We've got to grow our economy so we can pay off the crushing debt that has been heaped upon the next generation over the past 40 years. It is the fight of my generation. There are two world views to tackle this problem that threaten our Republic.

The first, offered by the President and those who control Washington, D.C. today, is more government, more spending, more redistribution of wealth, and more physical and spiritual dependence on government. The American people rejected this world view on November 2, 2010.

Then there is a second view. It is one that offers liberty and freedom from government instead of control by government. It recognizes that the left's morally misguided policies will expand government, suffocate growth, further depress job creation, and push millions of people farther away from any hope of rising out of poverty. These policies negatively impact American culture by squelching individual responsibility and initiative and work ethic. America has always had a cultural bias in favor of productive work, and has disapproved of the easy acceptance of charity and welfare payments when these are not necessary and when one can provide for oneself.

These competing visions of America frame the debate over reducing our Nation's spending addiction. It is the fight we're having today. So, today, I will vote for a bill that for the first time in decades begins to turn the tide against the radical job-killing spending of our current President.

Now, it's true that the election of President Barack Obama in 2008 and the Democratic retention of the Senate in 2010 continue to have consequences, so this bill is necessarily insufficient. It does not complete the mission. If this plan is all we ever do, we plainly will have failed the task that the new class of freshmen was sent to Washington, D.C. to take on.

But it is not all we'll do. We will continue to execute the will of the American people, and we will hold this Republic together by ending this spending addiction that has afflicted this town for decades. This bill is the Lexington and Concord of the American Revolution. It is Antietam to our Civil War. It is D-day to World War II. It is the first skirmish in a very long battle.

That great Kansan, General Eisenhower, did not declare victory on June 6, 1944, after America successfully commenced its liberation of Europe. Rather, he acknowledged a good day, that the battle had been joined, and he had a deep recognition that he needed to continue to execute his battle plan.

The American people spoke on November 2, 2010, and we now begin to do what they demand that we do.

This bill we vote on today honors that commitment. We said we would not raise taxes. This bill does not do that. Our President complains. We said we would not increase the debt limit beyond the amount of spending reductions that we undertake. This bill does that. Our President complains.

These were bold commitments we made to the American people, especially when Washington, D.C. continues to be controlled by liberal Democrats. How could we be sure that a rump group of Republicans could accomplish this? It had never been done

before—but today, we have an opportunity as this monumental struggle begins.

How big will our Federal Government be? Will our country return to its constitutional role of having bounded government?

In Kansas, I know that the battle sometimes looks messy—big challenges often look that way. Today, however, I can say clearly that we have stopped a President intent on growing government, and we have begun to head down a path towards prosperity for our Nation and our freedom. It's a good day.

U.S. MUST LEAD GLOBAL RESPONSE TO FAMINE IN HORN OF AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last week, the United Nations declared famine in Somalia and reported urgent needs in Ethiopia and Kenya. On our nightly TV news and in our daily papers, we are seeing the pictures of people dying, of children suffering from extreme malnutrition, and of mothers carrying their babies, walking over 100 miles in search of food and safe haven.

Tens of thousands of people in Somalia have already died. The Horn of Africa is suffering a devastating drought, with this year being recorded in some locations as the driest or second driest year on record since 1951. The impact has been compounded by war, neglect and spiraling food prices.

Currently, some 11.5 million people across east Africa urgently need food aid, medical supplies and care. More than 130,000 Somali refugees have left their country for refugee camps along the borders of Ethiopia and Kenya. They arrive exhausted and physically depleted. News reports estimate that about 1,300 Somali refugees arrive in northern Kenya every single day. They join already overcrowded camps, and stress the ability of the Kenyan Government and humanitarian agencies to provide food, water, emergency care, and shelter.

Working with local partners and NGOs such as Doctors without Borders, Save the Children, and Italian Aid, UNICEF will be vaccinating hundreds of thousands of children. Dehydrated and suffering from malnutrition, these children, especially those under the age of 5, are particularly susceptible to the measles, polio, diarrhea, and pneumonia.

To date, in fiscal year 2011, the United States has provided over $450 million in humanitarian aid to the Horn of Africa through USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance and the Food for Peace program, along with refugee assistance from the State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration.

But much more needs to be done. The next 3 to 6 months will be critical. The drought is expected to worsen, at least through the end of the year, and then we will wait to see what happens during the next cycle of rains. Will communities be able to recover? Will small farmers be able to plant new crops or will heavy rains produce floods that drive communities deeper into poverty?

My colleagues need to understand, however, that the current crisis, as terrible as it is, could have been much worse. There is good news amongst so much tragedy. The last time a drought of this magnitude hit Ethiopia, over 14 million people faced starvation. This time, about 4.5 million Ethiopians are in need of emergency aid. The difference? Since 2005, the United States and other donors have made significant investments in Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Program.

I saw firsthand several of these programs in 2007. They helped small farmers and poor communities diversify the crops they planted, broaden their sources of income, create local markets, better manage their water resources, and increase the nutritional content of their own diets and those of their children. This has enabled over 7.5 million Ethiopians to withstand the worst effects of the current drought. These families and communities are not part of the 4.5 million Ethiopians who require urgent humanitarian aid.

Mr. Speaker, these programs work. They were models for Feed the Future, our current global program to promote sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition. It's how you end global hunger, Mr. Speaker. It's the difference between needing to help rescue 4 million people rather than 14 million people. It's also the difference between investing $6 per person each year so they become more food secure and resilient to disasters—or having to invest $250 per person to deliver emergency relief that only covers 3 to 4 months.

It's the smart way to invest our development resources. Mr. Speaker, this is why I am so appalled by what happened yesterday in the markup of the State-Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

□ 1020

Development, humanitarian, and disaster aid programs were all brutally cut. These cuts come on top of the Agricultural appropriations bill that devastated our emergency food aid programs.

With the worst drought in 60 years hitting the Horn of Africa, these cuts amount to the United States turning its back on its own strategic interests and walking away from our international commitments.

Instead, we need to increase our emergency response to the current crisis, ensure that we have the resources to invest in long-term development, and continue our global leadership in ending hunger and famine once and for all. We need to do better, Mr. Speaker.

[From IRIN, July 27, 2011]

ANALYSIS: HORN OF AFRICA AID MUST ALSO BUILD LONG-TERM RESILIENCE

GENEVA.—The images of starving children bear grim witness to the extent of the crisis affecting millions of people in the Horn of Africa, but they also symbolize a failure to act in time, say aid experts.

''It is a colossal outrage that the warnings went unheeded, that the lessons of previous famines have been ignored,'' says Barbara Stocking, chief executive of Oxfam.

The crisis in the Horn of Africa, triggered by drought, conflict and high food prices, is affecting at least 11.6 million people, with two regions of southern Somalia suffering from famine. And the situation may well deteriorate.

But the crisis, experts say, could have been mitigated by mobilizing the necessary resources ahead of time. There is increasing evidence that helping people become more resilient to the naturally recurring cycles of drought is far more effective than responding after disaster has struck.

It is also sound use of donor money, they say. As such, helping farmers find alternative livelihood options, or teaching them to grow drought-resistant crops, is far more effective than providing food aid when the harvest has failed.

''We have hard evidence, including from Africa, that we need only five Swiss francs [US$6.20] per capita per annum to build up resilience,'' said Mohammed Mukhier, who heads the Disaster Risk Reduction unit at the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC).

''If you take the emergency response and emergency operations, you might need 200 francs [$250] per capita to deliver relief assistance for periods of just three or four months.''

Humanitarian agencies and donors agreed at an emergency meeting in Rome on 25 July that the response to the crisis must address the immediate needs of the desperate population and help build resilience to avert similar crises in the future.

RISK REDUCTION

Using donor money wisely is particularly urgent in view of the threats posed globally by natural disasters, including increasingly frequent storms, floods and droughts. Advocates of the risk reduction strategy argue that donors can no longer afford to provide funding for disasters primarily after the fact. The cost is rising and compromising regular development investment.

Yet, warnings of impending disaster in the Horn of Africa went largely unheeded.

''Measures that could have kept animals alive—and provided milk, and income to buy food—would have been much cheaper than feeding malnourished children, but the time for those passed with very little investment,'' said Simon Levine, of the Overseas Development Institute. Now, ''it is far too late to address anything but the worst symptoms'', he wrote on the website of the independent British think-tank.

While massive funding often goes to post-disaster response, funds for preparedness and contingency planning are relatively scarce. Risk prevention is often hard to fund as it does not generate the same kind of media as a high-profile emergency response. Government donors answer to taxpayers and need to demonstrate impact—something that is difficult to do when disaster has been averted.

With donors mobilized—even if funds pledged still fall well short of the US$2 billion needed—the focus in the Horn of Africa is now on emergency as well as long-term assistance.

''Short-term relief must be linked to building long-term sustainability,'' said UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. ''This means

an agricultural transformation that improves the resilience of rural livelihoods and minimizes the scale of any future crisis. It means climate-smart crop production, livestock rearing, fish farming and forest maintenance practices that enable all people to have year-round access to the nutrition they need.''

Kanayo F. Nwanze, president of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), stressed that building resilience in farming and herding communities required a long-term commitment. ''But time—as we can see from the devastating situation in the Horn of Africa—is running out,'' he told delegates at the meeting in Rome.

The challenge of seeking to avoid future food insecurity crises in the Horn of Africa is daunting. Conflict has severely hampered development and relief efforts in Somalia, and affects the mobility of pastoralists and their livestock, which is key to food security in the region.

But disaster risk reduction is increasingly seen as a humanitarian imperative, crucial to battling poverty and achieving sustainable development.

''Building resilience of farming and herding communities in East Africa requires a long-term, sustained commitment on the part of the region's governments and the international donor community,'' said Kevin Cleaver, IFAD's associate vice-president.

''The rains will fail. But let us not fail, too.''

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PRESS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, time is up. It is time for the administration to quit stalling and make a decision on the Keystone XL pipeline project, the pipeline that comes from our friends in Canada from Alberta all the way down to my congressional district in southeast Texas, to the refineries in Port Arthur, Texas.

The House has done its job this week by passing a bill to move this decision along. Now it's the Senate's turn to pass this bill so that the administration finally makes a decision on the Keystone XL project that will create thousands of American jobs and decrease our dependence on unfriendly nations for energy.

I commend my friend from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for passing this legislation and being the spearhead of this legislation.

All that has to happen is the State Department has to make a decision and the administration has to support that decision one way or the other. It's been 3 years for the administration to make a decision, yes or no, on the XL pipeline. It's time to fish or cut bait. Pick a horse and ride it. The administration must make a decision.

And this should be, to me, an easy choice for this administration. Either they can force Americans to continue to rely on unfriendly foreign countries for our energy, like Venezuela and the Middle Eastern dictators, by depriving Americans of a reliable source of oil at a time when gas prices are around $4, or they can work with our friends in the north to supply over 1.4 million barrels of oil per day.

Pipelines are the proven and safe, efficient source of energy. Best of all, this project creates thousands of jobs at a time when unemployment in this country is 9.2 percent. And it is climbing. I would think this job-creating, shovel-ready project—which my liberal friends always talk about—would be something they would support and the administration would support.

As the administration continues to stonewall our own domestic production, we must safely and immediately look for ways to meet energy needs.

The country needs energy. It needs jobs. This project provides both. What's the holdup, Mr. President?

For every barrel of oil shipped a thousand miles, less than one teaspoon of liquid is lost from a pipeline. Transporting goods by pipeline has the lowest carbon footprint as compared with other transportation modes. Crude oil has to get to America some way. It either comes by barge or truck or rail or marine, and pipelines historically are the safest way to transport crude oil.

Attacking a pipeline on environmental grounds seems to be absurd to me. Pipelines have been the most cost-effective and environmentally sound way to transport oil and natural gas. A medium-sized pipeline, which is about 150,000 barrels a day, requires operating more than 750 trucks or a 75-car train every day to transport the same amount of crude oil.

Transporting oil through a pipeline is far safer than using transportation by oil tankers. When an oil tanker has a major oil spill, millions of barrels of oil can be spilled in a matter of a few minutes, a few hours, or just a few days.

Nearly half a million miles of natural gas and crude oil pipelines are in the United States—500,000 miles of pipeline. Over half of these are in the State of Texas alone—270,000 miles of pipeline. And about one-third of all of the Nation's pipelines, I understand, go through the energy capital of the world, my district in southeast Texas.

If we don't use the crude oil from Canada in this pipeline, the Canadians could very easily, instead of having a north-to-south pipeline, have a pipeline east-to-west and pipe it to the west coast, and then ship it to our good buddies, the Chinese, who want to buy it.

You know, America's energy plan seems to be twofold: send money to Brazil and let the Brazilians drill off their coast, and we'll buy their crude oil; and the second part is, make sure we use those cute little curly CFL light bulbs. And that's it.

It's time that we take care of ourselves. This is a good project for America, American jobs, and a way to get crude oil into the United States. It's time for the White House to make a decision.

And that's just the way it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

DEBT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. With one simple vote last December, Congress precipitated the so-called debt crisis. We voted to extend all of the Bush tax cuts at a cost of $4 trillion over 10 years. I voted ''no.''

So now, the debate comes down to what's more important to the American people—Social Security or tax cuts; Medicare or tax cuts; jobs or tax cuts. That's what this debate is all about right now—preserving tax cuts, particularly tax cuts for the wealthy and the largest multinational corporations in this country.

Some are still trying to drag Social Security into this debate. Social Security did not cause one penny of this debt. In fact, Social Security is the largest owner of Federal debt in the world. They're the largest investor in Federal debt. Social Security did not cause this problem. Yes, long term, starting in 2037, Social Security is projected to only be able to pay 73 to 75 percent of benefits. We can solve that simply. Ask all Americans to pay the same percent of their income into Social Security.

Today, if you earn over $106,800, you pay a lower percentage of your income into Social Security. Lift that cap. You could lower the tax for everybody. All those who earn less than $106,800, they'd get a little tax cut. Everybody who earns more than $106,800 would pay the same percent of their income in taxes as those who earn less. That's fair. It solves Social Security's problems forever.

Then there are others who say well, it's Medicare. Medicare is the thing we've got to kill. The Ryan plan, the Republican plan: kill Medicare. Turn it into a voucher program. That's their solution there. Future seniors would have a subsidy to go to a government-sponsored exchange to buy private health insurance, and the voucher would be far less than the cost of health insurance. We don't need to kill Medicare to save it or to preserve the tax cuts.

Medicare, we could do away with the Bush-Republican unpaid-for prescription-drug benefit that subsidizes the pharmaceutical and insurance industries and instead say Medicare, we'll negotiate lower drug prices for all people on that program and give them an at-cost benefit. That saves $20 billion a year.

We could reform the way we buy durable medical equipment and save another $20 billion a year. And then we could move on to paying doctors for

good results rather than volume, saving tens of billions more.

Yes, we can fix Medicare. We don't need to destroy it to perpetuate tax cuts.

And then tax cuts create jobs. That's the reason we have to maintain the tax cuts, according to the Republicans. Tax cuts create jobs. Well, we're in the 11th year of the Bush tax cuts, the third year of the Obama tax cuts that supposedly are creating jobs. Well, where are the jobs? In fact, we just had a really good demonstration of this last week.

Last Friday, all taxes on airline tickets expired. Now, Republicans said, well, that will get passed on to the consumers. No. Most of the airlines are keeping the money. That's another issue. But did those tax cuts create jobs? No. Actually so far they've cost us 94,000 jobs—4,000 Federal employees. Now, they hate Federal employees, so that doesn't matter to them. But 90,000 private-sector construction jobs. Building of critical security and safety projects on airports all across the country has ground to a halt because they stopped us from continuing to collect that fee, that tax on people who use the system.

So tax cuts actually have destroyed 94,000 jobs. But they have profited a number of the airlines. One major airline, $4 million extra a day because, guess what, they raised their ticket prices to capture that money. They didn't refund it. A couple like Alaska have refunded it, but most of the airlines, no.

□ 1030

So we're putting a lie to a lot of their policies here, and the biggest core part of their policy is trickle-down economics. It failed in the Reagan years and it's failing again now.

Give billionaires, the job-creators, tax cuts, and they'll create jobs for us little people. Well, guess what; no. Maybe they hired another pool boy or someone else on the yacht. There are a few jobs there. They're now hiring private jets to fly their kids to camp in Maine. Yes, there's a job there, but not the jobs that 18 million American people need.

If we restore the taxes on airline tickets, we would put 90,000 construction workers, private sector workers back to work, and 4,000 government employees. And if we fully fund our transportation needs in this country, we could put another 2.7 to 3.5 million people to work.

No, they want to cut investment in transportation and infrastructure. Bridges are failing. They're falling down. The roads are potholed. Transit systems are decrepit, and the Republican answer is: Give people back their money and cut spending on those wasteful things like mass transit, bridges, and highways.

And, oh, by the way, under their plan, we lose another 600,000 private sector jobs on top of the 20 percent unemployment in construction.

It's time to get real around here. Put America back to work. If Americans were working, that would solve one-quarter of the deficit problem. Stop the tax cut mayhem.

OPEN LETTER TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have voted to raise the debt ceiling where the bill makes America's financial condition better, not worse.

In my judgment, both the Reid and Boehner plans fail to adequately address unsustainable deficits that threaten America with insolvency and bankruptcy. Both plans push the debt ceiling issue to 2012 or 2013, at which time a financially weaker America will confront a worse debt ceiling crisis. Both plans simply are not up to the seriousness of the financial challenges America faces.

Washington must put 2012 election considerations aside and put America's interests first and foremost, now. Congress and the White House can and must do better, now. America deserves better, now. And quite frankly, we have no choice but to do better, now.

Years of spending binges by the Federal Government have come home to roost. America's debt exceeds $14 trillion. America has suffered 3 consecutive years of trillion-dollar deficits and faces trillion-dollar deficits into the foreseeable future. Annual deficits and accumulated debt force America to confront two major financial threats, both with one common cause: unsustainable budget deficits.

In the short term, America faces a debt ceiling crisis. If the debt ceiling is not raised, economic hardship will ensue, unemployment rates will rise, and America's gross domestic product will decline. Over a longer term, however, America faces a larger, more serious debt crisis. If trillion-dollar deficits continue to run rampant, America's insolvency and bankruptcy is certain, which risks America's national defense capabilities, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, NASA, and everything else that the government provides.

The question is not whether Congress will raise the debt ceiling; the question is when and how. I have already voted to raise the debt ceiling $2.4 trillion as part of the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill. We're cutting FY12 expenditures by a modest $111 billion in the context of a $1.5 trillion deficit, capping Federal Government expenditures within historically justifiable 18 to 24 percent ranges, and passing a balanced budget constitutional amendment that protects future generations of Americans from the financial mess we now face.

I am prepared to vote to raise the debt ceiling again, so long as Congress substantively addresses our underlying deficit problem while protecting our fragile economy and jobs market. As best I can with the limited and changing information available, I have examined both the Boehner and Reid plans. While they differ in many respects, they also share common concepts:

Neither plan purports to immediately raise taxes. Neither plan cuts spending in FY 2012 or 2013 by as much as 5 percent of this year's $1.5 trillion deficit. Neither plan eliminates annual trillion-dollar deficits in the foreseeable future. Both plans raise the debt ceiling by at least $1 trillion and as much as $2.7 trillion. Both plans kick the can down the road and force America to revisit the debt ceiling crisis in either 2012 or 2013, at which time America's debt burden will be much higher and America will be that much weaker. Neither plan heeds Standard and Poor's or Moody's credit downgrade warnings. Neither plan cuts America's short- or long-term deficits enough to minimize the risk of downgrade in America's credit rating, a downgrade that will drive up America's debt service cost and cut funding for all other Federal Government programs. To make matters worse, if America's interest rates go up, State and local private interest rates are likely to also go up, thereby hurting Americans at all levels.

There is only one reliable solution that I can discern that protects America from both financial threats: a debt ceiling increase coupled with a balanced budget constitutional amendment that is phased in over a 5-year period of time.

In as much as constitutional amendments often take years to pass, time that America does not have, the first step must be to raise the debt ceiling when Congress passes a substantive balanced budget constitutional amendment. If the Senate and House concur, this can be done in as little as a week.

The second step, equally important, raises the rest of the debt ceiling when the States ratify the proposed balanced budget amendment, thus giving States a needed incentive to ratify the balanced budget amendment in less than 1 year.

This approach solves both financial threats.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I pray that Washington has the strength to do what it must before it is too late. America is on the verge of a downward spiral. We must act now, and we must act in substantive ways.

DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our current fiscal situation and how we got to where we are today. The thought that America would default on its obligations is unimaginable.

This afternoon, we're going to begin a debate on Speaker BOEHNER's debt

ceiling legislation, and I'll comment later on why I oppose the Speaker's approach. But before we begin that debate, I think it's important to acknowledge, step back, and review how we got to where we are.

The success of the 1993 Deficit Reduction Act, which was vehemently opposed by our Republican friends, led to a decade of prosperity and surplus. President Clinton balanced the budget for the first time since 1969 and ran surpluses for 4 years. Between 1998 and 2000, the publicly held debt was reduced by $363 billion, the largest 3-year pay down in American history. Under Presidents Reagan and Bush, the debt held by the public quadrupled. By the time Bill Clinton left office, the budget was on track to pay off the entire publicly held debt on a net basis by 2009. Remember, Alan Greenspan warned us that we were paying down the debt too quickly. The clock in Times Square, which chronicled the deficit, was actually turned off at the end of the Clinton years. But, unfortunately, there were those who thought that we should shift course.

Economic growth averaged 4 percent during those Clinton years, compared to an average of 2.8 percent during President Reagan's years. The economy grew for 116 consecutive months, the most in history, fueled by more than 22.5 million jobs that were created during those 8 years, the most jobs ever created during a single administration and more than were created in the previous 12 years.

On January 20, 2001, when George W. Bush took the oath of office, the CBO estimated that the total budget surplus for 2002 to 2011 would be $5.6 trillion. And their campaign began to spend that surplus in earnest, despite warnings. President Bush began taking us down that fiscal path by enacting tax cuts, first in 2001 of $1.3 trillion, and again in 2003, $1 trillion, that cost the government going forward almost $4 trillion. The other major expenditure in those years was our idea that you could simultaneously engage two wars and cut taxes by $2.3 trillion. Remember the argument about weapons of mass destruction that took us to the unnecessary war in Iraq.

While some question tax cuts in wartime, including people like Mr. Lincoln, others thought it brilliant. The Republican leader at the time or the deputy leader at the time said it was patriotic to cut taxes in a time of war. Well, I wonder if the 2.2 million more veterans who have served us with honor and distinction in Iraq and Afghanistan are going to feel that way when proposals come down the road to draw back on the benefits that they've earned. During the Bush years, our country spent $1.5 trillion in Iraq and on national defense.

The turnaround in our budget picture during the Bush years was remarkable. In October of 2008, CNN reported that the debt clock had run out of numbers. The debt clock actually had exceeded 13 digits that had been allotted, so the clock had to be revised.

□ 1040

According to one report at the end of the Bush term, the number of jobs in the Nation increased by 2 percent. That's the lowest or most tepid growth at any time since data began to be collected seven decades ago. Gross domestic product was at the lowest pace for a period of that length of time since the Truman administration. And the price that America has paid for the theology that suggested during all of those years that tax cuts paid for themselves, you can't find a mainstream economist in this town today who will acknowledge that argument. And yet we hear now more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

By the time that the Bush years ended, the debt had increased to $10.6 trillion, setting a record for any administration. And incidentally, the TARP vote that we hear so often, that took place in October of 2008, that's a very important consideration. That was during President Bush's years.

But let me give you a quote that I think sums up much of what we did during those years. Dick Cheney told the Treasury Secretary at the time, Paul O'Neill: Reagan proved that deficits don't matter. We won the midterm elections, this is our due.

We embraced the prescription D Medicare benefit that we're paying a price for today.

So here we are. My Republican colleagues try to place the blame for this situation on the current administration. There were many of us who saw what was happening with the reckless expenditure during those years and the price that America paid.

We need to vote to raise the debt ceiling. It's the responsible position for all of us to take.

CHANGING THE DIRECTION OF THIS COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, almost 7 months ago I stood in this Chamber and took the oath of office. It was one of the proudest days of my life.

Since my swearing-in, we've worked together to change the direction of this country, and we've changed it for the better. We've cut Federal spending by $361 billion. We've repealed an unpopular and unwanted government health care plan. And we've started dialing back some of the overregulation that's been slowing our economic growth.

During my short time here in Washington, I've heard some very passionate arguments, and I've seen some very heated debates. But they are nothing, Mr. Speaker, like the angry, confusing, misleading rhetoric I've heard in the last 2 weeks regarding the raising of the debt ceiling.

Some media reports around the Capitol make it seem like we will never come to an agreement. Not only are Democrats and Republicans seemingly miles apart, but it appears as if both parties have splintered internally. The bickering is dividing our government. It's dividing the American people, and it's bringing us to the brink of financial disaster.

Based on the calls my office has received over the past several days, my neighbors back in northeastern Pennsylvania want it to stop. They want a solution, and I'm sure every one of you and your neighbors back home do too.

There is no such thing as the perfect deal. There is no such thing as complete and total victory. Many of us came here opposed to raising the debt ceiling. Many of us prefer the Cut, Cap and Balance approach. Many on the other side prefer a clean debt ceiling increase with no spending cuts.

While the Budget Control Act is far from perfect, it accommodates the priorities of the people sitting on both sides of the table, both sides of the aisle, and both sides of the Capitol. If we, in this Chamber, if our friends in the other Chamber, or if the President holds out for the perfect plan, well, the United States will likely default on its obligations. As the responsible stewards of the people's government, we cannot let that happen. And I am confident that we will not let it happen.

But we need to work together. We need to trust each other. We need to realize that the perfect deal is neither possible nor practical.

We are at a critical moment in our history. This country has lived far beyond its means for far too long. The out-of-control spending has been going on in Washington for generations. Governments spent as if there were no tomorrow; and now we and our children and our grandchildren are left to pay the price.

I know the debt ceiling has been raised before, to the benefit of both Republican and Democratic administrations. Well, I wasn't there then and I didn't create this mess, but I'm sure going to clean it up, and that's why I'm here. That's why the people of northeastern Pennsylvania sent me here.

And while the thought of re-election should never, never enter anyone's mind when we're doing the people's business, let me say that this issue is far bigger than the next election. This issue is far bigger than one man or one branch of government or one political party.

How we solve this looming crisis is the defining issue of this Congress. We can either continue on the path that we've been on, a path of reckless spending, of increasing taxes, of mounting debts and deficits; or we can change our direction. We can put the brakes on the out-of-control spending. We can forge a new direction, one of fiscal responsibility, one of capped spending, one of balanced budgets.

We can send a message to the American people and to the world that the

United States is getting its fiscal house in order. And if we do that, we can bring stability to the shaky global economy. We can reassure skeptical business owners and encourage them to create jobs. And we can create a better financial future for our children and our grandchildren.

I believe our choice is clear. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, when you reach for your voting cards today, first take a glance at the pictures in your wallets, of your children and your grandchildren.

We are not Republicans; we are not Democrats. We are Americans. Today, let's put the American people first.

FAMINE IN EASTERN AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the catastrophic famine that continues to unfold in the Horn of Africa. Eastern Africa is currently in the grips of the worst drought in 60 years, affecting 11 million people in Somalia, Ethiopia, and Kenya. According to the U.N., Somalia now faces the highest malnutrition rates in the world, and some 3 million Somalis are in desperate need of immediate emergency aid.

The U.N. estimates that tens of thousands of Somalis have died of drought-related causes in the past few months, and acute malnutrition rates in the country's southern region now exceed 30 percent.

Thousands more are fleeing areas controlled by the al Qaeda-affiliated militant group, Al-Shabaab which, even in the face of such large-scale human suffering, refuses to allow major humanitarian groups to deliver aid. Some 50,000 Somalis have returned to the capital, despite continued violence and instability, in search of food and medicine.

Others have sought refuge from hunger and warfare in neighboring countries. Nearly 400,000 Somalis have crowded into Kenya's Dadaab refugee camp, a complex designed to house only 90,000 people. Another 9,000 arrive in the camp each week, and thousands of other Somalis continue to flee Ethiopia in search of food. Many, particularly children and the elderly, do not survive the harsh trek.

The warning signs of impending disaster have been visible for months, but the international community has been slow to respond. Aid is slowly now beginning to trickle in, however. The U.N.'s World Food Program has begun an emergency airlift of food. The first flight arrived in Mogadishu yesterday, bringing 10 tons of nutritional supplements for children. The World Food Program says that is enough to treat 3,500 malnourished children for 1 month. Clearly, the need is far greater. The World Food Program plans to increase its efforts in hope of reaching over 2 million people in Somalia's south.

Likewise, the United States has provided much assistance to 4.4 million drought-affected people in Eastern Africa. Since last October, our government has given $383 million in life-saving aid, including 348,000 metric tons of food.

□ 1050

Further, this week the Obama administration announced a further $28 million in emergency assistance for famine relief in Somalia. This aid is critical, and I commend the President for these steps. However, the scale of the current crisis requires a much greater response, as well as creative solutions tailored to the unique threats posed by Somalia's persistent instability and violence. For example, because al Shabaab is a terrorist organization, we continue to impose restrictions on aid organizations delivering assistance to the hard-hit regions under its control. We need to work with these humanitarian groups to ensure that, despite Somalia's continuing warfare and lack of governance, desperately needed aid can reach the most vulnerable men, women, and children.

Mr. Speaker, we need to act quickly to fight famine and save lives. We also need to address the long-term underlying causes that have left Somalia's people so vulnerable to drought and malnutrition. Even before the most recent crisis, Somalia was locked in a cycle of warfare, lawlessness, and bitter poverty. One expert recently called Somalia's current plight a catastrophic failure of all the systems that people rely on to survive. That's why part of our response must be an investment in resilience and food security; part of our response must be an effort to address the long-standing violent conflict that has torn Somalia apart; part of our response must go toward long-term economic development and capacity building.

We need to act immediately to ensure that humanitarian aid can reach the millions of eastern Africans who face imminent malnutrition and starvation that we're watching every day on television. I urge the United States and the international community to immediately scale up efforts to deliver urgent assistance to children and other vulnerable individuals.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

MAKING PROGRESS AND HISTORY WITH THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT AND BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. As America watches and the world watches from afar, Washington, D.C., debates a debt ceiling increase and debates various proposals for confronting it in a manner that is consistent with our commitment to this generation and the next.

For the past 10 years, I've been fighting runaway Federal spending, deficits, debt, and takeovers here in Washington, D.C., by both political parties. Now I recognize if you owe debts, pay debts. This Congress has an obligation to defend the full faith and credit of the United States of America and find a way to pay our bills. But this Congress also has an obligation to keep faith with this and future generations by restoring fiscal responsibility and discipline to our national Treasury.

I have come to the conclusion over the last decade that Washington, D.C., is not only broke; it's broken. As a colleague of mine said earlier this week, the American people don't just want a deal, they want a solution. And I rise to say that I believe a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States is that solution.

I told my colleagues earlier this week I did not want to vote for any increase in the debt ceiling unless this Congress did everything in its power to send a balanced budget amendment to the Senate and to the States. Earlier today, we learned that Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR had made a decision for this Friday to bring two separate balanced budget amendments to the floor, and I heartily support their decision.

The first balanced budget amendment will include spending limitations and require a supermajority on tax increases, and I support those measures. But the second balanced budget amendment hasn't seen action here on the House floor for 15 years. Fifteen years ago, what is commonly referred to as the ''historic'' or the ''clean'' balanced budget amendment received overwhelming and bipartisan support, some 300 votes on the floor of the House of Representatives and almost passed the Senate.

I believe that by bringing that historic balanced budget amendment to the floor of this Congress this week we are doing all we can to send the balanced budget amendment to the Senate and to the States. And with that, I inform my colleagues today that I will support the Boehner plan, I will support the Budget Control Act, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in doing the same.

Now, the Budget Control Act has much to recommend it. It has no tax increases, and we have confirmed from the CBO dollar-for-dollar spending cuts to match any increase in the debt ceiling. And there are mechanisms for additional cuts and additional reforms. But the Budget Control Act also includes a requirement that the Senate vote between October and November of this year on a balanced budget amendment. Again, let me say, a balanced

budget amendment to the Constitution has not been considered in the Congress for 15 years, despite overwhelming public support across this country.

Now, I'm for the version of the balanced budget amendment with various limits, but I believe it's vitally important that Republican leadership has chosen to bring the bipartisan version to the floor, to play it straight and give us a fighting chance to get those two-thirds votes necessary to amend the Constitution.

So I rise to announce my support for the Budget Control Act. I rise to express gratitude to Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR, who listened to colleagues like myself who thought we could improve the circumstances of this vote by accelerating and improving our choices for a balanced budget amendment. And, frankly, I also rise to commend all of my colleagues who have held out for a better deal. I want to say from my heart, this is better.

History is often made in unexpected ways and at unexpected times. I believe, with the consideration of the Budget Control Act on the floor today, we have an opportunity to make progress toward restoring fiscal discipline to Washington, D.C.; but I believe with consideration of the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States tomorrow, we have an opportunity to make history.

So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Budget Control Act on the floor today. But I also urge all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to join us as we make a good faith effort to send a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States to the Senate and to the States. Let us put into the national charter that this national government, for this generation and the next, must again live within our means.

POVERTY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. I rise today as a founding cochair of the 39-Member Out of Poverty Caucus to talk about the millions of people living in poverty in America.

Nearly 45 million Americans live in poverty, and one in five children are growing up in poverty. The recession may be over for big corporations and the superrich, but for far too many Americans the recession is actually a depression.

Yesterday, the Out of Poverty Caucus held a press conference with organizations working on the front lines with low-income and poor people. We heard stories of more homelessness, long lines at food pantries, and the desperation felt by so many. Our Nation's unemployment rate remains at an unacceptably high 9.2 percent. Millions of Americans who have lost their jobs are finding it harder and harder to find a new one. These new ranks of the long-term unemployed and their families are facing the stark reality of life in poverty for the first time.

The ongoing impact of the recession on struggling families and those facing or living in poverty simply must not be ignored. But instead of working to improve the lives of millions of Americans in poverty, the Republican Party continues their drive to plunge our Nation into default and our economy over the brink.

Speaker BOEHNER has unveiled yet another Republican plan that fails to do what America needs. His plan fails to end the threat of default. His plan targets the programs aimed at America's most vulnerable—our seniors, our children, and our low-income families—for more draconian cuts.

Trying to balance the budget on the backs of the poor is morally wrong.

□ 1100

We need a balanced approach that balances targeted cuts with the revenue that we need. We must make sure that we can pay the benefits that we owe to our seniors, protect Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, and safeguard our most vulnerable communities.

Mr. Speaker, while the Nation's unemployment level remains unacceptably high, for some minority communities it was double digits even before the recession began. The unemployment rate for African Americans today is recorded at 16.2 percent and Latinos recorded at 11.2 percent. And what many of us have known for a long, long time now, African Americans and Latinos have lost 18 to 20 times their net worth, more so than white Americans due to structural inequalities where race is a factor. These numbers are horrific and speak to the larger crisis facing our Nation, the jobs crisis.

Let me share the story of one American who is looking for a job. Reverend David was laid off from his job as the successful director of a faith-based nonprofit that served the disadvantaged and worked to put people on a path to self-sufficiency. Now he is relying on the very safety net programs that he used to connect others to. He diligently job hunts week after week. David and his wife rely on unemployment benefits to make ends meet, and he is worried about what he will do when he reaches the 99-week limit of those benefits.

Reverend David is not alone. Forty-five million Americans worry about where they will sleep at night, if their children will eat, what will happen if they need medical attention, and when will they secure a living-wage job.

We must work together to help the millions of Americans who are still struggling to recover from the Great Recession.

As the first order of business, I call on the Speaker to bring my legislation, H.R. 589, to the floor for an up-or-down vote immediately. It would add 14 weeks of retroactive emergency unemployment benefits to those long-term unemployed known as 99ers who continue to face uncertainty and hardships. Passing this extension will stimulate our economy, not to mention that it is our moral responsibility to help those in need.

But people really want to work. Instead of creating jobs, Republicans are holding our economy hostage, putting forth policies that will create more unemployment and more job loss. Instead of quickly passing a clean debt ceiling vote, the Republicans are marching lockstep to create this default.

Instead of supporting the vital human needs programs that will protect our most vulnerable, Republicans are trying to balance the budget on the backs of the poor while maintaining these tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires and Big Oil.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more time for these Republican games. The American people expect us to put partisanship aside to protect our economy and create jobs. The American Dream has been a nightmare for the 45 million living in poverty, and is turning quickly into a nightmare for millions who are falling from middle income into the ranks of the poor.

The bill put forth today by Republicans guarantees this tragic outcome.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2608. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

LEGACY OF FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, last week the remains of Corporal Judge C. Hellums of Paris, Mississippi, were returned from the Parroy Forest near Luneville, France, and given a proper burial in Arlington National Cemetery.

In the fall of 1944, following the Normandy invasion, Corporal Hellums' unit, the 773rd Tank Battalion, was fighting its way east through France toward the German border. The M–10 tank destroyer to which he was assigned was attacked. Two men survived with serious injuries, but Corporal Hellums, along with Private First Class Lawrence N. Harris of Elkins, West Virginia, and Private Donald D. Owens of Cleveland, Ohio, were killed in the attack. All evidence at the time indicated that their remains had been destroyed.

Over the last decade, through the cooperation of a French citizen who had been exploring the forest and the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command using DNA evidence and forensic identification tools, the remains of these heroes were identified.

On July 20, 2011, 67 years after their deaths, they were given the proper burial they had been denied as they were laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery.

To these heroes, we say: Welcome home, and may you rest in peace.

While these soldiers were identified, we still have 72,000 American soldiers who are unaccounted for from World War II, and more than 83,000 from all wars who are missing in action.

Staff Sergeant Leroy Leist is one of those Americans. In 1944, his World War II bomber was shot down over the North Sea. His body, along with several of his fellow crewmembers, was never recovered. For more than a decade, Adrian Caldwell has worked tirelessly to locate her father's remains and bring them home. All of our fallen war heroes deserve a proper burial, and my office is working with Mrs. Caldwell to ensure that her father receives what he earned—the honor and gratitude from the country he served and gave his life to defend.

This repatriation reminds us that freedom is not free. We enjoy the liberty of a free Nation today because of men like these who answered freedom's call. And the way we honor their sacrifice is to remember them and call them by name.

The Greatest Generation is passing to their heavenly reward at a rate of over a thousand people a day. These are veterans who left their homes to fight in faraway places. These are families who supported those efforts. We cannot thank them enough before they are called home.

The other way we honor their sacrifice is to pass on the legacy of freedom that they died to defend. When I conduct town hall meetings around Mississippi, I ask a question: Do you believe your grandchildren will live a better life than you lived? For the first time in American history the answer to that question is no.

Sixty-seven years from now, and 167 years from now, successive generations will review the actions of our generation. Only history will record if we answered freedom's call.

AMERICAN DREAM SHATTERED BY NIGHTMARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. My colleagues, yesterday I was talking about the American Dream. But then again, I was thinking about how many people woke up this morning concerned about our national debt.

When you represent the type of district that I do, and many other Members, they're concerned about can they get a job or can they keep the job they have. They're concerned about the bills and obligations that they have. They're concerned about whether they can keep their kids in school and whether they can keep food on the table, whether they can keep the dignity and pride and not have their dream shattered by this nightmare that their country owes $14.3 trillion.

We're making a special appeal to Americans, Republicans and Democrats, not to allow our country to get caught in a position that we don't pay our bills. I suspect that a lot of my constituents would say: Well, how the heck did I get that bill? How do we owe $14.3 trillion, and what did I have to do with it?

And I guess we have to say honestly: You didn't have much to do with it. You did not go into countries and get involved in three wars. You were not responsible for saying that the richest of Americans and corporations that are receiving large profits should have and continue to have preferential tax treatment.

Well, why are you telling me then that I have to pay the debt? If we all have to pitch in on this, what about the guys who will not be making a sacrifice?

Well, that's kind of difficult to explain to these people. But you tell them that there are people in the Congress who truly believe that they can address their problem by having a constitutional amendment.

□ 1110

I know it's a stretch, but that's what some of us have to deal with in the Congress. But you've heard some of them this morning say the only answer to our problem is to have a vote in the House of Representatives and persuade two-thirds of our Members that in the United States Constitution we will require a balanced budget.

Now, after we get two-thirds here—and we can't get two-thirds to agree to anything but, hey—then we have to get two-thirds from the Senate. And we only hold the Senate by one vote, but it's a commentary because after we do that, then we have to go out to the States and ask the State legislators to approve what we have done, at least two-thirds of the States. That's their answer to those people who had an American Dream.

It would seem to me that along the line they may ask: Who received the benefits of all of this debt? And I would suspect that a lot of the people that manufacture military equipment had a windfall. I would suspect that those people that were able to take jobs overseas, the profit-and-loss books look like they did pretty well. And the financial section, our committee voted for and it was approved by the President, $789 billion to be given to the financial community. And God knows they say these are the people that can create the jobs.

Well, I don't know whether any economist agrees with that, but they have enjoyed these tax cuts for decades, and we now are at the highest unemployment that we've ever been. And it would seem to me that those who have, through the benefits of all of our taxpayers, received this windfall, that it's not asking too much to ask them to invest in their country, to invest in jobs, to not look at how much profit they can make overseas but how many lives can they have to get a decent salary, to be able to join the union, to be able to pay their bills, and at the same time be able to go back to work.

This answer that everyone makes a sacrifice, it's not talking about the private sector that made the money. I don't even know why ''sacrifice'' is even used in any dialogue. What we're basically saying is that we have to cut spending. Well, everyone would agree to that. But these people that are receiving benefits from their government are the ones that will be making the sacrifice. And as we cut the benefits—whether we're talking about education benefits, health care benefits, supplements to pensions, or sometimes the only funds that they have in retirement, Social Security; whether we're talking about checks for the disabled who cannot work—now they want to cut those programs and the people that provide the service. So that means that they will be increasing the number of people that are unemployed.

It just doesn't make sense that we have unemployment compensation and other things for people to have disposable income, but we cut $4 trillion from those people that are trying to survive.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to address the House.

DO THE RIGHT THING FOR AMERICA: BALANCE THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there's no question this Congress for many years has had a problem with spending.

The Democratic Congress developed a bigger and bigger appetite for spending for 40 years, as it held the majority for years and years.

Then Republicans took the House in 1995, and they forced a balanced budget on President Clinton. They had friction between the President and the Congress, and that allowed this country to have a balanced budget.

Who would have ever thought—I certainly wouldn't. I know I have got some Democratic friends who would have thought it, but I wouldn't—but when we got a Republican President and we had Republican majorities in the House and Senate, we began to spend again. There wasn't the friction there to hold spending down, and Republicans, I would submit, lost their way and began spending too much money.

My first year in Congress, in 2005 and 2006, we shouldn't have spent the

money we did. And I can recall being here on the floor and having Democratic friends beating us up, rightfully so, because in 2006 we spent $160 billion more than we had coming in. We didn't have to do that. We shouldn't have done that.

I would never have dreamed that 5 short years later that with the Democratic majority the spending would have exploded once they had no friction between a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress, and that we would go from the $160 billion in deficit spending in 2006 that Republicans got beat up for to $1.6 trillion in deficit spending—10 times more—and people still thinking that's somehow okay.

It wasn't okay for Republicans to overspend by $160 billion, and it's not okay for this Democratic Senate and President to continue to push to spend $1.6 trillion more than the $2.2 trillion we supposedly will have coming in.

Now we're told today we're going to have a vote on a Republican bill. A little surprising to some of us Republicans. We passed a bill, Cut, Cap, and Balance. It wasn't what I wanted. I liked the balanced budget amendment with a percentage of GDP cap on spending to help rein Congress in, and that was negotiable on the percentage. But it also had $111 billion out of $1.6 trillion that would have been cut from spending. That just wasn't enough. But the balanced budget amendment, if it had been passed and become part of the law, was enough of a game changer it was worth voting for.

Then the Senate sits back and says, We're not going to go for that. We're not going to pass anything, so pass something else. And now our leadership has heard the call of Leader REID down the hall and is going to bring another bill.

And I know the intentions of both sides of the aisle want the best for the country. I get that. I understand that. We have different ideas on how that can be done. And I know that there are people in my party that want to keep beating up on me because I can't vote for a bill that only cuts $1 trillion out of $15 trillion to $16 trillion that will be deficit spending over the next 10 years. Because it's easy to do the math: We cut $1 trillion out of $15 trillion, $16 trillion over the next 10 years, and if we can keep doing that, and there are no assurances we can, every 10 years cut another trillion, then when I have my 207th birthday, we can celebrate that year a balanced budget, and we will have only added $120 trillion to the $14.3 trillion deficit now. I can't vote for that.

Politically we're told, this is the political thing to do. You've got to do the political thing. If you don't vote for the Boehner bill, you're voting for Obama. That's not true. If the Senate will pass anything—anything—then we could drive this to a conference committee and get a compromise. The Senate has to pass something.

Well, think about this scenario very quickly: We pass this, say, hypothetically. The Senate says, Oh, well, you pushed us to the edge of the cliff; we didn't want to vote for this. Then they pass it just like we did, and the President says, I was going to veto but we're on the edge of the cliff. A 100 percent Republican bill; they wouldn't compromise. And now they say, Well, gee, Republicans inherited the economy.

It's not right practically; it's not right politically. Let's do the right thing for America.

THE SOMALIA CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Horn of Africa is currently suffering from the worst drought in 60 years, one of the worst humanitarian crises in recent memory. For both moral and national security reasons, it demands a strong, clear, sustained response from this institution.

Last week, famine was declared in parts of southern Somalia. This means acute malnutrition rates among children now exceed 30 percent, that more than two people per 10,000 die every day, and that people are not able to access food or other basic necessities.

□ 1120

One out of every five households in famine-declared areas have no food at all. The malnutrition rates in Somalia are currently the highest in the world. In the last few months, tens of thousands of Somalis, the majority of them children, have died as a result of causes related to malnutrition. In some of the most affected areas, an estimated 310,000 children are acutely malnourished.

The worst may be yet to come. Eight million people are in need of assistance in Ethiopia and Kenya. Unless the global community and humanitarian agencies intervene now, it's predicted that the entire south of Somalia will face famine within the next 2 months.

Nearly a thousand people are arriving daily at overcrowded refugee camps in Kenya and Ethiopia. Many have journeyed for weeks to get there. According to Josette Sheeran, executive director of the U.N. World Food Program, the roads to these camps ''are becoming roads of death. Over half the women I talked to had to leave children to die or had children die. In the Horn of Africa, we could lose a generation.'' And the troubles do not end there. Sexual violence against women in these already overcrowded refugee camps is on the rise.

This crisis didn't happen overnight. The eastern Horn of Africa is prone to chronic food insecurity. What is more, below-average rainfall in late 2010 and the spring of 2011 anticipated drought conditions, which have been dramatically worsened by the fact Somalia has not had a central government since 1991. Drought conditions have also progressively worsened throughout the year in Ethiopia and Kenya.

To address the ongoing crisis, Secretary Clinton recently announced that the United States would provide another $28 million in aid for people in Somalia and for Somali refugees in Kenya, in addition to the over $431 million in food and nonfood emergency assistance already provided for the region this year.

It's a good start. But we need to ensure that the appropriate U.S. funds are available to address this crisis this year and that Congress provides enough funding to maintain our ability to really address these crises. It is a matter of life and death for the most vulnerable people in the world.

We do this not just out of moral responsibility, although that should be compelling enough. It is also because our national security interests need to be represented to maintain the capability to combat food insecurity in the Horn of Africa and other critical regions around the world. It's about our national security. Anti-hunger programs can help this crisis and strengthen international diplomacy. Yet, unfortunately, we have seen the money for international food aid cut back severely. When we fight hunger and poverty, we undercut the recruiting base of those who would threaten us—the terrorists who would threaten us.

Let me conclude by saying we know what we can do to help. We have the ability to alleviate hunger and suffering of millions in the Horn of Africa. We know that doing so is the right thing to do. It makes us safer in the long run. We lack the political will to do the right thing. I urge my colleagues, support funding for these critical programs in the coming budget for the millions of suffering in Somalia, Kenya and Ethiopia, for the humanitarian crisis of the future, for the continued safety and the security of the United States.

BROWN CHAPEL A.M.E. CHURCH 145TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. I rise today to recognize the 145th anniversary of Brown Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Selma, Alabama. For 145 years, Brown Chapel has been a pillar in the Selma community, and she stands today as a powerful symbol of the civil rights movement for the major role that this church played in the events that led to the adoption of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

One hundred forty-five years ago, just 2 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, freed slaves began worshipping, first in private homes, and

eventually in the basement of the Hotel Albert in Selma, Alabama. One hundred forty-five years ago, on August 31, 1867, an African Methodist Episcopal missionary, Brother John Turner, addressed the group assembled in the basement of the Hotel Albert and extended them an invitation to unite with the African Methodist Episcopal connection.

Two years later, in 1869, these visionary church members bought a plot of land on Sylvan Street, now known as Martin Luther King Street. This beautiful edifice of Brown Chapel that stands today, with its imposing twin towers and Romanesque revival styling, was built in 1908 by a black builder, Mr. A.J. Farley. Today, we celebrate 145 years of Brown Chapel—a history of faith, courage, and leadership.

It took great courage in the early 1960s to defy an injunction that forbade all churches in Selma, Alabama, from holding mass meetings. Most churches in Selma refused to disobey the court order, but Brown Chapel opened its doors to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and became that wonderful church of courage that played such an integral role in the civil rights movement. Brown Chapel became an icon of the movement.

It was from Brown Chapel that they marched on Bloody Sunday, 2 days later on Turnaround Tuesday, and on March 21, 1965, the day when the Selma to Montgomery march was finally completed. Leading the infamous Bloody Sunday was Hosea Williams, as well as our esteemed colleague in this Chamber, Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia.

The story of Bloody Sunday will go down in the annals of history as a pivotal event in the civil rights movement. On March 7, 1965, at the Edmund Pettus Bridge, six blocks from Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church, mounted troops confronted the marchers on that bridge. Sheriff Jim Clark and his posse charged the marchers with tear gas and with billy clubs. That night, ABC News interrupted regularly scheduled programs to air footage of Bloody Sunday. By morning, news of the event had spread to nearly every American household, and thousands of supporters began to walk to Selma. The Selma to Montgomery march and the subsequent outrage led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

For 145 years, Brown Chapel has been a powerful agent of change. It has been a place where socioeconomic and racial barriers have been challenged, a place where barriers that divide our Nation have been broken down.

Brown Chapel continues to make history. On March 4, 2007, then-Senator Barack Obama, a Presidential candidate, gave the address for the annual Bridge Crossing Commemoration. It was during this address in 2007 that Barack Obama thanked the ''Moses Generation'' and challenged the ''Joshua Generation.'' In his famous ''Joshua Generation'' speech, Obama asked what the present generation would do to fulfill the legacy, the obligations, and the debts that we owe to the people before them.

As a proud member of Brown Chapel Church, I had the privilege of being there that day. And for me, his words were a call to action. It was because people prayed in Brown Chapel and people marched on the Edmund Pettus Bridge that a little black girl from Selma, Alabama, could dream and could one day stand here in this wonderful Chamber as the first black Congresswoman from the State of Alabama.

Brown Chapel has been a pillar in my hometown of Selma, Alabama; and it still remains so today. I am a proud member of this church and have been for the last 30 years of my life. I was raised in this beautiful historic church, and I know its significance. I am now proud to represent the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama and proud of the many giants on whose shoulders I stand.

In honor of the 145th anniversary of the historic Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church, I, TERRI A. SEWELL, Representative to the United States Congress from the Seventh District of Alabama, do hereby recognize Brown Chapel for its numerous contributions to the city of Selma, the State of Alabama, and this Nation. I ask those present today to join me in celebrating 145 years of historic Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church.

□ 1130

CREDIT DEFAULT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has once again proven its complete irresponsibility by putting our economy at risk in handling our Nation's finances. A little over a decade ago, there were projected surpluses as far as the eye could see. The Nation had achieved a firm financial footing. That was before the George Bush administration and the Republicans took us on a spending spree, paying out trillions in huge tax cuts, skewed to—guess who?—the top 2 percent, the wealthy, whose investment decision then killed jobs in our country. The last month that George Bush was in office, we lost over 700,000 jobs just in that month. The Bush Administration plunged the Nation during that decade into two wars they refused to pay for.

History tells the story.

Then came the big economic collapse of 2008 during the Bush Administration that included a loss in Federal revenues, which followed the largest economic downturn since the Great Depression, due to George Bush's capitulation to Wall Street abuse. Now, Republicans claim to care about the Federal deficit?

Well, yes, revenues have shrunk by about $400 billion a year because of the financial crisis they created we're trying to dig ourselves out of. Spread out over 10 years, that covers the, roughly, $4 trillion we're trying to eke out of this sick economy to pay down our debt. But it's a very delicate balance we're attempting because there are 14 million Americans out of work and up to 24 million who are working part time, who want to work full time, or others who have completely given up and dropped out. We can't hurt them more.

Fewer jobs mean lower revenues at all levels. It means lower profits to many companies, and it certainly means lower revenues into the Federal Treasury because there are more people who are on unemployment: more people who rely on government assistance, more people who rely on public health because their private insurance has dried up. How many people now can't afford to pay their COBRA? Millions who are not earning paychecks are not able to pay their contributions to Social Security and Medicare. So it's a vicious cycle.

In any time of economic downturn, national economic policy must act like a fulcrum on a teeter-totter. It has to level impacts on people so they can reposition. The government has to at the Federal level help prop up the American people until they can find their footing again. It doesn't take a mental giant to figure that out. Unemployment is the major cause of the deficit that we are bearing now; yet we hear almost no discussion about jobs and how to create jobs, to get rid of unemployment, as the reemployed and lift the economy—healing the Republic. Rather than talking about how to create jobs and how unemployment causes lost revenues and kills more jobs, all we're hearing is take more flesh off the bones of families and communities. House Republicans have placed the entire economy at risk now to satisfy the ideological wishes of a few.

The American public sees what's happening. Importantly, they're feeling directly what is not happening. Nobody is being fooled. I've heard from thousands of people back home in northern Ohio who are concerned that the Republican leadership is playing politics—playing with fire—during a time when our economic recovery is very, very fragile. Putting our Nation's credit rating at risk is totally irresponsible and will cause more economic harm. I had somebody tell me yesterday he's trying to renegotiate his home loan, and the mortgage company wanted to raise the interest rate a quarter percent because of the market uncertainty all of this is causing.

Since World War I, our country has always received a AAA status from credit rating agencies because, until now, we have always put the Nation first—not any political party first, but the Nation first. To force America to default for the first time in history would hurt our Republic and every working family, and it would hurt

those who are out of work even more. It would mean higher interest rates on cars, on home loans, on credit cards, on student loans. It would mean fewer jobs and less growth.

Instability, uncertainty, creates a downdraft on the recovery. Congress should be focusing on economic recovery and creating jobs if we want to close that deficit gap. You balance budgets by full employment economies. We surpassed the debt limit over 2 months ago, and come August 2, the Treasury will simply not be able to pay all the bills that are currently due.

Yes, it's long overdue to reach a compromise. Instead, Speaker BOEHNER has walked away from the negotiating table and has chosen to roll out a hasty bill that hasn't gone through the normal committee process. Apparently, many in his own party reject it. This isn't leadership for America at a time when she needs it. It may be capitulation to Grover Norquist and his lobby, but our responsibility is far greater.

Mr. Speaker, the way that you balance budgets is to put people to work and grow the economy. I support a balanced, bipartisan solution to reduce our deficit, create jobs and grow our economy, to expand our middle class and protect Medicare, Social Security and Medicaid beneficiaries. The solution to deficits is robust job growth and full economic recovery. Let's spend two months putting that initiative forward!

THE AMERICAN DEBT LIMIT HELD HOSTAGE—AN UNNECESSARY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, today we face an unnecessary crisis. The debt limit has never before been held hostage by any political party, because it is in every American's best interest to protect the credit of the United States; but now ideologues in Congress have hijacked this issue, and have pushed our Nation to the brink of default in rejecting all offers of compromise.

Calls for massive spending cuts, and spending cuts alone, without raising any revenues whatsoever are irresponsible at least and deliberately destructive at worst. They would default on our debt, causing a global financial crisis, rather than see hedge fund managers, corporate jet owners or phenomenally profitable oil companies pay higher taxes. Their call for fiscal responsibility rings hollow, and the fiscal history of the last three decades shows that.

This chart shows the growth of America's national debt since 1980.

At the end of the Carter administration, the national debt was less than $1 trillion. Twelve years later, with President Reagan's 8 years and the first President Bush's 4 years, the national debt had grown by more than 300 percent—it had quadrupled—and we were mired in debt. The Reagan-Bush economic policies greatly increased the debt and led to soaring deficits and rising interest rates. It ended in a recession.

In 1993, President Clinton was under severe pressure from the very Republicans who had meekly followed the two Republican Presidents as they raised the national debt by over 300 percent. President Clinton championed a balanced austerity program with, roughly, equal spending cuts and revenue increases—the Clinton years. Republicans in both the House and Senate voted unanimously against that program, arguing it would cost jobs and cause a recession, but the exact opposite occurred. More than 20 million jobs were created under the Clinton administration, and each of the last three budgets of the Clinton Presidency produced a surplus. Those three budgets were the only budgets and surplus in the last 40 years, and Clinton's balanced program is considered highly successful by economists. President Clinton raised taxes on those who could afford it and reduced spending to shrink our deficit, and the economy grew by leaps and bounds.

The fiscal record of the second President Bush is a record of utter irresponsibility. It began with massive tax cuts, skewed sharply toward the wealthy, and with trillions of dollars spent on two long, unpopular wars—all of that paid for by borrowing. It ended in the Great Recession, caused by the collapse of an unregulated housing market which was fueled by Wall Street greed. President Bush turned President Clinton's surplus into more than 5 trillion additional dollars added to our national debt—all the way up to here—almost doubling the debt again.

President Obama was inaugurated during the worst month of job losses in the Great Recession and cannot be blamed for what happened before, but the recovery has stalled, and we're short 12 million jobs.

History has shown us what works and what doesn't. The Reagan-Bush economics led to hugely increased debt. The Clinton economics eliminated the deficit and accelerated economic growth, but it required some sacrifice by all Americans to fix the national problem.

Now Republicans want to slash social programs, gut Medicare and Social Security benefits, and further reduce taxes for the wealthiest few. The Republicans threaten default on our debt. The only plan they offer would add hundreds of thousands of people to the unemployment lines by eliminating jobs in the public sector. They would protect the wealthiest few at the expense of the entire country. They offer no plan to create jobs and no long-term solution. Yet America needs a long-term solution, and that must include spending reduction and revenue increase in balanced proportion.

□ 1140

DEBT CEILING HOSTAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the elaborate Kabuki dance continues here on Capitol Hill surrounding the angst about increasing the debt ceiling. I think what we are seeing can be summarized in three words: ''recklessness,'' ''abuse,'' and ''hypocrisy.''

First of all, it is reckless for my Republican friends to hold the debt ceiling discussions hostage in an attempt to achieve other political goals. There have already been significant costs. American currency has weakened. We've watched a slide of the stock market since last Friday when the agreement blew up as Speaker BOEHNER walked away from his work with President Obama. We've watched premiums being paid now to ensure United States debt. People are making adjustments that are having consequences right now and eroding the confidence that we have had globally in the strength of American commitments to pay its debt—a confidence that has resulted in record low-interest rates that have benefited everybody in the United States, and that is at risk.

The irony is that there is no reason for this to occur. We have increased the debt ceiling 102 times since this unusual little law was enacted in 1917. The United States, you recall, is one of only two countries in the entire world that goes through this charade of having to vote to finance spending that we've already done.

It has always been routine. We did this routinely for President Bush. The irony is now when we are facing another adjustment in the debt ceiling, ironically most of the debt, $9.5 billion, was incurred as a direct result of the policies of the two Presidents Bush and Ronald Reagan. There is a great little chart on page A–14 in today's New York Times that outlines this.

Instead of making it routine and making whatever pontification people will do on the floor of the House, which they have done since 1917, now all of a sudden we have thrown a monkey wrench into the process. We've raised the specter of default. We're having people speculate whether there's enough money to go to August 2 or August 5. We're speculating about what debts, what bills the President will pay.

The irony is that this Republican recklessness is actually empowering the President of the United States to make decisions about whether to pay Chinese creditors or honor our obligations to senior citizens or people who do business with the United States.

Absolutely outrageous.

Wouldn't you think Congress would like to make these decisions rather than punting to the President? Well, no. In fact, the Republicans are more

than willing to punt to the President the decision about lifting the debt ceiling, even though the law that we have puts that responsibility on Congress. It's reckless and it's unnecessary.

Second, there is an abuse of power. You know, the American public overwhelmingly wants a balanced solution with a little bit of revenue increase, maybe taking some unjustified tax loopholes, not slashing budgets unilaterally. They want a balanced approach. But my Republican friends, having taken control of one Chamber, now think that they ought to be able to dictate to the other body, dictate to the President of the United States, have it their way or the highway. It's not what the American public wants. It's not what should happen in our system of democracy, where there should be some give-and-take and some compromise.

But no, what we're seeing is an unfortunate abuse of power on the part of some people who are willing to take hostage the debt ceiling negotiation and risk economic damage to the United States, to our families, and businesses.

And third, it is a case of hypocrisy. You know, the Republican plan, the so-called Cut, Cap, and Balance—and they passed it last week on the floor of the House—would require cutting spending for the government to 18 percent of the overall economy. Interesting number. Ronald Reagan never even proposed a budget that was less than 21 percent.

They're talking about draconian cuts to things that the American public relies upon—everything from food safety to infrastructure to education. But when the time came to vote for it, this week, they voted ''no'' on an amendment that would have implemented that type of cut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JENKINS. Where is the President's plan?

If I had a nickel for every time I have heard that question, we would be much closer to resolving our debt crisis. But the President and my friends across the aisle have still not answered the most important question of all: Where is their plan for job creation?

House Republicans have a plan. At the core of this plan is passing the three pending trade agreements. These trade agreements have the ability to immediately create thousands of jobs, open new markets for our farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers, and to play a pivotal role in growing our economy. Yet, the President continues to stand in the way.

These agreements create jobs, period.

So let's pass these agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama. Let's reauthorize the GSP and the Andean Trade Preference Act and finally fulfill our duty to the American people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 47 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day. We give You thanks for all people who, through courage and selfless devotion, have carried the banner of righteousness before us and have pointed the way to the high ideals of human dignity that are the handiwork of Your creation. These are our American ancestors.

Bless now the men and women of the people's House. Call forth leaders from their number who understand that courage, exercised in the fulfillment of their legislative responsibilities, might cost them popularity now but reap them praise in the future from our American descendants. May they take solace in knowing that it has always been this way with great leaders.

We thank You for their hard work. Give them the consolation of knowing they will have done their best work for all of our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAMBORN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SUSTAINING NUCLEAR DETERRENCE AFTER NEW START

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a critical component of America's national security, our nuclear deterrence. Yesterday, the House Armed Services Committee Strategic Forces Subcommittee held a hearing on sustaining nuclear deterrence after New START. This hearing made it absolutely clear that the nuclear policy provisions in the House fiscal year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act are critical to our nuclear deterrence strategy.

The ink was barely dry on the New START Treaty, and the administration was already talking about deeper cuts. We need to slow down and wait for nuclear modernization to catch up to arms control. We must be wary of any further unilateral reductions of the U.S. nuclear deterrent, which is critical to America's defense and that of over 30 of our allies. Congress has an obligation to scrutinize U.S. nuclear policy and force structure to ensure that we have a sustainable and effective deterrent, which is why the House NDAA nuclear policy provisions must become law.

WE DON'T DEFAULT

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Here's what we should do to avoid default: increase the debt ceiling with no strings attached. Here's how to get out of debt: end the wars, save $1 trillion in 10 years; repeal tax cuts to the wealthy, save another $1 trillion; Medicare for all, end the $400 billion yearly subsidies for the health insurance industry; renegotiate trade agreements with workers' rights, human rights, and environmental quality principles to save millions of jobs and billions of dollars.

The Fed creates money out of nothing and gives it to banks. Why should our country go into debt, borrowing money from banks when we have the constitutional power to create money and invest in jobs? We could have another New Deal, putting millions to work, rebuilding America's roads and transportation system. We could have a Works Green Administration where NASA is the incubator of jobs, designing and engineering wind and solar microtechnologies for private sector manufacturing, distribution, installation, and maintenance in millions of homes, saving money and energy and protecting the environment.

We are the United States of America, the greatest country on Earth. We envision wealth; we don't default. We create wealth; we don't default. We build wealth; we don't default.

REID DEBT PLAN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the American people can finally see HARRY REID's debt ceiling plan. Only 5 days before the deadline set by the President, the Senate majority leader finally put something on paper and submitted it to the Congressional Budget Office. I think we understand why he waited so long to do this. The plan before the Senate is filled with gimmicks and does almost nothing to put our country on a better fiscal footing.

Of course, the largest gimmick is claiming to save $1 trillion by shutting down wars that are already winding down. Despite having these phantom cuts in his bill, Majority Leader REID gives the President the full amount of debt ceiling increase that he needs to push everything past next year's election. Once again, the financial security of our country would be sacrificed for political expediency.

By contrast, Speaker BOEHNER's plan cuts spending by $1 for each $1 increase in the debt limit. It may not be perfect, but it is necessary to keep us paying our bills and prevent a debt rating downgrade. It is a start to getting our country back on the path to a balanced budget.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today with a coat of many colors. It is a little unusual to do this, but I'm very proud of it. And I think everyone will recognize this because this is the traditional white coat that doctors wear. It was given to me by the passionate residents at Lucile Packard Children's Hospital in my district.

All of its pockets hold notes, and the notes were signed by the doctors and the nurses, all in support of a remarkable program in our country that has trained thousands of pediatricians and pediatric specialists over the last 12 years, the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education Program.

It was first created in 1999 because there was a shortage of pediatricians in our country and subspecialists. And this program today has been wildly successful, increasing the number of pediatricians by 35 percent. Congress needs to approve this and keep in place those that take such good care of our children.

WHAT KIND OF LEGACY WILL WE LEAVE?

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of an important debate. It's a debate on the debt ceiling and our spending crisis. But fundamentally, it's a debate about the future direction of our country, the next generation, and getting Americans back to work. Jobs are the cure for an ailing economy and the elixir for a bright and secure future. We cannot continue down the current path of fiscal irresponsibility. We cannot continue to commit generational theft of our children's and grandkids' futures.

What kind of legacy will we leave for this country and its future generations? Will we leave a legacy of debt? No, that's not what I want. We must not pass on to the generation of tomorrow the mistakes of our leaders today who, until now, remain unwilling to make the tough decisions and cut spending to create jobs and grow our economy. We can and must do right; and by God's grace, we will.

□ 1210

COMPROMISE AND A BALANCED APPROACH

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, Republicans claim that they want to lower the government spending, but they sure have a funny way of showing it. First, they refused to compromise with the President on a proposal that would lower the deficit by $4 trillion. Now they refuse to compromise on a long-term plan that would result in meaningful deficit reduction.

Even after the stock market plunged yesterday, Republicans still refuse to compromise. Why? Because they're more interested in scoring political points and protecting the tax breaks for the ultrarich corporations that ship jobs overseas.

We must not balance the budget on the backs of our seniors and the poor by cutting Social Security and Medicare. We need a balanced approach. We need to work together. No taxes, no jobs.

Let's stop this dangerous game of chicken before we have an economic disaster. We must compromise, and it shouldn't be ''my way or the highway.''

BALANCING THE BUDGET

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to thank every vocal constituent and American for pushing us up to this point today when we will consider a tax-free and sensible budget control plan in exchange for raising our Nation's debt ceiling.

Is it perfect? Far from it. Will I vote for it today? Yes. The alternatives are too scary to comprehend.

No matter how many times you try to put them down or call them names, the Tea Party movement and many others that share their views have had a monumental impact on the debt ceiling debate. Know this: If left to its own devices, Washington would have completed just another perfunctory raising of the debt ceiling, or worse, more taxes and more spending.

Call them hobbits. Call them what you like. I call the Tea Party and others who wish to fight to get this country on a proper fiscal trajectory true patriots.

The reality here on Earth, Mr. Speaker, is that America is a great Nation, and we wish to remain that way.

DEFAULT IS NOT AN OPTION

(Mr. ALTMIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, with the clock tick, tick, ticking away towards a default on our financial obligations for the first time in American history, we need to come together to find bipartisan solutions. It's time to stop holding America's credit rating hostage.

To be clear, what we face is not a possible government budget shutdown. The consequences of default would have far-reaching and long-lasting effects. The increase in interest rates resulting from a default could cost Americans an additional $10 billion in borrowing costs, and the loss in confidence from investors in government securities worldwide could easily send America into another recession. Default is simply not an option.

I support commonsense compromise solutions to reduce our deficit and return to balanced budgets.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides are ready to put the partisan politics aside and move forward with a plan to help keep America and the U.S. in good financial standing.

REPUBLICAN DEFAULT ACT

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republican Default Act, which will require deep cuts in Medicare while preserving tax breaks and loopholes for millionaires and large corporations. It is beyond disappointing that Republicans have squandered a real opportunity to put our Nation on a sustainable fiscal path.

Many of my constituents are afraid the Republican leadership will continue bending to the Tea Party demands to drive our economy toward a self-inflicted recession.

The risks here are very real. Default or a credit downgrade will hurt middle class families with higher mortgage and credit card interest rates and higher costs for food, gas, and utilities.

Republicans need to stop playing reckless games with our economy and start working for what the American people want: comprehensive deficit reduction that shares the burden equally,

strengthens Medicare and Social Security, ends tax giveaways, and puts our country back on the path to fiscal stability.

HOPING FOR A SPIRIT OF CONSENSUS

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to hope that a spirit of consensus will come forth to avoid this self-inflicted wound, I think it's well to think of a general principle on how we should approach our fiscal challenges, and that is that a nation that does not learn from its clear, unambiguous mistakes is bound to repeat them. And, in fact, the problem with the Republican plan that will be on the floor today is that it not only repeats the mistakes that occurred during the Bush administration, it enshrines them into permanent law.

Now, I remember very well where Alan Greenspan came before us years ago during the last President's administration and said that we needed to have massive cuts for multimillionaires and further cuts for the oil industries, because if we didn't do that the United States Government would just have too much money in the kitty.

That didn't work out too well. In fact, because of those giant mistakes, it blew a hole in the deficit.

Do not repeat them. Let's go back and solve this problem the real way.

RECOGNIZING CAPE COD BASEBALL LEAGUE'S ALL-STAR GAME

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Cape Cod League's All-Star Game, which is taking place in Fenway Park on Friday, July 29.

I rise, not just because this organization embodies the best of America's pastime, but because the league has decided to dedicate this year's game to the memory of Christina-Taylor Green, the youngest victim of the Arizona shootings that took the lives of six people and injured 13 others, including our colleague, Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS.

Christina was an avid baseball fan who hoped one day to become the first female major league baseball player. Her father, John, is a scout with the Los Angeles Dodgers, and the family spent summers in Cape Cod, in part so he could scout players in the Cape Cod Baseball League.

For those of you who are not familiar with the Cape Cod Baseball League, it's the Nation's premier amateur league and gives fans like Christina the opportunity to watch future major league players up close.

In Christina's honor, league players will wear commemorative patches on their shirts, and her brother, Dallas, will throw out the first pitch.

Additionally, Christina inspired the league to arrange for a Cape Cod Baseball League baseball to be brought into space by Congresswoman GIFFORDS' husband, Mark Kelly, and the astronauts on board the final mission of Space Shuttle *Endeavor*. The ''Spaceball'' covered 6.5 million miles during this trip.

Baseball games are wonderful examples of old-fashioned American fun, and I commend the Cape Cod League for their heartfelt tribute. Sadly, Christina, whose innocent life was lost too early, will only be there with us in spirit; yet that unique American spirit, to achieve new heights, the same we saw in her desire to be the first female major league baseball player, will continue to inspire us.

BOEHNER DEFAULT PREVENTION BILL

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I'm told that this afternoon this House will vote on the Boehner default prevention bill, in direct contravention of House rules, with limited debate and no opportunity for amendment. One of the most important discussions we need to have as a country—limited debate and no opportunity for amendment.

I would welcome that debate. I'd love to talk about what's involved in gutting Medicare and Social Security without asking the very wealthiest people in this country to participate in solving this problem. I'd love to have that debate. And we will, later, not today.

What I'm rising to talk about today, though, is the fact that this bill would have us having exactly this discussion 6 months from today, talking about default and credit ratings and the impacts of default, instead of talking about what every American wants this Chamber to be focused on, which is what we can do to bring about jobs.

This is not a good bill. But the notion that it would have us having this conversation again in 6 months is reason enough for every Member of this Chamber to reject that bill this afternoon.

□ 1220

STOP THE GOP FROM ENDING MEDICARE

(Ms. CASTOR of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to work together to resolve our debt reduction strategy, and I rise to urge my GOP colleagues to abandon their efforts to end Medicare as we know it.

For 45 years, Medicare has been that fundamental promise to our parents and our grandparents that if they work hard, if they play by the rules, and if they pay into Medicare, they're going to be able to live their retirement years in dignity, and that their children will have economic security because we won't be worried about the economic challenges that a diagnosis or an emergency situation or health condition would bring.

It's fundamentally unfair that the debt racked up over the last decade with two wars put on a credit card, tax breaks for special interests, and other special provisions, and now the GOP is looking to end Medicare as we know it and to undermine that fundamental promise. We're not going to stand for it. We can work together on a more reasonable solution, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

LIFE SCIENCES JOBS AND INVESTMENT ACT

(Ms. SCHWARTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHWARTZ. As we seek ways to get America's economy growing again, one part of this effort must be to create the right environment to grow private-sector, cutting-edge jobs and cutting-edge industries. That is why I have joined several of my colleagues in a bipartisan, bicameral basis to introduce legislation that will keep America on the front edge of scientific research and development and offer new opportunities for job creation in America's life sciences industry.

This legislation provides targeted tax credits to promote innovation, entrepreneurship, and new, high-quality jobs here at home. It expands on the research and development tax credit, and allows companies to bring back overseas earnings for the purpose of creating American jobs and investing in American startup companies.

American universities, research centers, and private companies are the world leaders in medical sciences and the development of new medical devices and therapeutics, but we are no longer alone. This legislation will help ensure that our life sciences industries maintain their competitive edge in the global marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of innovative small businesses and the new jobs that they create. Let's help them create the cures and treatments of tomorrow right here at home today.

LINCOLN'S WARNING STILL STANDS

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. ''Fellow-citizens, we cannot escape history,'' said Lincoln in an address to Congress in 1862. ''We of this Congress and this administration, we will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another

of us. We, even we here, hold the power and bear the responsibility.''

Lincoln didn't say that on one side of the battle lay a Democratic victory, and on the other side a Republican defeat, or vice versa. Lincoln didn't say that this was a victory achieved without great compromise. Lincoln didn't say, if you do things my way, with my party, we'll win this one. He told the story of a Nation that faced terrible consequences and yet still had the extraordinary foresight and fortitude to charge ahead toward a victory that included compromise.

''We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of Earth.'' His warning stands today.

HEADS UP AMERICA

(Mr. GARAMENDI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. Heads up America. This isn't just about raising the debt limit; this is about fundamental change in all the things that we hold dear here in America.

If you care about Medicare for your parents, or if you happen to be 65, pay attention to what's going to be on this floor in the next couple of hours. If you think Social Security is important to you or to your parents and to your future as the foundation for your pension, pay attention to what's going on here. Because have no doubts, America, that the Republican Party is putting forth, using the debt limit as a lever, putting in place fundamental changes in Medicare, basically looking to terminate Medicare as we know it, and changing Social Security so that it is no longer the foundation for your pensions.

Heads up America. Watch carefully, because the Republican Party is going right at the very heart of the most stable and most important parts of every retiree's future. Pay attention. Pay attention. Because this is a critical moment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to address their remarks to the Chair.

WE NEED A BIPARTISAN DEBT COMPROMISE

(Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I've heard many of my Republican friends claim that providing the private sector with certainty and then getting out of its way is one of the ways Congress spurs economic recovery. Unfortunately, Speaker BOEHNER's plan does neither of those two things. It delays a catastrophic default only for a short time, keeping this crisis going before requiring the same charade in 6 months time.

If House Republicans are so unwilling to consider compromise today, if they eschew the bipartisan compromise that's proposed under Simpson Bowles, the Biden Group, and the bipartisan Gang of Six, why should the American people have any faith that when they come back in 6 months they will be more willing to compromise?

Where the Boehner plan fails, the Senate proposal provides economic certainty to the American economy through 2012, while protecting Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security from the drastic cuts the Boehner plan envisions. And according to the CBO, the Senate plan's $2.2 trillion in deficit reduction is more than double the Boehner plan of $915 billion.

The American people have spoken, Mr. Speaker, in poll after poll, on our phones, in our emails and at our offices. Get a bipartisan compromise now.

VOTE ''NO'' ON DEBT CEILING LEGISLATION

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the majority's debt ceiling proposal.

Democrats and Republicans agree that raising the Federal debt is unsustainable, that the default is absolutely unacceptable, and that we must set our country on a course of fiscal responsibility. But the majority's unwillingness to propose a solution that has any chance of working is putting our economy at risk and threatening the wage earners and senior citizens of America. We can find good solutions, but this bill is not the way.

Now, in the few days that we have left, it will take all of us working together to find sensible solutions. Americans expect leadership from the President to solve this budget stalemate, and alternatives to the bill do exist.

Americans want jobs, jobs, jobs and a responsible budget. There is a better approach that protects wage earners and senior citizens. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation we are considering today.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO LEBANON—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112–47)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect to the actions of certain persons to undermine the sovereignty of Lebanon or its democratic processes and institutions is to continue in effect beyond August 1, 2011.

Certain ongoing activities, such as continuing arms transfers to Hizballah that include increasingly sophisticated weapons systems, serve to undermine Lebanese sovereignty, contribute to political and economic instability in the region, and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared on August 1, 2007, to deal with that threat and the related measures adopted on that date to respond to the emergency.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 28, 2011*.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 627, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 375 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 375

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, modified by the amendments printed in part B of that report, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate, with one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of July 31, 2011, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules if the legislative text that is the object of the motion was

available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner on the legislative day before consideration, except that a motion described in subsection (b) may not be entertained until the third legislative day on which the legislative text that is the object of the motion is available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner.

(b) If the Speaker entertains a motion to suspend the rules relating to a measure proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution under subsection (a) debate under clause 1(c) of rule XV shall be extended to two hours.

SEC. 3. When the House adjourns by operation of section 4 of this resolution on any legislative day during the period from August 1, 2011, through September 6, 2011, it shall stand adjourned until the third constitutional day thereafter at a time to be announced by the Speaker in declaring the adjournment (except that when the House adjourns on September 6, 2011, it shall stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on September 7, 2011).

SEC. 4. On each legislative day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution:

(a) the Speaker may dispense with legislative business, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to section 3 of this resolution after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV; and

(b) if the Speaker does not dispense with legislative business, the Speaker may at any time declare the House adjourned pursuant to section 3 of this resolution.

SEC. 5. On each legislative day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution (except a day before August 8, 2011, on which the Speaker does not dispense with legislative business pursuant to section 4), the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved.

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 7. Bills and resolutions introduced during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall be numbered, included in the Congressional Record, and printed with the date of introduction, but may be referred by the Speaker at a later time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of the Budget Control Act of 2011. It provides for 2 hours of debate, as the Reading Clerk just said. One hour is equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules. That'll be yours truly and Ms. SLAUGHTER, and 30 minutes will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 30 minutes will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, since 1962, there have been 74 increases in the debt ceiling. At this moment, we begin what is clearly the single most historic debate on any measure that addresses increasing the debt ceiling. Why? Because for the first time we are working to get at the root cause of why it is that the debt ceiling needs to be increased.

As the debate negotiations over the looming debt ceiling limit have proceeded over the last weeks and months, people across this country are asking: How did we get to this point? How was the crisis created and how do we resolve it? As is often the case, we can't hope to reach a solution without understanding the fundamental problem.

At the very start of this process several months ago, many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle advocated strongly and worked very, very hard for an increase in the debt ceiling that had no strings attached to it at all; had nothing attached to it at all. They argued that the debt ceiling had been increased 10 times over the last decade, and it was just a perfunctory legislative act that should be done without any broader debate or accompanying policy changes.

Mr. Speaker, that approach is precisely the fundamental problem. And that approach is one that has, throughout the past several decades, led to what for all intents and purposes was little more than a blind increase in the debt ceiling itself. For years and years and years, the Federal Government has spent money that it does not have, expanding the size and scope of government and its reach without regard to the long-term fiscal consequences.

When the tax dollars ran out, Mr. Speaker, it turned to borrowing voraciously. Each and every time the borrowed money ran out, the Federal Government just borrowed more. It was always clear that catastrophic consequences would ensue if the U.S. Government defaulted on its obligations. So Congress took the path of least resistance and simply raised the debt ceiling. But sometimes, Mr. Speaker, the path of least resistance is, in fact, the road to ruin.

Raising the debt ceiling, without taking measures to address the underlying issues merely put off the crisis for a short time, making it larger and more entrenched in the process. That's how we got to the point where we are today.

And that's why from the very outset Republicans have insisted that this time would be different. We refused to contemplate yet another debt ceiling increase without addressing the underlying cycle of reckless, unaccountable spending and borrowing.

Yes, we absolutely must avert the looming crisis that could force the United States Government to default and put our ailing economy into a tailspin. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot and will not do so in a way that creates an even bigger crisis down the road.

Republicans put Washington on notice that the era of unchecked spending was coming to an end at the start of this Congress with the passage of H.R. 1, which dramatically cut spending for the current fiscal year. We continued the process of imposing new levels of fiscal discipline with the passage of our budget resolution for the coming fiscal year. This measure outlined not just spending cuts but long-term reforms that would help to prevent entitlement programs from collapsing into insolvency and dragging the rest of the economy along with them.

In May of this year, at the Economic Club of New York, Speaker BOEHNER once again outlined the Republican agenda for creating growth and opportunity, creating jobs and opportunity for our fellow Americans through greater fiscal discipline and more rigorous accountability for the size and scope of government.

From the very start of this new majority, Mr. Speaker, and at every step of the way since, Republicans have been fighting for real solutions to the fiscal mess that the country finds itself in. We promised that we would start a new course, and it is with a great deal of pride, Mr. Speaker, that I stand here and say we have done just that.

Today's underlying legislation, this underlying measure is a dramatic stride forward in our ongoing quest. While we have steadily laid the groundwork over the last 6 months, this plan represents the single most significant, most fundamental reform to our fiscal situation in the modern era.

It makes immediate, enormous cuts in Federal spending. These cuts are greater than the corresponding increase in the debt ceiling, ensuring that action taken to avert an immediate crisis is coupled with a massive down payment on dealing with the long-term crisis.

It sets caps on spending in order to impose discipline and accountability on the process going forward. It establishes a joint select committee that will be directed to identify at least $1.8 trillion in additional cuts and guarantee an expedited vote on those cuts later this year.

□ 1240

This is a critical component to the long-term solution.

Mr. Speaker, you know very well that we've had countless commissions over the years that have proposed ideas for cutting deficits. Some ideas have had more merit than others, but their

merit has been immaterial because no serious proposal has been afforded congressional consideration. This measure before us ensures that Congress will address the proposals that we receive.

Now, for the last 6 months, the House of Representatives has taken a number of key steps to rein in spending and ensure greater accountability and discipline in the use of taxpayer dollars. Yet they have been held up indefinitely by our friends in the other body. Today's underlying measure would eliminate the challenge by guaranteeing a clean up-or-down vote in both Chambers of the work product that emerges from this Joint Select Committee. The entire Congress, Mr. Speaker, will have no choice but to consider real solutions. Each and every Member of the House and the Senate will have to go on record. No deficit commission, Mr. Speaker, no deficit commission, no plan, no proposal that has come before has had that kind of guarantee, the kind of guarantee that is included in this measure that's before us.

Today's underlying measure also moves the process forward on a balanced budget amendment. Taken together, these proposals represent a radical departure from the status quo. Mr. Speaker, they fundamentally alter our Federal spending process in order not just to avert an immediate crisis but to diffuse the ticking timebomb of our $14.3 trillion national debt.

Mr. Speaker, global markets, U.S. job creators, and, most importantly, the American people are watching what we do here today. They want to see bold and credible action that restores confidence in our economy now and in the future.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, delivers that very action that the American people, that U.S. markets and the global markets are seeking. It's a plan for the short, medium, and long term. It fundamentally alters the current landscape and helps to ensure that we never get back to where we are right now, and that is, as we all know, on the brink of a fiscal and economic catastrophe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues—and I hope very much that we will be able to enjoy bipartisan support. I urge them to support both the rule that allows for consideration of this measure and the underlying legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman, my friend Mr. DREIER, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize that we have two separate but equally urgent issues facing our country: raising the debt ceiling and reducing the Nation's debt. In this Congress we should make a serious effort to do both. However, after 100 years, almost, of protecting the full faith and credit of the United States by raising the debt ceiling without pause, the majority's decided to hold the debt ceiling hostage in order to push drastic cuts and place the burden of future debt reduction squarely upon the middle class. This unprecedented effort to put ideology before country has led us to the brink of default, a prospect that is all too real as we vote today.

The plan we're considering today is not the product of a bipartisan compromise. No matter how many times anybody says that, it does not make it true. We're considering a bill the majority knows will never be approved by the Senate nor signed by the President. Members of the House are being told to vote on legislation despite having no idea, no idea, what cuts are in this bill. Any Democrat who votes for this bill could be cutting Social Security or heating for low-income families and not even know it. To ask the House to vote on undisclosed cuts is a cynical waste of time.

Furthermore, the bill shrugs aside the burden of governing. It asks us to vote like a mock government that will be set up and pass the buck to a commission to make decisions for us, leaving us to simply rubberstamp what they decide. That is not why I ran or was elected to Congress, and it is an abandonment of the responsibilities we are sworn to uphold.

Today's reckless plan would put us right back in the same situation a few months from now when the atmosphere is even more politically charged by the coming election. Our economy and our markets won't have the stability they need. Credit agencies will have no choice but to downgrade the U.S. debt. This would cause interest rates to rise, effectively raising taxes for every American family.

The leaders of the majority know this and said so publicly, but they don't seem to care. In a June 13 interview with Politico, Majority Leader CANTOR said, ''We feel very strongly that one of the reasons why we continue to see an ailing economy is that people have very little confidence, have very little certainty in terms of where we are headed.'' In that same interview, he was explicit that he wants a single debt ceiling vote for this Congress and not, as he said, ''a series of short-term extensions, as some have suggested.''

The following week Politico quoted Leader CANTOR saying, ''If we can't make the tough decisions now, why would we be making them later? I don't see how multiple votes on a debt ceiling increase can help get us to where we want to go.'' Yet here we are today considering a bill that will require a second debt ceiling vote just 6 months from now.

Not only is this bill awful policy and a waste of our time, but the rule before us clears the way, which will come as a great surprise to Members, for a constitutional amendment that would give a simple majority the ability to cut spending, while only allowing the government to raise revenues—that is, to go after the people who are more able to pay and to get corporations to pay their own way—by having to have approval of three-fifths of the House to do that. In other words, they are sacrosanct; the poor always give.

This cut-first, think-later approach would directly harm the middle class. The amendment stacks the deck in favor of future cuts to Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid while making it virtually impossible to close tax loopholes for oil companies and millionaires who own private jets.

As if this was not enough, the process by which we will vote on this amendment is a disgrace to this institution. Under today's rule the majority proposes we consider a constitutional amendment under suspension of the rules, the most closed procedure that we have. As we all should know, suspension of the rules is designed for noncontroversial legislation such as naming a post office or congratulating a winning sports team. To give a constitutional amendment the same consideration as renaming a post office is embarrassing for us and a disgrace to the dignity and tradition of the House.

In closing, today's debate is about fairness. Are we a nation that asks the most of those who have the least? It certainly appears so. Or are we a nation of shared sacrifice and fairness, a nation that asks every American to do his fair share? Today's bill turns upside-down any notion of fairness and proposes radical changes to our Constitution that would protect millionaires and special interests while making it easier than ever to take from the middle class.

For this reason I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend from Lawrenceville, Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), now in his seventh month as a Member of Congress, the Budget Committee's representative from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WOODALL. I very much thank the chairman for yielding.

That's right, 7 months—7 months.

I'm one of the new guys on Capitol Hill, and I ran for Congress to do exactly what we're doing down here today.

There are going to be a lot of folks down here with accusations and recriminations. I just want you to know I'm going to be the guy down here with a smile on my face because today is why I came to Congress.

Seventy-three times, I'm told by folks who have been here longer than I, this Congress has taken a withdrawal out of America's ATM.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I just wanted to say it's 74 times.

Mr. WOODALL. Seventy-four times. I appreciate the chairman for correcting me. Seventy-four times that America's ATM card has been stuck in, no funds to withdraw, and yet cash has been dispensed. And not once, I'm told by my friend from New York, not once have we ever tied any spending decisions to increasing America's credit line. That's outrageous. That's outrageous.

But today we do. Today we do. Today we say the buck stops with the 112th Congress. The buck stops with us.

□ 1250

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. DREIER. I've just been informed by the staff that both the gentleman and I are wrong, Mr. Speaker. It's 75 times that this has taken place. I've just been told by the Congressional Research Service. So we're just being very modest in our assessment of it so far. But we're up to 75, as of right now.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the chairman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. WOODALL. That almost takes the smile off my face. Can you believe that? Seventy-five times this Congress, the people's House, the most responsive body we have in Federal Government, has reached in with that ATM card and taken that money out, with absolutely no funds on deposit. Again, the buck stops today.

Now, in fairness, Mr. Speaker, this bill does not do everything I wanted it to do. I wanted more. And each and every time we've had an opportunity—we had an opportunity in H.R. 1, that continuing resolution we passed. A great process, a great debate, great conclusion. This does not go as far as the House budget—the budget that we passed that day.

Mr. Speaker, you remember we considered absolutely every budget that any Member of Congress brought to the floor of this House. We decided on one. This doesn't do as much as that did. But you know what this does do? This says we're not going to increase the credit line by a penny unless we're cutting a penny too, because the problem in this town, I have learned, Mr. Speaker, in 7 months, is not that we don't spend enough. It's not. And that's a legitimate disagreement I have found that we have. But it is not that we don't spend enough. The problem is that we spend too much.

Mr. Speaker, do I wish that we were doing more in this bill today? Yes, I do. But I smile with pride because we could have been yet another Congress, Congress No. 76, where we just kick the can down the road and accept no responsibility at all. We don't do that, Mr. Speaker. The buck stops here. I'm in strong support of this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule, to this closed process, and to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I keep expecting lion tamers and acrobats to appear on the House floor. Because this process, under this Republican leadership, has become a complete circus. The underlying Boehner plan should be called the Republican Default Act.

The rule allows the Republican leadership to bring a radical balanced budget amendment to the Constitution before the House, but right now we have no idea what that amendment will look like. This is crazy.

Our Founding Fathers spent weeks and weeks arguing over every clause, conjunction, and comma in the Constitution. But today, my Republican friends treat it as just another excuse for a partisan press release. And why are they doing this, Mr. Speaker? It's simple. Politics. The Speaker of the House made that clear in a radio interview. He argued that the reason the Republicans should support his radical plan to slash Medicare and Social Security and education and medical research is that ''Barack Obama hates it, HARRY REID hates it, NANCY PELOSI hates it.''

And yesterday, in a meeting of the Republican conference, their leadership tried to rally votes for this bill by playing a clip from the movie, ''The Town.'' The quote they used—and I guess this was supposed to be inspirational—was this: ''I need your help. I can't tell you what it is, you can never ask me about it later, and we're gonna hurt some people.''

The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that the people they're going to hurt are senior citizens on Medicare and Social Security. They're going to hurt children who don't have enough to eat. They're going to hurt students trying to afford a college education. They're going to hurt the very people who can least afford to take the hit, all in the name of protecting tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires. Their approach is reckless. Their approach is wrong. Their approach is unfair. And I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and against this bill.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to simply congratulate my colleague for the success that he had last night in the Rules Committee in encouraging the Rules Committee to adopt a measure that will ensure that we would have the 3-day layover requirement in place for consideration of any balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The gentleman offered the amendment, and I'm very pleased that the Rules Committee saw fit to make it in order. I want to congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I appreciate it very much. The problem is you're bringing it under a suspension of the rules, the most closed process that we have in this House. There are no amendments. Quite frankly, even 3 days is not enough to do the proper and due diligence on a constitutional amendment to the United States Constitution.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, I would say to my friend that in both 1962 and 1983 constitutional amendments were brought up in this House under suspension of the rules. This is not at all unprecedented. What is unprecedented is the fact that we said there would in fact be, based on the gentleman's amendment, a 3-day layover requirement addressed to ensure that Members would have an opportunity to see the proposed constitutional amendment before it is voted on.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a very distinguished former Rules Committee member, my very good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, TOM COLE.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second time that this Congress has chosen—this House—has chosen to raise the debt ceiling in a responsible and historic way, that is, not only allowing the ceiling to go up, but coupling it with real reductions in long-term spending that we all know need to occur. So far, the President and the other body have both failed to act. The Senate, just for the record, hasn't even passed a budget in 2 years, hasn't moved a piece of legislation in this crisis. Frankly, it has done nothing.

The President is now a born-again deficit hawk. It's a false conversion. Let's just look at the record. He appointed a deficit reduction commission and then refused to adopt any of its recommendations. He sent this body and the other body a budget that was so flawed, it failed 97–0 in a Democratic Senate. He asked for a clean vote on the debt ceiling in this body. He was given that vote, and he got fewer than a hundred of my friends on the other side to vote with him. He's talked about a plan, but never presented a plan in public. Frankly, the President in this crisis has failed to lead.

But we have not failed to act.

I'm proud of our Speaker, I'm proud of our Congress, and I know I'm going to be proud of the House at the end of the day because this House is going to do the right thing for the American people. We'll see if the Senate and the President will follow suit.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, an expert on the Constitution, Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, since our Republican colleagues assumed the majority in January, we have swung from one artificially created crisis to the next.

In the spring, we barely dodged a government shutdown. Now we face an unprecedented and unnecessary crisis over raising the debt ceiling, an event that's occurred more than 70 times since 1964. And we're already hearing rumblings of another potential shutdown in October at the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, the most baffling part of this legislation is that it requires us to have this debate all over again in 6 months.

Time and time again, I've heard my Republican colleagues say that private capital has not found its way back into the market because of economic uncertainty. Surely the majority cannot believe that going through this debate again in 6 months would do anything to increase market stability or reduce uncertainty.

Mr. Speaker, lurching from one politically motivated calamity to the next is doing our economy great harm. It's doing our country great harm. We need a bill that addresses the default issue for the long term, not one that will require us to repeat this madness in a matter of weeks. It's past time for the majority to bring such a bill to this floor, so that we can focus on bringing jobs back and building our economy for the long haul.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 3 minutes to another hardworking member of the Committee on Rules, my good friend from Spring Hill, Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California, for allowing me to speak on this topic.

We have an obligation to ensure that government doesn't default on its debts for the first time in history. I've always said that America is a country that keeps her promises, and those promises include our debts. The Senate hasn't acted. The President hasn't acted. So today, the House is considering yet another solution to keep these promises. I'm not just talking about promises to our creditors. If we default, we break promises to our seniors, to our troops, and to our veterans. Such a scenario, in my view, is just totally unacceptable.

□ 1300

The Budget Control Act is a way forward. It's a down payment on serious spending reforms. It's cuts now, and it's more cuts in the future. Most importantly, it requires both chambers of Congress to vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Future cuts and future spending caps are all well and good, but they don't hold our feet to the fire. We all know, if the Federal Government wants to spend money, they will do it. They've proven that time and time again. The Budget Control Act recognizes that we can't keep spending what we don't have, which is why it requires Congress to vote on a balanced budget amendment.

It's a new promise to the American people—a promise that we are going to do better, a promise that we will only spend what we collect.

President Obama says he wants a balanced approach. What we want, what the American people want, is a balanced budget. The President has done plenty of telling us what he won't do. What President Obama hasn't told us is what he will do. What President Obama has are his speeches. Speeches aren't plans.

A plan is what we have here in front of us today. It's a good plan. Could it be better? All of us on this side of the aisle believe it could be. We passed a resolution of Cut, Cap, and Balance, but that died in the Senate. So, today, we are talking about what is going to move this country forward, what is going to set us up on a path of sustainable spending, not what we're currently living with, which is an addiction. We have a spending addiction in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield my friend from Spring Hill an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NUGENT. A plan is what we have here in front of us today, and it's a new way forward. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle recognize that and move with us.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. The Republican Party's deficit plan is very simple: one, prolong the default crisis; two, push the Nation to the very brink of economic collapse; three, repeat it all again and again until election day 2012.

The Republican Party cares only about political victory. They don't want compromise. They want capitulation.

And if America goes into default, it will be your fault.

We now have the pluperfect form of the Republican Party's political paradox: Republicans hate government, but they have to run for office in order to make sure it doesn't work. In 1995 and '96, the Republican Party shut down the Federal Government. In 1997 and '98, the Republicans shut down the Congress over impeachment. Earlier this year, they threatened to shut down the Federal Government again unless they got an extension of tax cuts for the very rich.

And now Republicans are trying to shut down the entire economy. Republicans are turning Americans into the laughingstock of the world.

If our Nation defaults, it will devastate Americans all across the country. If you have an adjustable rate mortgage, you will pay more. If you have a credit card, you will pay more. If you have a small business, you will pay more.

This Republican default will impose a Tea Party tax on the entire country. It will force Americans to pay billions more of their hard-earned money when they can least afford it. The Tea Party has congressional Republicans wrapped around its little finger, but it's the American people who are going to get squeezed. The Republican Party doesn't care. After all, it was the Bush administration and congressional Republicans who put us on this course in the first place.

The only way to end this historic nightmare is to resolve another massive deficit—the leadership deficit in the Republican Party.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my very good friend from Massachusetts that, as I listen to those remarks, I am really struck by the fact that our view is that we're in this together, and I will say for the record that we care about absolutely everything that my friend said we don't care about.

We as a Nation have a challenge that needs to be addressed in a bipartisan way. The measure that is before us today is one that was—and I underscore the word ''was''—agreed to by the Senate majority leader, HARRY REID, and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER. Now, I know that Senator REID is not at this juncture supportive of this measure; but it's important to note that we need to bring about greater spending cuts.

I know that I speak for most all of my Republican colleagues when I say that this is really the beginning of a process towards reducing the size and scope and reach of government. We feel passionately about the need to expand individual initiative and opportunity in this country, and to characterize us as doing nothing but wanting to close down the government and being controlled by some outside group, Mr. Speaker, we as Republicans want to work in a bipartisan way because we recognize that Barack Obama is the President of the United States and that the Democrats have control in the United States Senate. That's why Speaker BOEHNER has worked diligently in pursuing the goals and the priorities that we have, but at the same time, he has recognized that we can't get it all.

No one is happy with this measure that is before us. Speaker BOEHNER is not happy with this measure that is before us, but he understands that we have to ensure that we don't see the Nation go over the brink and that we do, in fact, increase the debt ceiling, but his goal has been to get to the root cause.

As we've now found out, 75 times the debt ceiling has been increased since 1962. In fact, I'm told that former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, as

he's on his book tour, is now talking about the fact that we've seen the increase that he had to vote on in 1962. It was a $250 billion increase in the debt ceiling at that time, and it was the first of 75 increases that we've had. Never before in our history have we, Mr. Speaker, focused on getting at the root cause of why it is we have to increase the debt ceiling.

So it was a very interesting presentation that my friend just gave, but I will tell you that I want to work with him and that I want to work with other Democrats to make sure that we address this and do it for the American people.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I rise in strong opposition to the Republican Default Act, which represents a continued effort by our Republican colleagues to hold our economy hostage while forcing an ideological agenda and jeopardizing our economy.

Yet again, our colleagues across the aisle have put forward a legislative proposal that would lead to crippling cuts in Medicare, Social Security and Medicaid, all while refusing to even consider ending ill-advised tax breaks for the most fortunate Americans.

Who absorbs the total burden from these drastic cuts, Mr. Speaker? Our seniors and working families, that's who.

On a day when Exxon Mobil's second quarter profits soared 41 percent and they earned $10 billion, it is simply unconscionable for us to ask seniors, working families, children, and middle class folks to bear the burden of our deficits when we are asking nothing—nothing—of corporations, special interests and the wealthiest few. This short-term debt limit increase measure fails to instill the necessary confidence in the American people that we have their best interests at heart, and it certainly does little to calm our creditors throughout the world.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in opposition to this reckless, dead-on-arrival bill that the majority of the Senate and the President oppose so that we can find legitimate compromise with a long-term solution. Mr. Speaker, Democrats have been sitting at the compromise table for a very long time. There is a cold, empty chair across the table from us. It is time for the Republicans to warm that seat.

□ 1310

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine, a former member of the Rules Committee, Ms. PINGREE.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my former colleague for her wonderful work and for recognizing me today.

Mr. Speaker, about an hour ago, I met with a wonderful group of religious and civic leaders from around this country. After our meeting, they walked into the Capitol Rotunda, they got down on their knees to pray, and at this moment, they are being arrested.

They were praying for those who will be hurt the hardest by the bill that we are considering today. They were praying for seniors who will face rising costs for their prescription drugs. They were praying for low-income Americans who depend on heating assistance to stay warm in the winter. They were praying for working families who already struggle to make ends meet and find a way to send their kids to college. They were praying for the millions of Americans who don't have high-priced lobbyists to protect them.

You know who can afford those lobbyists? Corporations who ship jobs overseas and are protected by this bill, the big oil companies whose subsidies are protected in this bill, the millionaires and billionaires whose tax breaks are protected in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women arrested today were standing up for the families that find it harder and harder to afford basics like groceries and heat and health care.

I urge you to vote against this rule and against this bill and join them, the members of the faith and civic community, who are standing up for those Americans.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to say to my good friend from Maine and former Rules Committee colleague that obviously we want to do everything we can to ensure that people do receive their Social Security checks.

On July 12, the President of the United States said that if we don't see an increase in the debt ceiling take place by August 2, that he can't guarantee that Social Security checks will in fact go out.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's pretty apparent that we have a proposal before us. It's a proposal that Speaker BOEHNER and Senator REID worked on in good faith last weekend. Senator REID is no longer supportive of this. But this is what was a bipartisan work product that came forward to ensure that we could increase the debt ceiling and to ensure that we would not see our Nation go into default.

So I would say to my friends who are advocating a vote against this, any Member who does vote against this is voting for us to go into default. Why? We are faced with a very, very certain time limit. It happens to be August 2.

Now, we've just gotten word that our colleagues in the other body are, upon passage of this measure here in the House of Representatives, potentially moving to table the measure in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, that will only slow down and undermine the opportunity for those people who have been on their knees in the great Rotunda of this Capitol praying to ensure that no one is denied their Social Security check, that enhances the prospect of those Social Security checks not being delivered.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I pray that we don't go into default. I pray that our Nation does not go over the edge, and I hope and pray that we are able, in a bipartisan way, to successfully address this issue.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that we know very good and well where the majority stands on Social Security and Medicare because we heard the Ryan proposal, and everybody knows it in the country. Those programs are to be changed from what we have, and we're working really hard here to help them out, maybe what you would consider a temporary solution.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the gentlelady.

Bond rating houses have already predicted that if we have a short-term fix to the debt ceiling here in the House today, we risk the downgrading of the creditworthiness of this country. Now, the GOP has proved itself fundamentally ill-suited to governance on this issue. They were for a big deal before they were against it, they were against a short-term fix before they were for it, and at least two walkouts from negotiations they asked for.

They can't accept a ''yes'' from the United States Senate getting what they wanted in the proposal: $2.2 trillion in cuts, no revenue, and a fix through 2012, providing the very certainty just in the last campaign cycle they preached about forever.

So why would they insist on this plan, a short-term fix that actually cuts less spending? Speaker BOEHNER said, ''to make sure the Democrats don't prevail in the Senate or at the White House.'' That simple. And that cynical.

It is no coincidence that the Republicans chose the clip from ''The Town.'' The topic has Ben Affleck talking about, ''We're going to harm some people.'' And his colleague jumps up and says, ''Whose car are we going to use?'' Reportedly, in the Republican caucus, somebody jumped up and said, ''I'll drive the car.''

I'm afraid that's true.

They're willing to drive the car to harm some people today. Though what they forgot to tell their caucus was that that scene is about a group of people plotting a crime. And that's what it will be today if we pass this seductively simple, short-term plan that will hurt America and hurt America's families.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6½ minutes, and the gentlewoman from New York has 13½ minutes.

Mr. DREIER. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for your generosity. And I want to thank the gentlelady from Maine for recounting the prayers of Americans. And I would ask them to continue to pray, because compromise is part of the democratic way.

But my friends on the other side did not tell you correctly why we are now involved in frivolous activity on the floor. We're not raising the debt ceiling. And the reason is there are 53 Senators in the other body that have signed a letter that said they're absolutely not going to vote for this draconian presentation. And the reason—and let me call the roll.

The reason they're not going to vote for it is because it is a short-term solution to a long-term problem. It has no revenues along with cuts. Sixty-four percent of the American people say balance it, cuts with revenues, to invest in our Nation.

Let me read the roll why Senators are not voting, the other body is not voting. Democrats recognize this is not the way to go.

You will lose your Medicare. Pell Grants will not be available for our young people. Medicaid will see in its loss seniors being put out of nursing homes. And then we'll have Social Security, our safety net, being trampled on. The loss of America's savings. The Dow went down 200 points yesterday. Just wait until under this bill we do it again and again and again, Americans will lose their shirt. The American Dream of buying a home will be lost. And all of our mobility systems, America's railroads and airports and airlines, will be jeopardized.

Pay our bills. And if we cannot pay our bills, Mr. President, use the Constitution and use the 14th Amendment if we cannot pay our bills.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, many of us have already voted for a clean debt ceiling. We're willing to do it again. But we will not suffer the idea of a one-sided government that takes away entitlement, that caps spending that is for those who are in need and balances an amendment on the backs of those who are suffering from devastating disasters in States like Missouri, States like Alabama, with all of the flooding.

This is not the way to go. Vote ''no'' on this rule and ''no'' on the underlying bill.

Pray for America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the House Amendment to S. 627, the ''Budget Control Act of 2011,'' which, like the previous debt-ceiling bills introduced by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, attempts to resolve our budget ceiling crisis by demanding sharp cuts to domestic programs that ask average Americans to make life-changing sacrifices while not asking America's wealthiest individuals and most profitable corporations to contribute their fair share.

In my lifetime, I have never seen such a concerted effort to ransom the American economy in order to extort the American public. While I support bipartisan efforts to increase the debt limit and to resolve our differences over budgetary revenue and spending issues, I cannot support a bill that unduly robs average Americans of their economic security and ability to provide for their families while constraining the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

The Budget Control Act of 2011 cuts $22 billion from the Federal Budget for FY2012. Robert McIntyre, of Citizens for Tax Justice testified before the Senate Budget Committee that tax loopholes for corporations, big business owners and business investors cost the Treasury Department $365 billion dollars in FY2011.

This bill is essentially a rehashed version of the same bill that President Obama promised to veto and the Senate vowed to reject. It asks for $917 billion in cuts from domestic spending for a $900 billion dollar increase in the debt ceiling, while demanding nothing in revenue from the nation's wealthiest. It's nothing more than a ransom note, irresponsibly raising the debt ceiling for only a few months so that in just a short period of time, the American public can be hit up again for $1.6 trillion in cuts from Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Veterans benefits.

There has been a theme this Congress of focusing on cutting programs that benefit the public good and for the most at need, while ignoring the need to focus on job creation and economic recovery. This bill is wasting a tremendous amount of time when we should be focused on paying our nation's bills and resolving our differences!

In my district, the Texas 18th, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. We must not, we cannot, at a time when the Census Bureau places the number of Americans living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years, cut vital social services. Not in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and persistent unemployment, when so many rely on federal benefits to survive, like the Supplemental Nutrition Access Program (SNAP) that fed 3.9 million residents of Texas in April 2011, or the Women, Infant, and Children, WIC, Program that provides nutritious food to more than 990,000 mothers and children in my home state.

In 2009, there were 43.6 million Americans living in poverty nationwide. According to the 2010 Federal poverty threshold, determined by the U.S. Census, a family of four is considered impoverished if they are living on less than $22,314 per year.

Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States poor population. In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the Nation, 20.7 percent of America's youth. The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that there are currently 5.6 million Texans living in poverty, 2.2 million of them children, and that 17.4 percent of households in the state struggle with food insecurity.

There is no doubt that we must reduce the national debt, but my Republican colleagues' desire for instant gratification through deep spending cuts to benefits, Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security is reckless and threatens the financial security of millions of Americans.

Instead of closing corporate tax loopholes to reduce the deficit, the Budget Control Act cuts discretionary spending, and requires Congress to draft proposals to cut at least $1.8 trillion from Medicare and Social Security. This is an outrage, and an insult to the American dream.

Forcing Congress to draft plans to cut 1.8 trillion from Medicare and Social Security forces Members to disregard the best interests of their constituents. Medicare guarantees a healthy and secure retirement for Americans who have paid into it for their entire working lives. Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors, including the 2.9 million Texans who received Medicare in 2010.

Any cuts to Medicaid would be just as damaging. Harris County has one of the highest Medicaid enrollment records in Texas. Limits and cuts to Medicaid funds would significantly hurt the citizens of Texas's 18th District. Harris County averages between 500,000 and 600,000 Medicaid recipients monthly, thousands of people who may not have access to healthcare should Congress sacrifice Medicaid to cut spending.

Yes, we must take steps to balance the budget and reduce the national debt, but not at the expense of vital social programs. It is unconscionable that in our nation of vast resources, my Republican colleagues would pass a budget that cuts funding for essential social programs. Poverty impacts far too many Americans and social safety nets provide these individuals with vital assistance.

Perhaps my friends on the other side of the aisle are content to conclude that life simply is not fair, equality is not accessible to everyone, and the less advantaged among us are condemned to remain as they are, but I do not accept that. That kind of complacency is not fitting for America.

As we continue to discuss the necessity of increasing out debt ceiling, I have heard the concerns of many of my constituents and the American people regarding the size of our national debt and the care with which taxpayer money is spent. I, too, am concerned about these issues; for to burden future generations of Americans with tremendous amounts of debt should not be a way to avoid our fiscal responsibilities to the American people. However, the task of resolving our debt ceiling crisis must take precedence over other concerns, including political ideology. The game is up, and the American people understand that increasing the debt ceiling has nothing to do with any new spending and everything to do with paying off the obligations that we have already agreed to and promised to pay.

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the Federal Government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

To address this need, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the Federal Government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior Congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade. Congress last came together and raised the debt ceiling in February 2010.

Today, the debt ceiling currently stands at $14.3 trillion dollars. In reality, that limit has already been eclipsed, but due to accounting procedures by Treasury Secretary Geithner, the debt limit can be artificially avoided until August 2.

Congress must act now in order to avert a crisis. Never in the history of America has the United States defaulted on its debt obligations.

We must be clear on what this issue means for our country. America has earned a reputation as the world's most trusted borrower. United States Treasury bonds have traditionally been one of the safest investments another country or investor could make. For investors around the world, purchasing a U.S. Treasury bond meant that they held something virtually as safe as cash, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States government.

In turn, with the proceeds from the bonds, the Federal Government of the world's largest economy is able to finance its operations. If the United States defaults on its debt obligations, the financial crisis that began in 2008 would pale in comparison, according to economic experts. The ensuing economic catastrophe would not only place the U.S. economy in a tailspin, but the world economy as well.

The fact that Congress, a body that typically has its fair share of political battles, has never played political chicken when it came to raising the debt ceiling should give us all pause, and is a testament to the seriousness with which we must approach this issue. However, this time around, my Republican colleagues have created an impasse based upon an ideological commitment to spending cuts. While I understand and share the concern of my Republican colleagues with respect to deficit spending, and will continue to work with them in order to find reductions, now is not the time to put ideology over pragmatism. The reality is that, on August 3, the United States will begin to default on its debt obligations if the debt ceiling is not raised.

This unnecessarily places the American public and the economy between a rock and a hard place. Either Congress sides completely with the radical agenda of the Tea Party, which irresponsibly pulls the chair out from under the average American while polishing the throne of the wealthiest.

This detour into a spending debate is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present.

Moreover, the impending crisis would have already occurred were it not for the extraordinary measures taken by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, including the suspension of the investment in securities to finance the Civil Service retirement and Disability Fund, as well as the redemption of a portion of those securities already held by that fund.

If the United States defaults on its obligations on August 3, the stock market will react violently to the news that for the first time in history, America is unable to keep its promises to pay. Not once in American history has the country's full faith and credit been called into question.

Once America defaults, investors who purchase U.S. bonds and finance our government will be less likely to lend to America in the future. Just as a person who defaults on a loan will find it harder to convince banks to lend them money in the future, a country that defaults on its debt obligations will find it harder to convince investors to lend money to a government that did not pay. Showing the world that the United States does not pay its debts makes the purchasing of that debt less desirable because it requires the assumption of more risk on the part of the investors. The proponents of this bill are putting the country at serious risk of losing its status as the world's economic superpower. Our allies will lose faith in our ability to manage global economic affairs. Our status in the world will be diminished, which will undermine our leverage on the world stage that allows us to command the respect and compliance of other nations when it comes to decision-making. This bill will reduce America's ability to compete with a surging China.

Furthermore, any investors that do continue to purchase U.S. Treasury bonds will demand much higher interest rates in order to cover the increased risk. Once a default occurs, investors figure that the chance of the United States defaulting again is much greater, and will require the government to pay higher rates of interest in order to make the loan worth the risk for investors to take on.

Imagine the impact on our stock market if we do not pay our debts. As we have seen throughout the recent financial crisis, a bad stock market hurts not only big businesses and large investors on Wall Street, but small businesses and small investors as well. Families with investments tied to the stock market, such as 401(k)s, pension plans, and savings, will once again see the value of their investments drop. The American people are tired of the uncertainty of the value of their retirement accounts. We must not allow another wild fluctuation to occur due to default and add to the uncertainty still lingering the minds of citizens.

As if another stock market crisis were not enough, the housing market would take another hit if America defaulted. Higher mortgage rates in a housing market already weakened by default and foreclosures would cause a further depression of home values, destroying whatever equity families might have left in their homes after the housing crisis. Moreover, the long-term effects would. spending and investment in the housing market.

Increasing the debt ceiling is the responsible thing to do. Congress has already debated and approved the debt that an increased ceiling makes room for. However, my Republican colleagues have chosen to use this as an opportunity to hold the American people hostage to their extreme agenda.

Even prominent Republicans like Senator JOHN MCCAIN and Christine Todd Whitman have criticized the radical elements of their party who insist upon holding up the entire political process in order to flaunt their extreme, irrational, and unrealistic ideology. Senator MCCAIN has called the Tea Party's stance and the way they have conducted themselves during this manufactured crisis ''bizarre'', and I am inclined to agree. Their agenda for this country is even too radical for Speaker BOEHNER, with the Tea Party vowing to reject their leader's own bill.

They live in a world that is not the world that the American people live in. In their world, they believe that taxes are always too high, even on people making over a billion a year in a struggling economy; that any increase in revenue is fundamentally wrong, even if it comes from large corporations who use tax loopholes at the expense of our job-creating small businesses; that investing anything in our economic future above tax revenues is impermissible, even in the midst of an economic downturn; and that tax cuts for the wealthy are always the nation's top priority, even at the expense of people that depend on Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Veterans benefits to survive.

These beliefs place them on the fringe of American society, and yet due to the nature our political process, they have held up the entire government and placed our economy on the precipice of a turbulent second recession.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents in their home districts who would be hurt by this bill. I urge my colleagues to return to the world in which the vast majority of Americans live in; a world in which our shared destiny is determined by reasonable minds and good faith efforts to compromise. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned that defaulting could ''throw the financial system into chaos'', and ''destroy the trust and confidence that global investors have in Treasury securities as being the safest liquid assets in the world''. Instead of injecting ideological spending cuts and Constitutional amendments, into the traditionally non-political business of raising the debt ceiling, we must work quickly to pass a bill that makes good on our debt obligations and restores confidence in American credit.

□ 1320

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad situation. There are two failures: One is the process by which we got here, where we've abandoned a willingness to compromise when compromise is required; and second is to propose a plan that's not balanced with revenues as well as with spending cuts.

I just want to go through the process. This institution is responsible for making decisions about taxing and spending. Those are contentious debates; always have been, always will be. But whenever we've made progress, there's been a recognition that the Republican argument, that we have to watch how we spend our money, has validity, and that the Democratic argument, that we have to have fairer taxes, has had merit. This is a one-sided approach.

There were negotiations that were promising. In May, the Biden group began negotiations to avert a crisis. On May 16, the U.S. hit the debt ceiling, and Treasury moved money around to avert the August 2 deadline. June 23, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, walked out because revenues were on the table. July 3, President Obama and Speaker BOEHNER meet to work out a ''grand bargain'' deal. It was very promising, $4 trillion in deficit reduction by combining revenues as well as

cuts. President Obama, incidentally, put on the table things that were giving enormous heartburn to many Democrats, but he said, We have to compromise for the greater good. The Speaker indicates on July 9 that the ''grand bargain'' is unlikely due to differences on revenues, so he leaves. July 22, Mr. BOEHNER walks away from the debt talks, saying that we can't have revenue.

So now we have the bill. The bill is defective in this fundamental respect: It is going to damage the economy; $1 trillion in cuts, increasing on a short-term basis the debt ceiling, followed by $1.8 trillion that will hurt Medicare and Social Security. This is going to be very harmful for the economy.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the reputation of this United States House of Representatives and Congress is at a low ebb because of the fact that we haven't acted prior to this date, the fact that the reputation of the United States of America is on the line, and we're being talked about at the same level as the economies of Spain and Greece and Ireland and Portugal. This should never have happened. I'm embarrassed as I see the greatest power on Earth and the country that's been the greatest country on Earth through my entire life possibly diminish because of the actions of the other side and not getting this debt ceiling resolved.

The ratings of the United States will go down. That will cause interest rates to go up, and it will cause us to lose jobs. And to extend this for just 6 months—which is what is happening—means the same Kabuki theater will take place again in 6 months. The American public doesn't want to see it. Moody's doesn't want to see it. Standard and Poor's doesn't want to see it. The markets don't want to see it. The world doesn't want to see it. When I was in Europe with the Bundestag in Germany, they almost laughed at us, and they said, You are like Greece and Ireland and Portugal. And that should not happen. It should not have happened in this country and while we're in charge.

So I would ask this United States Congress, Mr. Speaker, to have a 2-year extension, enough money to lift this ceiling to where this President won't have to deal with it again and the next President can deal with it. And if it is, as I hope, President Obama, the Republicans won't have to work to see that he is not reelected because he will be term-limited, so they can work at ease. And if it's a Republican, they can even have more ease. But let's be fair and let's extend this for 2 years.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Savannah, Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a hardworking member of the Committee on Appropriations and one of our cardinals.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I must begin, Mr. Speaker, by asking, do you have the President's plan? Or perhaps, do any of the Democrats over there have the President's plan? I keep hearing that this plan is not a good one; it's not a compromise; it hasn't been vetted. I would like to see the President's plan. That way, I can sit down with a cheat sheet and compare the President's plan with the plan of Senator REID, with the plan proposed by Speaker BOEHNER. There's nothing, nothing but silence.

How long has he been President? Nearly 3 years. He knew the debt crisis was looming out there. He knew that there would be a debate about the debt ceiling. Indeed, as a Senator, in 2006, Barack Obama voted ''no'' to a debt ceiling increase, citing lack of leadership. Well, surely since that moment in 2006, he knew he would have to be dealing with the debt ceiling. He knew Medicare needed reform. He knew that Social Security needed reform. He continued the war, which he campaigned against. He continued the Bush tax cuts, which he now cries is the whole problem, that that's why we're in this situation.

It's even more appalling, Mr. Speaker, when you read his statement, July 12, just a few weeks ago, ''I cannot guarantee that those checks''—speaking of Social Security checks—will ''go out on August 3 if we haven't resolved this issue because there may simply not be the money in the coffers to do it.'' That's what the President believes, but he has no plan? How can he face the seniors of the United States of America?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KINGSTON. How can he say to the seniors of America, I might not be able to pay you your Social Security, and then not offer a plan? Well, God bless the Speaker, and God bless the people who have, in good faith, engaged in this discussion and offered plans. Indeed, the Republicans have already passed one plan, Cut, Cap, and Balance. The Senate, in their cowardliness, tabled it, refused to even vote on it. In fact, this was the same Senate who rejected the President's budget 97–0. Today we offer a second plan. If the Democrats have a plan, let them put it on the table. If the President has a plan, let us look at it so we can compare.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, since I have extra time and didn't give him enough in the first place, I yield 2 more minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

I would like to insert into the RECORD at this time a letter from 53 United States Senators saying that they will not support the Boehner default plan.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal that we are debating today is dead on arrival. We are wasting precious time. We are fast approaching a deadline that we need to address, and here we are, debating a bill that we know is going nowhere in the United States Senate.

I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, enough of the theatrics. This is time for a grownup moment. This is time to act like adults, to work with the Senate, to work with the President, to come up with a bipartisan deal, and to get this job done.

But let's understand why we are where we are. When Bill Clinton left office, we had a balanced budget. We had surpluses. When President Bush took over and the Republicans, what happened? Tax cuts, mostly for wealthy people that weren't paid for; a prescription drug bill that wasn't paid for; two wars that weren't paid for. And we end up in this terrible debt situation.

And what do my friends propose as a way to get out of it? They propose a bill that would make drastic cuts in programs that benefit the poor and the most vulnerable in our country. What they propose is eviscerating Medicare and Social Security. They propose cutting education money so that our kids can afford to go to school. They propose balancing the budget on the backs of the middle class and the most vulnerable in this country. It is wrong. It is shameful. It is an outrage to bring a bill like this to the floor.

□ 1330

And given the fact that we know it's going nowhere, this is just politics. Enough. I think the American people have had enough. They want us to get together to do our job, and I would urge my Republican colleagues to pull this bill from the floor and get serious about negotiating a real deal.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, July 27, 2011.

SPEAKER JOHN BOEHNER,
U.S. Capitol, H–232,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: With five days until our nation faces an unprecedented financial crisis, we need to work together to ensure that our nation does not default on our obligations for the first time in our history. We heard that in your caucus you said the Senate will support your bill. We are writing to tell you that we will not support it, and give you the reasons why.

A short-term extension like the one in your bill would put America at risk, along with every family and business in it. Your approach would force us once again to face the threat of default in five or six short months. Every day, another expert warns us that your short-term approach could be nearly as disastrous as a default and would lead to a downgrade in our credit rating. If our credit is downgraded, it would cost us billions of dollars more in interest payments on our existing debt and drive up our deficit. Even more worrisome, a downgrade would spike interest rates, making everything from mortgages, car loans and credit cards more expensive for families and businesses nationwide.

In addition to risking a downgrade and catastrophic default, we are concerned that in

five or six months, the House will once again hold the economy captive and refuse to avoid another default unless we accept unbalanced, deep cuts to programs like Medicare and Social Security, without asking anything of the wealthiest Americans.

We now have only five days left to act. The entire world is watching Congress. We need to do the right thing to solve this problem. We must work together to avoid a default the responsible way—not in a way that will do America more harm than good.

Sincerely,

Harry Reid; Richard J. Durbin; Charles E. Shumer; Patty Murray; Jeanne Shaheen; Ben Nelson; Bernard Sanders; Claire McCaskill; Mary L. Landrieu; John F. Kerry; Al Franken; Patrick J. Leahy; Christopher A. Coons; Barbara A. Mikulski; Barbara Boxer; Ron Wyden; Robert Menendez; Carl Levin; Sherrod Brown; Herb Kohl; Richard Blumenthal; Mark Begich; Michael F. Bennet; Thomas R. Carper; Frank R. Lautenberg; Dianne Feinstein; Max Baucus; Debbie Stabenow; Bill Nelson; Kirsten E. Gillibrand; Maria Cantwell; Kent Conrad; Mark R. Warner; Kay R. Hagan; Sheldon Whitehouse; Daniel K. Inouye; Daniel K. Akaka; Tim Johnson; Mark Udall; Joe Manchin III; Amy Klobuchar; Benjamin L. Cardin; Tom Udall; Joseph I. Lieberman; Jeff Bingaman; Jack Reed; Jon Tester; Jeff Merkley; Tom Harkin; Jim Webb; John D. Rockefeller IV; Mark L. Pryor; Robert P. Casey, Jr.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and am prepared to close.

Mr. DREIER. Then I will reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible rule. It trivializes the Constitution, endangers Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, and says to the world, The United States Congress is incapable of doing its job.

The majority's risking a calamitous default on our debt, and they're doing so in the name of politics. The Republicans' ''my way or the highway'' approach is dead wrong, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing both this rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, not one Member of this House likes the fact that we are here today and that we're facing the issue that is before us. As we've found throughout this debate, 75 times since 1962 the United States Congress has been in a position where it's had to increase the debt ceiling. And here we are again today, dealing with a very unpopular increase in the debt ceiling because it has to be done.

Democrat and Republican alike recognize that we can't let our Nation go into default. We are the greatest Nation the world has ever known, and we can't follow the trend that we have seen in Europe of Greece, Portugal, Ireland, and other countries.

But, Mr. Speaker, we're getting close. We're getting close. The President of the United States has requested that we have an increase in the debt ceiling so that our Nation doesn't default. When that request was made of Speaker BOEHNER, he chose to work together in a bipartisan way, recognizing that the President of the United States is a Democrat, the United States Senate is controlled by Democrats, the United States House of Representatives is controlled by Republicans.

The most recent message that was sent by the American people came last November. Last November we saw a net gain of 63 seats for the Republican Party. It had been decades and decades and decades, in fact, three-quarters of a century since we'd seen that kind of gain for the Republican Party here in the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, the message was overwhelming. The message was, create jobs, get our economy growing, and get our fiscal house in order. And that's exactly what we're trying to do.

So as we are faced with this 76th increase in the national debt since 1962, Speaker BOEHNER has said we're not going to do it as it's been done the last 75 times. We are going to insist that we bring about dramatic spending cuts. In fact, we want to see spending cuts that actually exceed the level of the debt ceiling increase.

Now, it was on July 12, as we've said, that President Obama said if we don't have this increase in the debt ceiling, he couldn't, on August 3, guarantee that Social Security checks would go out. And so we have this measure before us, Mr. Speaker.

We've heard that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and on the other side of the rotunda are planning to simply table this measure if it passes the House of Representatives. Now, we all learned in school how a bill becomes a law, and we know very well that one House passes a measure and the other House is to address it.

Now, we saw Cut, Cap and Balance pass the House of Representatives, and our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol chose to table it. And now the word comes that if we pass this today that they're going to choose to table it.

Well, this is the plan that is before us. It is a plan that was worked on in good faith by Speaker BOEHNER and the Democratic leader of the United States Senate, HARRY REID. Now, I know that Senator REID no longer supports this plan, but last weekend he did. And I believe that we have a responsibility to step up to the plate, take action, increase the debt ceiling, but do so by addressing the long-term challenges and get at the root cause of why it is we have to increase the debt ceiling.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and then the underlying legislation which will allow us to have the debt ceiling increased and ensure that our Nation does not go into default.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 186, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 663]

YEAS—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—186

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Bachmann
Chandler
Chu
Giffords
Hinchey
Johnson (GA)
Lee (CA)
Payne

□ 1401

Messrs. RUNYAN, FLAKE, SOUTHERLAND, FITZPATRICK, DENT, TIBERI, KINGSTON, and DENHAM changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on House Resolution 375, the Rule providing for consideration of S. 627. Had I been able to cast my vote I would have voted "no."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to House Resolution 363 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2584.

□ 1401

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. DOLD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 27, 2011, amendment No. 13 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) was pending, and the bill had been read through page 106, line 8.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Ms. RICHARDSON of California.

The first amendment by Mr. LANKFORD of Oklahoma.

Amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

The second amendment by Mr. LANKFORD of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment by Mr. WALBERG of Michigan.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 314, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 664]

AYES—114

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Chabot
Chaffetz
Conaway
Culberson
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Flake
Fleischmann
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Mack
Marchant
Marino
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder

NOES—314

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herger
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette

Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Bachmann
Chandler
Giffords
Hinchey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1420

Mr. GOHMERT and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 258, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 665]

AYES—168

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—258

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Bachmann
Bass (NH)
Chandler
Giffords
Hinchey
McIntyre

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1426

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 263, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 666]

AYES—161

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Bartlett
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack

Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Crawford
Culberson
Denham
DesJarlais
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Welch
West
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—263

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Bachmann
Chandler
Conyers
Giffords
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Schrader
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1432

Mr. DOLD changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 295, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 667]

AYES—130

Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Butterfield
Campbell
Cantor
Carney
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Coble
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Courtney
DeFazio
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Engel
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Himes
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lipinski
Mack
Maloney
McGovern
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Nunes
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pearce
Peters
Petri
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quayle
Reed
Ribble
Rokita
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shuler
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stutzman
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waxman
Welch
West
Wilson (SC)
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—295

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Amash
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul

McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stivers
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Webster
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Andrews
Bachmann
Chandler
Fudge
Giffords
Hinchey
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1439

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 227, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 668]

AYES—198

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—227

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Bachmann
Chandler
Giffords
Hinchey
McHenry
Stutzman
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1445

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 317, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 669]

AYES—110

Adams
Akin
Amash
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Denham
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)

Griffith (VA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Long
Luetkemeyer
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McClintock
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Nunnelee
Paul
Pence
Petri
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Renacci
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Royce
Scalise
Schilling
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
West
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder

NOES—317

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Andrews
Bachmann
Chandler
Giffords
Hinchey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1451

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 240, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 670]

AYES—181

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—240

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Olson	Rothman (NJ)	Sutton
Olver	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Owens	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Pallone	Rush	Thompson (PA)
Pascrell	Ryan (OH)	Tiberi
Pastor (AZ)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Tierney
Paulsen	Sanchez, Loretta	Tipton
Pelosi	Sarbanes	Tonko
Perlmutter	Schakowsky	Towns
Peters	Schiff	Tsongas
Peterson	Schmidt	Turner
Pingree (ME)	Schock	Van Hollen
Platts	Schrader	Velázquez
Polis	Schwartz	Visclosky
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Walden
Quigley	Scott, David	Walz (MN)
Rahall	Serrano	Wasserman Schultz
Rangel	Sewell	Waters
Reed	Sherman	Watt
Reichert	Shuler	Waxman
Reyes	Simpson	Welch
Richardson	Sires	Whitfield
Richmond	Slaughter	Womack
Rivera	Smith (WA)	Woolsey
Rogers (KY)	Speier	Wu
Ros-Lehtinen	Stark	Yarmuth
Ross (AR)	Stivers	Young (AK)
Ross (FL)		

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Johnson (IL)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann	Ellison	Payne
Buerkle	Giffords	Wilson (FL)
Carson (IN)	Hinchey	
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1458

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. DOLD Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 377

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Ms. Hochul.

(2) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—Ms. Hahn.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 375, I call up the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 375, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 112–184, modified by the amendments printed in part B of the report, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

S. 627

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Budget Control Act of 2011''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—TEN-YEAR DISCRETIONARY CAPS WITH SEQUESTER

Sec. 101. Enforcing discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 102. Definitions.
Sec. 103. Reports and orders.
Sec. 104. Expiration.
Sec. 105. Conforming amendments to the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

TITLE II—VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Sec. 201. Vote on the balanced budget amendment.
Sec. 202. Consideration by the other House.

TITLE III—DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS

Sec. 301. Debt ceiling disapproval process.

TITLE IV—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

Sec. 401. Establishment of Joint Select Committee.
Sec. 402. Expedited consideration of joint committee recommendations.
Sec. 403. Funding.
Sec. 404. Rulemaking.

TITLE V—PELL GRANT AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM CHANGES

Sec. 501. Federal Pell Grants.
Sec. 502. Termination of authority to make interest subsidized loans to graduate and professional students.
Sec. 503. Termination of Direct Loan repayment incentives.
Sec. 504. Inapplicability of title IV negotiated rulemaking and master calendar exception.

TITLE I—TEN-YEAR DISCRETIONARY CAPS WITH SEQUESTER

SEC. 101. ENFORCING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 251. ENFORCING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

''(a) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) SEQUESTRATION.—Within 15 calendar days after Congress adjourns to end a session there shall be a sequestration to eliminate a budget-year breach, if any.

''(2) ELIMINATING A BREACH.—Each non-exempt account shall be reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the enacted level of sequestrable budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to eliminate a breach.

''(3) MILITARY PERSONNEL.—If the President uses the authority to exempt any personnel account from sequestration under section 255(f), each account within subfunctional category 051 (other than those military personnel accounts for which the authority provided under section 255(f) has been exercised) shall be further reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the enacted level of non-exempt budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to offset the total dollar amount by which outlays are not reduced in military personnel accounts by reason of the use of such authority.

''(4) PART-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS.—If, on the date specified in paragraph (1), there is in effect an Act making or continuing appropriations for part of a fiscal year for any budget account, then the dollar sequestration calculated for that account under paragraphs (2) and (3) shall be subtracted from—

''(A) the annualized amount otherwise available by law in that account under that or a subsequent part-year appropriation; and

''(B) when a full-year appropriation for that account is enacted, from the amount otherwise provided by the full-year appropriation.

''(5) LOOK-BACK.—If, after June 30, an appropriation for the fiscal year in progress is enacted that causes a breach for that year (after taking into account any sequestration of amounts), the discretionary spending limits for the next fiscal year shall be reduced by the amount or amounts of that breach.

''(6) WITHIN-SESSION SEQUESTRATION.—If an appropriation for a fiscal year in progress is enacted (after Congress adjourns to end the session for that budget year and before July 1 of that fiscal year) that causes a breach for that year (after taking into account any prior sequestration of amounts), 15 days later there shall be a sequestration to eliminate that breach following the procedures set forth in paragraphs (2) through (4).

''(7) ESTIMATES.—

''(A) CBO ESTIMATES.—As soon as practicable after Congress completes action on any discretionary appropriation, CBO, after consultation with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall provide OMB with an estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority for the current year, if any, and the budget year provided by that legislation.

''(B) OMB ESTIMATES AND EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCES.—Not later than 7 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after the date of enactment of any discretionary appropriation, OMB shall transmit a report to the House of Representatives and to the Senate containing the CBO estimate of that legislation, an OMB estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority for the current year, if any, and the budget year provided by that legislation, and an explanation of any difference between the 2 estimates. If during the preparation of the report OMB determines that there is a significant difference between OMB and CBO, OMB shall consult with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate regarding that difference and that consultation shall include, to the extent practicable, written communication to those committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before the issuance of the report.

''(C) ASSUMPTIONS AND GUIDELINES.—OMB estimates under this paragraph shall be made using current economic and technical assumptions. OMB shall use the OMB estimates transmitted to the Congress under this paragraph. OMB and CBO shall prepare estimates under this paragraph in conformance with scorekeeping guidelines determined after consultation among the House and Senate Committees on the Budget, CBO, and OMB.

''(D) ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph, amounts provided by annual appropriations shall include any discretionary appropriations for the current year, if any, and the budget year in accounts for which funding is provided in that legislation that result from previously enacted legislation.

''(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

''(1) CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.—When the President submits the budget under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, OMB shall calculate and the budget shall include adjustments to discretionary spending limits (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the budget year and each outyear to reflect changes in concepts and definitions. Such changes shall equal the baseline levels of new budget authority and outlays using up-to-date concepts and definitions minus those levels using the concepts and definitions in effect before such changes. Such changes may only be made after consultation with the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate and that consultation shall include written communication to such committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before official action is taken with respect to such changes.

''(2) SEQUESTRATION REPORTS.—When OMB submits a sequestration report under section 254(e), (f), or (g) for a fiscal year, OMB shall calculate, and the sequestration report and subsequent budgets submitted by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall include adjustments to discretionary spending limits (and those limits as adjusted) for the fiscal year and each succeeding year, as follows:

''(A) EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS; OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—If, for any fiscal year, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that—

''(i) the President designates as emergency requirements and that the Congress so designates in statute on an account by account basis; or

''(ii) the President designates for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism and that the Congress so designates in statute on an account by account basis;

the adjustment shall be the total of such appropriations in discretionary accounts designated as emergency requirements or for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, as applicable, and the outlays flowing in all fiscal years from such appropriations.

''(B) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND REDETERMINATIONS.—(i) If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies an amount for continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such expenses for that fiscal year and the additional outlays flowing therefrom, but shall not exceed—

''(I) for fiscal year 2012, $623,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(II) for fiscal year 2013, $751,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(III) for fiscal year 2014, $924,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(IV) for fiscal year 2015, $1,123,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(V) for fiscal year 2016, $1,166,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VI) for fiscal year 2017, $1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VII) for fiscal year 2018, $1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, $1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(IX) for fiscal year 2020, $1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

''(X) for fiscal year 2021, $1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

''(ii) As used in this subparagraph—

''(I) the term 'continuing disability reviews' means continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act; and

''(II) the term 'additional new budget authority' means the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of $273,000,000, in an appropriation Act and specified to pay for the costs of continuing disability reviews under the heading 'Limitation on Administrative Expenses' for the Social Security Administration.

''(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL.—

''(i) If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies an amount for the health care fraud abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services (75–8393–0–7–571), then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such program for that fiscal year and the additional outlays flowing therefrom, but shall not exceed—

''(I) for fiscal year 2012, $270,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(II) for fiscal year 2013, $299,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(III) for fiscal year 2014, $329,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(IV) for fiscal year 2015, $361,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(V) for fiscal year 2016, $395,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VI) for fiscal year 2017, $414,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VII) for fiscal year 2018, $434,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, $454,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

''(IX) for fiscal year 2020, $475,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

''(X) for fiscal year 2021, $496,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

''(ii) As used in this subparagraph, the term 'additional new budget authority' means the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of $311,000,000, in an appropriation Act and specified to pay for the costs of the health care fraud and abuse control program.

The adjustment for outlays shall only be for the outlays flowing from the additional new budget authority and the total outlays adjustments made for any fiscal year shall not exceed the total adjustments made for that fiscal year in new budget authority.

''(c) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMIT.—As used in this part, the term 'discretionary spending limit' means—

''(1) with respect to fiscal year 2012, for total discretionary spending: $1,043,000,000,000, in new budget authority of which new budget authority for function 050 shall be between $535,440,000,000 and $568,560,000,000;

''(2) with respect to fiscal year 2013, for total discretionary spending: $1,047,000,000,000 in new budget authority of which new budget authority for function 050 shall be between $537,440,000,000 and $570,560,000,000;

''(3) with respect to fiscal year 2014, for total discretionary spending: $1,066,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(4) with respect to fiscal year 2015, for total discretionary spending: $1,086,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(5) with respect to fiscal year 2016, for total discretionary spending: $1,107,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(6) with respect to fiscal year 2017, for total discretionary spending: $1,131,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(7) with respect to fiscal year 2018, for total discretionary spending: $1,156,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(8) with respect to fiscal year 2019, for total discretionary spending: $1,182,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(9) with respect to fiscal year 2020, for total discretionary spending: $1,208,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and

''(10) with respect to fiscal year 2021, for total discretionary spending: $1,234,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

as adjusted in strict conformance with subsection (b).''.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 250(c) is amended as follows:

(1) Strike paragraph (4) and redesignate succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

(2) In paragraph (7)(C) (as redesignated), strike ''the food stamp program'' and insert ''the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program''.

(3) Strike paragraph (13) (as redesignated) and insert the following new paragraph:

''(13) The term 'outyear' means a fiscal year one or more years after the budget year.''.

(4) At the end, add the following new paragraphs:

''(19) The term 'emergency' means a situation that—

''(A) requires new budget authority and outlays (or new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom) for the prevention or mitigation of, or response to, loss of life or property, or a threat to national security; and

''(B) is unanticipated.

''(20) The term 'unanticipated' means that the underlying situation is—

''(A) sudden, which means quickly coming into being or not building up over time;

''(B) urgent, which means a pressing and compelling need requiring immediate action;

''(C) unforeseen, which means not predicted or anticipated as an emerging need; and

''(D) temporary, which means not of a permanent duration.''.

SEC. 103. REPORTS AND ORDERS.

Section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (c)(2), strike ''2002'' and insert ''2021''.

(2) In subsection (f)(2)(A), strike ''2002'' and insert ''2021''.

SEC. 104. EXPIRATION.

(a) REPEALER.—Section 275 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING CHANGE.—Sections 252(d)(1), 254(c), 254(f)(3), 254(f)(4), 254(g), and 254(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not apply to the Congressional Budget Office.

SEC. 105. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AND IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT OF 1974.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended as follows:

(1) Strike subsection (a) and insert the following:

''(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate may make appropriate budgetary adjustments of new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom in the same amount as required by section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.''.

(2) Strike subsections (b) and (e) and redesignate subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(3) At the end, add the following new subsections:

''(d) EMERGENCIES.—If a reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, contains a provision providing new budget authority and outlays or reducing revenue, and a designation of such provision as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall not count the budgetary effects of such provision for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

''(e) ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause the discretionary spending limits as set forth in section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act to be exceeded.''.

(b) MOTION TO STRIKE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—(1) In the House of Representatives, if a reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, contains a provision providing new budget authority and outlays or reducing revenue, and a designation of such provision as an emergency pursuant to this section, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall not count the budgetary effects of such provision for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) In the House of Representatives, a proposal to strike a designation under paragraph (1) shall be excluded from an evaluation of budgetary effects for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(3) An amendment offered under paragraph (2) that also proposes to reduce each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by the pending measure that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available shall be in order at any point in the reading of the pending measure.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(11) The terms 'emergency' and 'unanticipated' have the meanings given to such terms in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.''.

(d) APPEALS FOR DISCRETIONARY CAPS.—Section 904(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by striking ''and 312(c)'' and inserting ''312(c), and 314(e)''.

TITLE II—VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

SEC. 201. VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

After September 30, 2011 and not later than December 31, 2011, the House of Representatives and Senate, respectively, shall vote on passage of a joint resolution, the title of which is as follows: ''Joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.''.

SEC. 202. CONSIDERATION BY THE OTHER HOUSE.

(a) HOUSE CONSIDERATION.—

(1) REFERRAL.—If the House receives a joint resolution described in section 201 from the Senate, such joint resolution shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. If the committee fails to report the joint resolution within five legislative days, it shall be in order to move that the House discharge the committee from further consideration of the joint resolution. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to discharge the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except twenty minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a motion is adopted, the House shall proceed immediately to consider the joint resolution in accordance with paragraph (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After the joint resolution has been referred to the appropriate calendar or the committee has been discharged (other than by motion) from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the joint resolution. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(b) SENATE CONSIDERATION.—(1) If the Senate receives a joint resolution described in section 201 from the House of Representatives, such joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate. If such committee has not reported the joint resolution at the close of the fifth session day after its receipt by the Senate, such committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar.

(2) Consideration of the joint resolution and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 20 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal. All time used for consideration of the joint resolution, including time used for quorum calls and voting, shall be counted against the total 20 hours of consideration.

(3) If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution, the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the seventh session day after such joint resolution has been reported or discharged or immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

TITLE III—DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS

SEC. 301. DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS.

Subchapter I of chapter 31 of subtitle III of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 3101(b), by striking ''or otherwise'' and inserting ''or as provided by section 3101A or otherwise''; and

(2) by inserting after section 3101, the following:

''§3101A. Presidential modification of the debt ceiling

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) $900 BILLION.—

''(A) CERTIFICATION.—If, not later than December 31, 2011, the President submits a written certification to Congress that the President has determined that the debt subject to limit is within $100,000,000,000 of the limit in section 3101(b) and that further borrowing is required to meet existing commitments, the Secretary of the Treasury may exercise authority to borrow an additional $900,000,000,000 subject to the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval enacted pursuant to this section. Upon submission of such certification, the limit on debt provided in section 3101(b) (referred to in this section as the 'debt limit') is increased by $400,000,000,000.

''(B) RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Congress may consider a joint resolution of disapproval of the authority under subparagraph (A) as provided in subsections (b) through (f). The joint resolution of disapproval considered under this section shall contain only the language provided in subsection (b)(2). If the time for disapproval has lapsed without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval under this section, the debt limit is increased by an additional $500,000,000,000.

''(2) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—

''(A) CERTIFICATION.—If, after the debt limit is increased by $900,000,000,000 under paragraph (1), the President submits a written certification to Congress that the President has determined that the debt subject to limit is within $100,000,000,000 of the limit in section 3101(b) and that further borrowing is required to meet existing commitments, the Secretary of the Treasury may exercise authority to borrow an additional amount equal to $1,600,000,000,000 if the amount of deficit reduction achieved pursuant to the enactment of the joint committee bill as set forth pursuant to section 401(b)(3) of the Budget Control Act of 2011 is greater than $1,600,000,000,000, subject to the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval enacted pursuant to this section.

''(B) RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Congress may consider a joint resolution of disapproval of the authority under subparagraph (A) as provided in subsections (b) through (f). The joint resolution of disapproval considered under this section shall contain only the language provided in subsection (b)(2). If the time for disapproval has lapsed without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval under this section, the debt limit is increased by the amount authorized under subparagraph (A).

''(b) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for the $400,000,000,000 increase in the debt limit provided by subsection (a)(1)(A), the debt limit may not be raised under this section if, within 60 calendar days after the date on which Congress receives a certification described in subsection (a)(1) or within 15 calendar days after Congress receives the certification described in subsection (a)(2) (regardless of whether Congress is in session), there is enacted into law a joint resolution disapproving the President's exercise of authority with respect to such additional amount.

''(2) CONTENTS OF JOINT RESOLUTION.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution—

''(A)(i) for the certification described in subsection (a)(1), that is introduced on September 6, 7, 8, or 9, 2011 (or, if the Senate was not in session, the next calendar day on which the Senate is in session); and

''(ii) for the certification described in subsection (a)(2), that is introduced between the date the certification is received and 3 calendar days after that date;

''(B) which does not have a preamble;

''(C) the title of which is only as follows: 'Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code, on _____', with the blank containing the date of such submission; and

''(D) the matter after the resolving clause of which is only as follows: 'That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 3101A(a) of title 31, United States Code.'.

''(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(1) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification described in subsection (a)(2), the Speaker, if the House would otherwise be adjourned, shall notify the Members of the House that, pursuant to this section, the House shall convene not later than the second calendar day after receipt of such certification.

''(2) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than 5 calendar days after the date of introduction of a joint resolution described in subsection (a). If a committee fails to report the joint resolution within that period, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar.

''(3) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution reports it to the House or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order, not later than the sixth day after introduction of a joint resolution under subsection (a), to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on a joint resolution addressing a particular submission. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

''(4) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

''(d) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN SENATE.—

''(1) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification under subsection (a)(2), if the Senate has adjourned or recessed for more than 2 days, the majority leader of the Senate, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate that, pursuant to this section, the Senate shall convene not later than the second calendar day after receipt of such message.

''(2) PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.—Upon introduction in the Senate, the joint resolution shall be immediately placed on the calendar.

''(3) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time during the period beginning on the day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (a) and, for the certification described in subsection (a)(1), ending on September 14, 2011, and for the certification described in subsection (a)(2), on the 6th day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (a) (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

''(B) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration of the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(C) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution, the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall occur immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

''(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

''(e) AMENDMENT NOT IN ORDER.—A joint resolution of disapproval considered pursuant to this section shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(f) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint resolution, one House receives from the other a joint resolution—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint resolution under this section, the joint resolution of the House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

''(3) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the joint resolution in the Senate, the Senate then receives the companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

''(4) CONSIDERATION AFTER PASSAGE.—(A) If Congress passes a joint resolution, the period beginning on the date the President is presented with the joint resolution and ending on the date the President signs, allows to become law without his signature, or vetoes and returns the joint resolution (but excluding days when either House is not in session) shall be disregarded in computing the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1).

''(B) debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.''.

''(5) VETO OVERRIDE.—If within the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1), Congress overrides a veto of the joint resolution with respect to authority exercised pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the limit on debt provided in section 3101(b) shall not be raised, except for the $400,000,000,000 increase in the limit provided by subsection (a)(1)(A).

''(6) SEQUESTER.— (A) If within the 60-calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1), Congress overrides a veto of the joint resolution with respect to authority exercised pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a), OMB shall, immediately, sequester pro rata amounts from all discretionary and direct spending accounts as defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)) (as in effect September 30, 2006) equal to $400,000,000,000. No reduction of payments for net interest (functional category 900) shall be made under any order issued under this paragraph.

''(B) Section 255 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not apply to this section, except that payments for military personnel accounts (within subfunctional category 051), TRICARE for Life, Medicare (functional category 570), military retirement, Social Security (functional category 650), veterans (functional category 700), and net interest (functional category 900) shall be exempt.

''(g) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection and subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.''.

TITLE IV—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

SEC. 401. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.—The term ''joint committee'' means the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction established under subsection (b)(1).

(2) JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE BILL.—The term ''joint committee bill'' means a bill consisting of the proposed legislative language of the joint committee recommended under subsection (b)(3)(B) and introduced under section 402(a).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a joint select committee of Congress to be known as the ''Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction''.

(2) GOAL.—The goal of the joint committee shall be to reduce the deficit by $1,800,000,000,000 or more over the period of fiscal years 2012 to 2021.

(3) DUTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) IMPROVING THE SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM FISCAL IMBALANCE.—The joint committee shall provide recommendations and legislative language that will significantly improve the short-term and long-term fiscal imbalance of the Federal Government.

(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEES.—Not later than October 14, 2011, each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate may transmit to the joint committee its recommendations for changes in law to reduce the deficit consistent with the goal described in subsection (b)(2) for the joint committee's consideration.

(B) REPORT, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 23, 2011, the joint committee shall vote on—

(I) a report that contains a detailed statement of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the joint committee and the CBO estimate required by paragraph (5)(D)(ii); and

(II) proposed legislative language to carry out such recommendations as described in subclause (I) which shall include a statement of the deficit reduction achieved by the legislation over the period of fiscal years 2012 to 2021.

Any change to the Rules of the House of Representatives or the Standing Rules of the Senate included in the report or legislative language shall be considered to be merely advisory.

(ii) APPROVAL OF REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—The report of the joint committee and the proposed legislative language described in clause (i) shall require the approval of a majority of the members of the joint committee.

(iii) ADDITIONAL VIEWS.—A member of the joint committee who gives notice of an intention

to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of final joint committee vote on the approval of the report and legislative language under clause (ii), shall be entitled to 3 calendar days in which to file such views in writing with the staff director of the joint committee. Such views shall then be included in the joint committee report and printed in the same volume, or part thereof, and their inclusion shall be noted on the cover of the report. In the absence of timely notice, the joint committee report may be printed and transmitted immediately without such views.

(iv) TRANSMISSION OF REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—If the report and legislative language are approved by the joint committee pursuant to clause (ii), then not later than December 2, 2011, the joint committee shall submit the joint committee report and legislative language described in clause (i) to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Majority and Minority Leaders of both Houses.

(v) REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE TO BE MADE PUBLIC.—Upon the approval or disapproval of the joint committee report and legislative language pursuant to clause (ii), the joint committee shall promptly make the full report and legislative language, and a record of the vote, available to the public.

(4) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The joint committee shall be composed of 12 members appointed pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) DESIGNATION.—Members of the joint committee shall be appointed as follows:

(i) The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(ii) The minority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(iii) The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(iv) The minority leader of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(C) CO-CHAIRS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—There shall be 2 Co-Chairs of the joint committee. The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint one Co-Chair from among the members of the joint committee. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint the second Co-Chair from among the members of the joint committee. The Co-Chairs shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section.

(ii) STAFF DIRECTOR.—The Co-Chairs, acting jointly, shall hire the staff director of the joint committee.

(D) DATE.—Members of the joint committee shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section.

(E) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the joint committee. Any vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled not later than 14 calendar days after the date on which the vacancy occurs in the same manner as the original designation. If a member of the committee leaves Congress, the member is no longer a member of the joint committee and a vacancy shall exist.

(5) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To enable the joint committee to exercise its powers, functions and duties, there are authorized to be disbursed by the Senate the actual and necessary expenses of the joint committee approved by the co-chairs, subject to Senate rules and regulations.

(B) EXPENSES.—In carrying out its functions, the joint committee is authorized to incur expenses in the same manner and under the same conditions as the Joint Economic Committee as authorized by section 11 of Public Law 79-304 (15 U.S.C. 1024 (d)).

(C) QUORUM.—7 members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of voting, meeting, and holding hearings.

(D) VOTING.—

(i) PROXY VOTING.—No proxy voting shall be allowed on behalf of the members of the joint committee.

(ii) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—The Congressional Budget Office shall provide estimates of the legislation (as described in paragraph (3)(B)) in accordance with sections 308(a) and 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 639(a) and 601(f))(including estimates of the effect of interest payment on the debt). In addition, the Congressional Budget Office shall provide information on the budgetary effect of the legislation beyond the year 2021. The joint committee may not vote on any version of the report, recommendations, or legislative language unless such estimates are available for consideration by all members of the joint committee at least 48 hours prior to the vote as certified by the Co-Chairs.

(E) MEETINGS.—

(i) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 45 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section, the joint committee shall hold its first meeting.

(ii) AGENDA.—The Co-Chairs shall provide an agenda to the joint committee members not less than 48 hours in advance of any meeting.

(F) HEARINGS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The joint committee may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, require attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, and documents, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths the joint committee considers advisable.

(ii) HEARING PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CO-CHAIRS.—

(I) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The joint committee Co-Chairs shall make a public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted not less than 7 days in advance of such hearing, unless the Co-Chairs determine that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

(II) WRITTEN STATEMENT.—A witness appearing before the joint committee shall file a written statement of proposed testimony at least 2 calendar days prior to appearance, unless the requirement is waived by the Co-Chairs, following their determination that there is good cause for failure of compliance.

(G) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon written request of the Co-Chairs, a Federal agency shall provide technical assistance to the joint committee in order for the joint committee to carry out its duties.

(c) STAFF OF JOINT COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Co-Chairs of the joint committee may jointly appoint and fix the compensation of staff as they deem necessary, within the guidelines for Senate employees and following all applicable Senate rules and employment requirements.

(2) ETHICAL STANDARDS.—Members on the joint committee who serve in the House of Representatives shall be governed by the House ethics rules and requirements. Members of the Senate who serve on the joint committee and staff of the joint committee shall comply with Senate ethics rules.

(d) TERMINATION.—The joint committee shall terminate on January 13, 2012.

SEC. 402. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) INTRODUCTION.—If approved by the majority required by section 401(b)(3)(B)(ii), the proposed legislative language submitted pursuant to section 401(b)(3)(B)(iv) shall be introduced in the Senate (by request) on the next day on which the Senate is in session by the majority leader of the Senate or by a Member of the Senate designated by the majority leader of the Senate and shall be introduced in the House of Representatives (by request) on the next legislative day by the majority leader of the House or by a Member of the House designated by the majority leader of the House.

(b) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which the joint committee bill is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than December 9, 2011. If a committee fails to report the joint committee bill within that period, it shall be in order to move that the House discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. Such a motion shall not be in order after the last committee authorized to consider the bill reports it to the House or after the House has disposed of a motion to discharge the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a motion is adopted, the House shall proceed immediately to consider the joint committee bill in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After the last committee authorized to consider a joint committee bill reports it to the House or has been discharged (other than by motion) from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint committee bill in the House. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to the joint committee bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The joint committee bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint committee bill and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint committee bill to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the joint committee bill. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall not be in order.

(4) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(c) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN THE SENATE.—

(1) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—A joint committee bill introduced in the Senate under subsection (a) shall be jointly referred to the committee or committees of jurisdiction, which committees shall report the bill without any revision and with a favorable recommendation, an unfavorable recommendation, or without recommendation, not later than December 9, 2011. If any committee fails to report the bill within that period, that committee shall be automatically discharged from consideration of the bill, and the bill shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) MOTION TO PROCEED.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order, not later than 2 days of session after the date on which a joint committee bill is reported or discharged from all committees to which it was referred, for the majority leader of the Senate or the majority leader's designee to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill. It shall also be in order for any Member of the Senate to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill at any time after the conclusion of such 2-day period. A motion to proceed is in order even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to. All points of order against the motion to proceed to the joint committee bill are waived.

The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill is agreed to, the joint committee bill shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—All points of order against the joint committee bill and against consideration of the joint committee bill are waived. Consideration of the joint committee bill and of all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith shall not exceed a total of 30 hours which shall be divided equally between the Majority and Minority Leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate on the joint committee bill is in order, shall require an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn, and is not debatable. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal. All time used for consideration of the joint committee bill, including time used for quorum calls and voting, shall be counted against the total 30 hours of consideration.

(4) NO AMENDMENTS.—An amendment to the joint committee bill, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint committee bill, is not in order.

(5) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to the joint committee bill, the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint committee bill, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(6) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint committee bill shall be decided without debate.

(d) AMENDMENT.—The joint committee bill shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(e) CONSIDERATION BY THE OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint committee bill, one House receives from the other a joint committee bill—

(A) the joint committee bill of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint committee bill had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint committee bill received from the other House shall supplant the joint committee bill of the receiving House.

(2) REVENUE MEASURE.—This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint committee bill received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(f) RULES TO COORDINATE ACTION WITH OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) TREATMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint committee bill under this section, the joint committee bill of the House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

(2) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES IN THE SENATE.—If following passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate, the Senate then receives the joint committee bill from the House of Representatives, the House-passed joint committee bill shall not be debatable. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate shall be considered to be the vote on passage of the joint committee bill received from the House of Representatives.

(3) VETOES.—If the President vetoes the joint committee bill, debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

(g) LOSS OF PRIVILEGE.—The provisions of this section shall cease to apply to the joint committee bill if—

(1) the joint committee fails to vote on the report or proposed legislative language required under section 201(b)(3)(B)(i) by November 23, 2011; or

(2) the joint committee bill does not pass both Houses by December 23, 2011.

SEC. 403. FUNDING.

Funding for the joint committee shall be derived in equal portions from—

(1) the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the contingent fund of the Senate from the appropriations account ''Miscellaneous Items'', subject to Senate rules and regulations.

SEC. 404. RULEMAKING.

The provisions of this title are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

TITLE V—PELL GRANT AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM CHANGES

SEC. 501. FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.

Section 401(b)(7)(A)(iv) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(7)(A)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II), by striking ''$3,183,000,000'' and inserting ''$12,183,000,000''; and

(2) in subclause (III), by striking ''$0'' and inserting ''$8,000,000,000''.

SEC. 502. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INTEREST SUBSIDIZED LOANS TO GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS.

Section 455(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INTEREST SUBSIDIZED LOANS TO GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B) and notwithstanding any provision of this part or part B, for any period of instruction beginning on or after July 1, 2012—

''(i) a graduate or professional student shall not be eligible to receive a Federal Direct Stafford loan under this part; and

''(ii) the maximum annual amount of Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford loans such a student may borrow in any academic year (as defined in section 481(a)(2)) or its equivalent shall be the maximum annual amount for such student determined under section 428H, plus an amount equal to the amount of Federal Direct Stafford loans the student would have received in the absence of this subparagraph.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an individual enrolled in course work specified in paragraph (3)(B) or (4)(B) of section 484(b).''.

SEC. 503. TERMINATION OF DIRECT LOAN REPAYMENT INCENTIVES.

Section 455(b)(8) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)(8)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by amending the header to read as follows: ''(A) INCENTIVES FOR LOANS DISBURSED BEFORE JULY 1, 2012.—''; and

(B) by inserting ''with respect to loans for which the first disbursement of principal is made before July 1, 2012,'' after ''of this part''; (2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''with respect to loans for which the first disbursement of principal is made before July 1, 2012'' after ''repayment incentives''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) NO REPAYMENT INCENTIVES FOR NEW LOANS DISBURSED ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2012.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary is prohibited from authorizing or providing any repayment incentive not otherwise authorized under this part to encourage on-time repayment of a loan under this part for which the first disbursement of principal is made on or after July 1, 2012, including any reduction in the interest or origination fee rate paid by a borrower of such a loan, except that the Secretary may provide for an interest rate reduction for a borrower who agrees to have payments on such a loan automatically electronically debited from a bank account.''.

SEC. 504. INAPPLICABILITY OF TITLE IV NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING AND MASTER CALENDAR EXCEPTION.

Sections 482(c) and 492 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1089(c), 1098a) shall not apply to the amendments made by this title, or to any regulations promulgated under those amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 2 hours, with 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) each will control 30 minutes; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the measure before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it's about 1½ minutes after 3 p.m. on July 28, 2011. At this moment, we begin the debate on one of the most crucial items that we have had or will have before us.

Since 1962, on 75 different occasions, the United States Congress has chosen to increase the debt ceiling to ensure that we paid our past obligations. It has been done 75 times without ever having any strings attached whatsoever.

Last November, we all know that there was an overwhelming message

that was sent by the American people to Washington, DC; and that message was, number one, create jobs, get our economy back on track, and in so doing, rein in the dramatic increase in the size and scope and reach of government that we witnessed in the past several years. We all know that in the last 4 years we've had an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending. And so the message that was sent was: That has to come to an end.

So Speaker BOEHNER, when asked by the President of the United States to move an increase in the debt ceiling, said that he was willing to do that. He recognized, as I believe an overwhelming majority of both Democrats and Republicans in this institution recognize, it is absolutely essential that we increase the debt ceiling. We have to do everything that we can to ensure that Social Security checks get to those retirees. We have to make sure that the many other obligations that we have are in fact met.

And on that one issue of Social Security, we know that on July 12 the President of the United States in a speech said that if we don't see an increase in the debt ceiling by August 2, he could not guarantee that on August 3 those Social Security checks would go to our retirees. And so, Mr. Speaker, what happened was Speaker BOEHNER said we want to make sure that those Social Security checks get out. We want to make sure that we increase the debt ceiling so our Nation doesn't default and follow the pattern of Greece, Portugal, Ireland, and other countries in the world that have gone through tremendous economic devastation.

But what the Speaker said is that, while we are going to, in increasing the debt ceiling, meet those obligations of the past, we are not going to do it the way it has been done the last 75 times. We are going to get to the root cause of why it is that we have to increase the debt ceiling, and that is the runaway spending that Democrat and Republican, alike, decries regularly. And so the Speaker said that he would increase the debt ceiling, but he wanted to ensure that we cut spending in an amount that was greater than the level of the debt ceiling increase.

And so he began discussions, recognizing that Republicans—those who won this majority last November—only controlled the United States House of Representatives. Speaker BOEHNER does not look at the world through rose-colored glasses. He knows that the Republicans don't control the United States Senate and he knows that he has to work with President Obama. But he does know that the last statement that was made by the American people in November of last year was we've got to have a dramatic change in the course that we have been on. And so he began negotiating. He began discussions. He began working over the past several weeks and months to try to put together a bipartisan effort so that Democrats and Republicans, alike, could come together and ensure that those Social Security checks get out and that the other obligations that we have are in fact met and that we do increase our debt ceiling.

We've all followed, and the American people are following very closely, the global markets are following closely, this debate and the discussions that are taking place. It came to a head last weekend when we know that the President of the United States had requested a 50 percent increase in the level of taxes to be increased from $800 billion to $1.2 trillion, and the Speaker of the House said that that was a nonstarter. So the Speaker said that he wanted to work with the bipartisan leadership of the United States Congress, both Houses of Congress. And so last weekend we know that Speaker BOEHNER and the Democratic Majority Leader of the United States Senate, HARRY REID, came together and fashioned, by and large, the measure that is before us today.

Now, I'm the first to say that HARRY REID no longer supports this measure. HARRY REID has indicated that he does not support it. We have this letter from the 53 Senators. We have word that they're going to table this measure when it passes the House of Representatives. But it's important, Mr. Speaker, for everyone to recognize that what is before us today is, by and large, a measure that is not what Speaker BOEHNER would write if he were doing it on his own. It's a measure that is the byproduct of bipartisan discussion and, as the Speaker likes to say, the ability to find common ground.

We are, today, in a position where we face, in just a few days, the prospect of those Social Security checks not going out. And, Mr. Speaker, that's why I don't like this measure, but I'm voting for it. I'm voting for it because I want to get those Social Security checks out, I want to make sure that the United States of America does not default, and I believe that that's the responsible thing for us to do.

What we have before us in the House of Representatives is the closest thing to a bipartisan agreement. First of all, we know that, by and large, there have been no other plans put forward, but the plan that does exist—there are very few plans put forward. The plan that has been put forward by Senator REID is one that does not enjoy bipartisan support and it was not put together in a bipartisan way. This one was, by and large, even though it does not have the support of Senator REID any longer, was put together based on the discussions they had. I believe that this measure is deserving of strong bipartisan support here in the House of Representatives and from our colleagues in the United States Senate as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, in the name of sanity and in the name of ensuring that we maintain the solvency and the strength of the greatest nation the world has ever known, that we pass this measure and that we send it to our colleagues in the United States Senate so that they can do the same, and so that when it's placed on the desk of the President of the United States, he will have his opportunity to ensure that what he predicted as a possibility for August 3, that being that Social Security checks do not go out, will not happen.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1510

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts seek to control the time of the gentlewoman from New York?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to open debate, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is no common ground here, nor was it sought. We find ourselves at an unprecedented place today. America stands on the brink of default. It stands there, my friends, because the leadership of this House has failed to act in a timely and responsible way. This is an unprecedented status for America, an intolerable place, and Americans are understandably outraged at this politically caused impasse that confronts us, the consequences of which for every American and our country have been correctly characterized as ''catastrophic.''

For more than two centuries, an American default has been unthinkable. The men and women who came before us in this Chamber built up the full faith and credit of the United States until it became the bedrock of the world's economy. Despite their differences, they agreed that the honor that comes from paying our bills responsibly and on time was a moral obligation.

Now our Nation is on the verge of breaking that trust. If America fails to pay its bills and default comes, the wound to the global economy, to jobs across this country, to our standing among nations, that wound will be entirely self-inflicted. It cannot and must not come to that.

Americans have overwhelmingly called on us to come to a balanced, bipartisan solution, one that pays our bills, reduces our deficit, and draws common contributions from all Americans—not only the vulnerable and the unconnected, but also those who have enjoyed our Nation's prosperity.

That is the consensus of the vast majority of the people who sent us here. They understand that ''my way or the highway'' is no way to govern. They understand that all of us who had a hand in accumulating our debt must share the work of paying it off. They understand that the prosperity and prestige of our country are at stake right now. And they are relying on the

ability of this body to put partisanship aside.

There will, in fact, be bipartisan opposition to this bill, but I predict there will be no Democrat for this bill because bipartisanship was not sought.

So I am deeply concerned that the short-term plan offered by Speaker BOEHNER would put us right back, right back here on the precipice of imminent default in just a few months, casting a pall of uncertainty over our economy and leading to a job-destroying credit downgrade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Each of us, ladies and gentleman of this House, has a duty to end this impasse. Let's live up to that duty by voting down this partisan legislation.

And then let's come together on a balanced, bipartisan solution to reduce our deficit and pay our bills. I suggest to my friend from California that Majority Leader REID has offered just such a plan. In fact, it incorporates exactly what Speaker BOEHNER suggested in his speech in New York City. Let us embrace that plan. After this fails, let the Senate send it to us.

This is a moment of great crisis for our country and for our citizens, a crisis that demands our putting aside partisanship and politics for the good of our people. We're not there yet, but it is my great hope that we as a body can live up to that challenge. Our fellow citizens expect it, our duty demands it, our oath requires it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my very good friend from Maryland, the distinguished whip, that bipartisanship has been sought, and I am seeking it right now. So I hope very much that we will be in a position where we will be able to enjoy bipartisan support for this.

I yield 2 minutes to my very good friend, the gentlewoman from Hinsdale, Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), a hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a single Member of Congress or the administration who did not know that this day was coming. Washington was spending tax dollars faster than ever before, and the debt ceiling was caving in.

The question is: How do we respond? Do we protest? Do we argue? Or do we govern?

Last November, the voters asked for change. That's how this House stopped the largest tax increase in history and cut spending this year to levels not seen since 2008.

Today, we have the opportunity to take the next step by passing the Budget Control Act. This is a balanced compromise that will avert a default and stop the cycle of debt that is draining our economy. It makes nearly $1 trillion in immediate cuts—more than the debt increase—caps future spending, and lays the groundwork for additional savings in a balanced budget amendment.

In a perfect world, some of us would like more cuts. Those on the left also want a bigger plan—or at least a big enough debt increase to carry the President beyond the next campaign.

But the American people care about jobs, not politics. They want solutions that will restore confidence, credit, and growth in the United States. And neither a default nor a 2-year budget gimmick will accomplish that task. This bill will.

I urge my colleagues on both sides to recognize that good politics is about doing what's right for the American people. Let's take this opportunity, cut spending, and put America back on a sound fiscal path to prosperity.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we are 5 days away from a historic, unprecedented, and needless default. Instead of acting responsibly and in a bipartisan way to raise the debt ceiling, the Republican majority continues to hold the American economy hostage to press their agenda.

Even though the debt ceiling was raised seven times under President Bush, even though 110 current Members of the majority have voted to raise the debt ceiling in the past, the majority continues its dangerous game of brinksmanship.

Included in this bill is $917 billion in cuts mostly to critical public investments like education, infrastructure, biomedical research, law enforcement, and food safety. They will all be slashed. And yet these programs, which are called discretionary programs, they are only 3.1 percent higher than they were 5 years ago, less than what it was under both Ronald Reagan and the first Bush administration.

It is disingenuous for this majority to pretend that these public investments, critical to job creation and economic growth, are the source of our deficit problems. The primary reason the deficits have grown is because revenues are lower than they have been in 60 years—15 percent lower thanks to the Bush tax breaks for the wealthy—and because we initiated two wars on the Nation's credit card.

If the majority was serious about deficit reduction, they would allow for additional revenue by asking the wealthiest Americans and corporate special interests to share in the sacrifice rather than seeking to protect them—which they do—in this legislation.

The majority is not serious. This bill is not about deficit reduction. It is about using the threat of default to enact a radical agenda, one that will cost jobs and undermine the American economy, where middle class families would have an opportunity for a decent retirement.

In a few months they are coming back, $1.6 trillion in cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. This form of hostage taking is not responsible leadership. It's the wrong direction for our country. I urge my colleagues to vote against this incredible, outrageous piece of legislation, and I call on the majority to quit playing political games.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my good friend that I believe that the majority is serious, and I believe that the Democrats are serious in their quest to ensure that we don't default. This is their opportunity to step up to the plate and make sure that it doesn't happen.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Gold River, Mr. LUNGREN, the hardworking chairman of the Administration Committee.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, what is incredible, what is outrageous, what is unprecedented is the amount of debt that we are incurring on a daily basis and have been doing for some time. Those who are being held hostage are our children and our grandchildren and their futures. The question we have is whether or not we are going to reach a balanced approach.

□ 1520

What do I say a balanced approach would be? A balanced approach is when we are once again creating jobs in this economy.

What those on the other side have led us to believe is that the answer to our problems is to follow the European experience over the last 30 to 40 years, and that is to rely more on government, higher taxes, with the net result of a shrinking private economy and fewer jobs.

What is unprecedented is that we are now in the longest period of continuous unemployment that we've seen since the Great Depression. What is unprecedented is that if you call this a recovery, it is the most jobless recovery in the history of modern-day United States. What it is, is very much like what we've seen in Europe over the last 30 years.

So the question before us is do we follow the European experience with greater reliance on government; greater balance, which translated means ''taxes,'' when we know that not a single economist of any repute would tell us that the answer to our jobless situation is to tax those who create the jobs?

That's why this is such an important vote for us today. That is, we will show that the way to the future is the American way; the way we've done it in the past: reliance on the private sector, allowing the ingenuity, the creativity, the risk-taking, the courage of the American people to bring us back to prosperity.

Those on the other side, the gentlewoman from New York just suggested that the way to do that is through the expansion of government programs.

That's not the essence of how we create jobs.

We are in an unprecedented period of time; that is true, Mr. Speaker. We must act in an unprecedented way, and that is to follow the Boehner plan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Robert Greenstein, the president of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, says that if enacted, the Boehner bill could well produce the greatest poverty and hardship produced by any law in modern history.

CENTER ON BUDGET
AND POLICY PRIORITIES
July 25, 2011.

STATEMENT: ROBERT GREENSTEIN, PRESIDENT, ON HOUSE SPEAKER BOEHNER'S NEW BUDGET PROPOSAL

The plan is, thus, tantamount to a form of ''class warfare.'' If enacted, it could well produce the greatest increase in poverty and hardship produced by any law in modern U.S. history.

This may sound hyperbolic, but it is not. The mathematics are inexorable.

The Boehner plan calls for large cuts in discretionary programs of $1.2 trillion over the next ten years, and it then requires additional cuts that are large enough to produce another $1.8 trillion in savings to be enacted by the end of the year as a condition for raising the debt ceiling again at that time.

The Boehner plan contains no tax increases. The entire $1.8 trillion would come from budget cuts. Because the first round of cuts will hit discretionary programs hard—through austere discretionary caps that Congress will struggle to meet—discretionary cuts will largely or entirely be off the table when it comes to achieving the further $1.8 trillion in budget reductions.

As a result, virtually all of that $1.8 trillion would come from entitlement programs. They would have to be cut more than $1.5 trillion in order to produce sufficient interest savings to achieve $1.8 trillion in total savings. To secure $1.5 trillion in entitlement savings over the next ten years would require draconian policy changes.

Policymakers would essentially have three choices: 1) cut Social Security and Medicare benefits heavily for current retirees, something that all budget plans from both parties (including House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan's plan) have ruled out; 2) repeal the Affordable Care Act's coverage expansions while retaining its measures that cut Medicare payments and raise tax revenues, even though Republicans seek to repeal many of those measures as well; or 3) eviscerate the safety net for low-income children, parents, senior citizens, and people with disabilities. There is no other plausible way to get $1.5 trillion in entitlement cuts in the next ten years.

The evidence for this conclusion is abundant.

The ''Gang of Six'' plan, with its very tough and controversial entitlement cuts, contains total entitlement reductions of $640 to $760 billion over the next ten years not counting Social Security, and $755 billion to $875 billion including Social Security. (That's before netting out $300 billion in entitlement costs that the plan includes for a permanent fix to the scheduled cuts in Medicare physician payments that Congress regularly cancels; with these costs netted out, the Gang of Six entitlement savings come to $455 to $575 billion.)

The budget deal between President Obama and Speaker Boehner that fell apart last Friday, which included cuts in Social Security cost-of-living adjustments and Medicare benefits as well as an increase in the Medicare eligibility age, contained total entitlement cuts of $650 billion (under the last Obama offer) to $700 billion (under the last Boehner offer). The Ryan budget that the House passed in April contained no savings in Social Security over the next ten years and $279 billion in Medicare cuts.

To be sure, the House-passed Ryan budget included much larger overall entitlement cuts over the next 10 years. But that was largely because it eviscerated the safety net and repealed health reform's coverage expansions. The Ryan plan included cuts in Medicaid and health reform of a remarkable $2.2 trillion, from severely slashing Medicaid and killing health reform's coverage expansions. The Ryan plan also included stunning cuts of $127 billion in the SNAP program (formerly known as food stamps) and $126 billion in Pell Grants and other student financial assistance.

That House Republicans would likely seek to reach the Boehner budget's $1.8 trillion target in substantial part by cutting programs for the poorest and most vulnerable Americans is given strong credence by the ''Cut, Cap, and Balance'' bill that the House recently approval. That bill would establish global spending caps and enforce them with across-the-board budget cuts—exempting Medicare and Social Security from the across-the-board cuts while subjecting programs for the poor to the across-the-board axe. This would turn a quarter century of bipartisan budget legislation on its head; starting with the 1985 Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law, all federal laws of the last 26 years that have set budget targets enforced by across-the-board cuts have exempted the core assistance programs for the poor from those cuts while including Medicare among programs subject to the cuts. This component of the ''Cut, Cap, and Balance'' bill strongly suggests that, especially in the face of an approaching election, House Republicans looking for entitlement cuts would heavily target means-tested programs for people of lesser means (and less political power).

In short, the Boehner plan would force policymakers to choose among cutting the incomes and health benefits of ordinary retirees, repealing the guts of health reform and leaving an estimated 34 million more Americans uninsured, and savaging the safety net for the poor. It would do so even as it shielded all tax breaks, including the many lucrative tax breaks for the wealthiest and most powerful individuals and corporations.

President Obama has said that, while we must reduce looming deficits, we must take a balanced approach. The Boehner proposal badly fails this test of basic decency. The President should veto the bill if it reaches his desk. Congress should find a fairer, more decent way to avoid a default.

At this point I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this smoke-and-mirrors bill before us today actually stands to increase—yes, increase—the deficit of the United States of America by over $100 billion.

Let me walk the Speaker through the math here. This is why credit ratings matter: countries that have AA credit ratings—this is a group of them—pay an average interest on their sovereign debt of 3.75 percent. Countries with a AAA rating—this is a 10-year bond, but it would carry across 3-year, 5-year, 30-year in similar degrees—countries with AAA pay 2.98 percent. That's 1.75 percent, almost a 2 percent difference between AAA and AA.

In passing this bill today, which only has a 6-month extension, we are jeopardizing our AAA rating that will be incredibly hard to ever earn back. And in addition to paying 2 extra percentage points on your variable rate home mortgage that middle class families can't afford, 2 points more on your credit card debt, 2 points more on your car debt, in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the government, the biggest borrower in the country, will pay more interest on the debt. Over 10 years that 1.75 percent difference, which is just taking the average between AAA and AA, costs over $100 billion a year in extra interest on the debt. Over a 10-year period, over $1 trillion of additional interest paid on the Federal debt.

So what are we doing? Cutting $915 billion and risking adding over $1 trillion in additional expenditures.

This smoke-and-mirrors effort before us today risks increasing the Federal deficit at a time when we all know we need to decrease Federal spending, we need to decrease our deficit. The last thing we need is to set motion forward to actually up our interest rate, jeopardize our credit rating because of the short-term nature, and increase the interest payments on our Federal debt.

I encourage my colleagues to look at these numbers and vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to my friend that he is absolutely right: if we go into default, if we don't extend the debt ceiling, we are, in fact, going to see an increase in interest rates. The fact of matter is the ratings agencies like Standard & Poor's say that we not only have to increase interest rates but we have to put into place a deficit reduction plan that will pay down our debt, and that's exactly what's happening.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to our hardworking colleague from the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentlewoman from Brentwood, Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the Budget Control Act of 2011, what I like to call Cut, Cap, and Balance 3.0.

Last week the House passed Cut, Cap, and Balance 1.0 in bipartisan fashion. Not surprisingly, Senator REID and his Democrat colleagues in the Senate failed to even allow for a vote. Speaker BOEHNER then offered Cut, Cap, and Balance 2.0, which, according to the CBO, failed to generate sufficient savings to accompany the debt ceiling increase. So the Speaker went back to the drawing board, found more cuts and reductions, and I applaud him for that.

Today the House will once again ensure that our Nation will take another step by enacting legislation that cuts spending more than any increase in the debt ceiling, does not raise taxes on

America's families and job creators during a time of economic hardship, and ensures an up-or-down vote on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. And I thank my constituents and the small business owners who have called to encourage me in this process to say let's get this job done.

Let it be known that this is merely a small foundational step to ensure that we put this Nation on the road to fiscal health, and it is historic. By passing the Budget Control Act, we will take away President Barack Obama's blank check. For the first time, debt limit legislation will cut spending, lock in these cuts, cap future spending, does not raise taxes, ensures that balanced budget amendment vote, and keeps our attention on the Nation's fiscal problems.

House Republicans are saying the buck stops here. Let's get to work addressing our Nation's fiscal woes and cutting the spending problem in Washington, D.C.

For that, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Budget Control Act.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a recent New York Times editorial entitled ''The Republican Wreckage.''

[From The New York Times, July 25, 2011]

THE REPUBLICAN WRECKAGE

House Republicans have lost sight of the country's welfare. It's hard to conclude anything else from their latest actions, including the House speaker's dismissal of President Obama's plea for compromise Monday night. They have largely succeeded in their campaign to ransom America's economy for the biggest spending cuts in a generation. They have warped an exercise in paying off current debt into an argument about future spending. Yet, when they win another concession, they walk away.

This increasingly reckless game has pushed the nation to the brink of ruinous default. The Republicans have dimmed the futures of millions of jobless Americans, whose hopes for work grow more out of reach as government job programs are cut and interest rates begin to rise. They have made the federal government a laughingstock around the globe.

In a scathing prime-time television address Monday night, President Obama stepped off the sidelines to tell Americans the House Republicans were threatening a ''deep economic crisis'' that could send interest rates skyrocketing and hold up Social Security and veterans' checks. By insisting on a single-minded approach and refusing to negotiate, he said, Republicans were violating the country's founding principle of compromise.

''How can we ask a student to pay more for college before we ask hedge fund managers to stop paying taxes at a lower rate than their secretaries?'' he said, invoking Ronald Reagan's effort to make everyone pay a fair share and pointing out that his immediate predecessors had to ask for debt-ceiling increases under rules invented by Congress. He urged viewers to demand compromise. ''The entire world is watching,'' he said.

Mr. Obama denounced House Speaker John Boehner's proposal to make cuts only, now, and raise the debt ceiling briefly, but he embraced the proposal made over the weekend by the Senate Majority Leader, Harry Reid, which gave Republicans virtually everything they said they wanted when they ignited this artificial crisis: $2.7 trillion from government spending over the next decade, with no revenue increases. It is, in fact, an awful plan, which cuts spending far too deeply at a time when the government should be summoning all its resources to solve the real economic problem of unemployment. It asks for absolutely no sacrifice from those who have prospered immensely as economic inequality has grown.

Mr. Reid's proposal does at least protect Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. And about half of its savings comes from the winding down of two wars, which naturally has drawn Republican opposition. (Though Republicans counted the same savings in their budgets.)

Mr. Boehner will not accept this as the last-ditch surrender that it is. The speaker, who followed Mr. Obama on TV with about five minutes of hoary talking points clearly written before the president spoke, is insisting on a plan that raises the debt ceiling until early next year and demands another vote on a balanced-budget amendment, rejected by the Senate last week. The result would be to stage this same debate over again in an election year. Never mind that this would almost certainly result in an immediate downgrade of the government's credit.

We agreed strongly when Mr. Obama said Americans should be ''offended'' by this display and that they ''may have voted for divided government but they didn't vote for a dysfunctional government.'' It's hard not to conclude now that dysfunction is the Republicans' goal—even if the cost is unthinkable.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the biggest problem in this country is not that the American Government is about to breach its debt ceiling; it's that too many American families have already breached their debt ceilings. We have a jobs crisis in this country, and this should be our principal focus.

Now, somewhere in America today, some decision-makers are not getting much help with that jobs crisis. A hospital that's thinking about adding a rehab lab and adding a couple hundred jobs wonders how much Medicare revenue it's going to get. This bill says wait 6 months and we'll let you know.

An entrepreneur who has a software company who is about to finally get off the ground is thinking about borrowing some money to hire more people, but she doesn't know what the interest rates are going to be. This bill says wait 6 months and we'll let you know.

And, yes, there's a diabetic, a person who's worried about whether they should keep their house or not because their health care bills are rising and they're worried that Medicare may not pay as many of their diabetic bills as they have right now. And we're saying to her wait six months; we'll let you know.

We can't wait to solve this problem. The Republicans should listen to their own leadership, who spoke out against a short-term fix to this problem: ''We feel very strongly that one of the reasons why we continue to see an ailing economy is that people have very little confidence, have very little certainty in terms of where we are headed.''

I completely agree with Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR, who said that in June. We should listen to Mr. CANTOR's advice. We should adopt a long-term plan and put America back to work, get back to the negotiating table today.

□ 1530

Mr. DREIER. I yield 2 minutes to our thoughtful and hardworking colleague from Allentown, Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Budget Control Act. First and foremost, we, the United States House of Representatives, have an obligation to govern. We have a tremendous responsibility to the American people to consider this plan that ensures our Nation does not default on our Nation's commitments while at the same time places this country on a sustainable fiscal path.

Let me be clear: Defaulting on America's obligations to our creditors, to our seniors, disabled veterans, activity military personnel, college students, and many others is not an option. This bill prevents a default and it pays our bills. Congress must act swiftly to deter a ratings downgrade of our U.S. Government, a downgrade that will affect families and small businesses across the country. Only a sound, credible plan that places us on that sustainable trajectory will prevent that downgrade, driven in part by an unprecedented spending binge by this administration which has blown up the fiscal balance sheet.

A previous speaker said a few moments ago that we're playing games. I can assure you this is no game. This is serious stuff. And speaking of serious, the White House has still refused to offer a serious specific plan in writing that we can review. In fact, in a stinging rebuke of the administration, the nonpartisan Director of the CBO, Doug Elmendorf, said, ''We don't estimate speeches.''

The Senate has dug in its heels, too. It would be nice if they passed the bill, any bill. It's been 800 days since there's been a budget. It's time for them to act and to move to prevent this type of a fiscal calamity that many have predicted.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation. It's a step forward. It may not be the final product, but it moves this process forward. I encourage the Senate to take it up.

Most importantly, we have a sacred duty and a solemn obligation to lead and to act. We do have that affirmative obligation to govern for the benefit of our country and for the American people. The world is watching. Americans are watching. It's time for us to lead and demonstrate American exceptionalism.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

We're here today, at long last, to vote on the Republican default plan. After 200 days without a jobs agenda, after 200 days of saying that those hardest hit by the recession should bear the burden of unbalanced cuts, after 200 days of rhetoric and walking away, my Republican colleagues have finally brought their top secret default plan to the floor for a public debate and a vote.

So, what did they offer up? Courageous leadership? A grand bargain? Sadly, no. When you walk out of negotiations and spend more time talking to the press than to the President, I'm not sure we expected more.

We have before us the same tired policies that got us into this mess—cut taxes for millionaires, give kickbacks to special interests, pay for it all with cuts to the middle class. And never forget the central tenets of the conservative agenda: end Medicare and privatize Social Security.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will no doubt come to the floor to say the bill explicitly protects Medicare and Social Security from cuts. That claim is blatantly false. It's a desperate campaign speech to counter the backlash that comes when the American people read the bill, like they read the Ryan budget.

So I would ask my colleagues to take another careful look at the bill before us. It is only 57 pages long. There is even a summary online through the Rules Committee Web site. After that careful examination, I would ask you to come before my constituents, before the American people, to myself, and promise us with a straight face that you have no intention of using this legislation to dismantle Medicare and cut Social Security in the next 12 months. You can't.

I don't support these policies, and I cannot support a plan that puts us back in the same bitter, vilifying debate in January. It may be good politics, but it's not good government. I'm tired of it, my constituents are tired of it, and anyone who's watched the nightly news for the last 6 months is tired of it.

Washington loves to kick the can down the road. That's how we got here in the first place. This is our moment. We need a plan, not another Republican manifesto. There are better plans out there. Let us vote on them.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill and get back to work.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to a good friend and Presidential candidate, the gentleman from Livonia, Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman from California.

We hear a lot of talk about plans. We hear a lot of talk about secret default plans, Senate plans, the Reid plan, but we've yet to hear about the President's plan.

We live in a period of time where we are engaged in a struggle against economic stagnation, where 30 million people can't trade jobs because there are no better ones out there, where 14 million people are unemployed. We live in a period of time where inflation is rising, real wages are declining. In short, we live in a period of time in which we are being neither led nor governed.

We are seeing postures, not plans—with one exception. The House Republicans have endeavored to meet the duty that was entrusted to them by the American people, which is to put forward a plan that will prevent the default of the United States and a diminishment of our economic credibility in the world. Unfortunately, what we get in response is not an attempt at honest bipartisan collaboration. Instead, it is more political rhetoric, more partisanship, more posturing.

At this point in time we have before us a plan that can work. It is not a perfect plan. People on both sides of the aisle have their qualms with it. And yet it is a plan that can be helpful to the American people, that can be helpful to ensuring that our economy does not further deteriorate, a plan that can make sure that Big Government no longer crushes the aspirations of the American people to grow this economy, to find employment, to secure their pursuit of happiness around their hearth and home.

For that, I will support this bill, and I would urge my colleagues to do it, because the American people deserve no less.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. What's not safe under the Boehner default plan?

Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare are not safe under the Boehner default plan. In just 7 months, it forces nearly $1.6 trillion in cuts from these programs. They will be unrecognizable.

Jobs are not safe under the Boehner default plan. It will force 2 million Americans to lose their jobs, putting greater strain on struggling families.

Our economy is not safe under the Boehner default plan. This short-term deal could lead to an automatic tax increase for every American with a mortgage, car loan, or credit card. It would leave a cloud of uncertainty. Businesses won't invest and our economy won't grow.

Nothing is safe under the Boehner default plan except tax breaks for Big Oil, companies that ship jobs overseas, and the rich.

We must reject this ideological approach and come together on a balanced solution that will ensure that every American will have a safe and secure future.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 12¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, according to Grover Norquist, who's apparently the real Republican strategist, this is about ensuring that Democrats will never again have the revenue to govern as Democrats. But what does he mean by that? Is he talking about when Roosevelt rescued us from the Great Depression in the 1930s or when we saved the world for democracy in the forties or when we built the middle class with the GI Bill in the late forties? Or when we won the race to space in the early sixties or when we started Medicare and passed civil rights laws in the mid-sixties? Or when President Clinton raised taxes, balanced the budget, generated 20 million new jobs, cut poverty, grew the middle class, passed on projected surpluses as far as the eye could see, and enabled those at the top tax rates to take home more after-tax income than in any prior time in American history?

□ 1540

The fact is that Democrats have made this Nation great by investing in all our people and by raising the revenue necessary to meet our obligations and to secure our future. This is the alternative. This is about an ideology that lowers our sights, diminishes our stature and sells short our future. That is why it should be rejected.

Mr. DREIER. In light of the disparity here, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague, Mr. LYNCH.

Mr. LYNCH. I rise today in opposition to the Budget Control Act because I honestly believe that this Nation is better than this bill reflects.

Just so we're clear on the differences here between our positions, this amendment seeks to place the overwhelming burden of this crisis on the backs of senior citizens, and it forces seniors especially to make enormous sacrifices while, at the same time, it allows the richest Americans and oil companies and hedge fund operators to escape any responsibility or sacrifice.

This is not how we should be treating America's Greatest Generation, who survived the Great Depression, who fought in World War II, and who made the sacrifices in their time when their country called upon them. This is not the way to treat the frail elderly or any senior, who, at the end of their working lives, are now on a fixed income.

The way we deal with this crisis will say a lot about America. I think Hubert Humphrey said it best when he said that the true test of any society is

how we treat those citizens in the dawn of life, our children; those in the twilight of life, our elderly; and those in the shadow of life, our poor and disabled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LYNCH. I just want to say, as Republicans are rallying to the ramparts to save the millionaires from suffering from any loss of a tax loophole, I take a full measure of pride at where the Democrats in this House are standing on this issue. I urge my colleagues to stand with seniors and to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that last November sent 87 new Republicans to the House of Representatives. To one of them, I yield 2 minutes, the very thoughtful gentleman from Newburgh, Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for America's financial future.

We are at a time when we need to make every effort to save our Nation's credit rating. The rating agencies have said that raising the debt ceiling is not enough. While I would have preferred the Cut, Cap, and Balance plan, the Budget Control Act vote today and the balanced budget amendment vote tomorrow is the best remaining approach to reduce spending and help avoid a downgrade.

We can institute real reforms today as a first step on a long path to fiscal stability. However, the bill isn't perfect. I wanted more, and frankly, all of our constituents deserve more. The reality is our friends on the other side of the aisle won't allow it.

With years of reckless spending by the Federal Government, instead of making tough choices to address our spending problems, the other side wants to raise taxes on the American people to continue funding Washington, D.C.'s spending spree. In addition, they want us to give the President a blank check to get him through the 2012 election. Well, that's not going to happen. The United States has always maintained a AAA credit rating, and the threat of inaction by our colleagues in the U.S. Senate and no plan offered by the administration puts that at risk.

The House has and will take action.

We need to send a clear message to the American people that we are willing to make the tough choices and work together on behalf of our Nation's citizens. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill and to take the first step to restoring fiscal responsibility to our Nation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Congress' approval rating is now down around 10 percent, and given the debate on this politically induced default crisis, I have to ask myself: Who are these crazy 10 percent? The American people are looking at this institution right now, and they're asking: What on Earth are you thinking?

They're sick of these games and they're sick of us. They want this default crisis resolved now, and they definitely don't want to repeat it 6 months from now. They understand that a real solution means a real compromise. Our constituents have made it clear that they want shared sacrifice where millionaires, billionaires and oil companies contribute their fair share. They want their Social Security and Medicare benefits to be protected.

Yet this bill, the Republican default agenda, does none of that. In fact, this reckless bill is actually a stealth attack on Medicare and Social Security because it requires large cuts next year that can only come from those programs. The Boehner plan would increase borrowing costs across the entire spectrum of American society, including local and State governments, businesses, and our citizens—producing, essentially, a backdoor tax hike on the American people. It does all this damage to seniors and middle class families while sparing the wealthy from even the slightest inconvenience.

We weren't elected to Congress to run our economy and our country into the ground—to fail to respond to a crisis of our own creation, but here we are. The American people deserve better and are demanding better. We need to defeat this bill so we can move on to a real solution.

Mr. DREIER. At this juncture, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, frustrated in that, as we sit here on the brink of the financial unknown, families in my district are left hanging, worrying about jobs.

The bill we're debating today fails to address America's number one priority of creating jobs. Instead, it puts us in the exact same position 6 months from now, threatening working families with deep, unbalanced, unfair cuts while protecting tax cuts for millionaires and big corporations that ship jobs overseas.

It has been 200 days of this new Republican-led Congress, and what have we seen? We have seen them target Medicare, working families, the environment, and education—we've even seen them use up time to target energy-efficient light bulbs—but what we haven't seen them do is target job creation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this risky plan and to responsibly raise our debt limit so America can pay its bills and so this Congress can get serious about creating good-paying jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 10¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. I don't think there is a question. It is very clear that we have to act to prevent a default and a downgrade of our Nation's credit rating. Sadly, the House Republican leadership's plan is not a serious plan to avoid such a downgrade.

It's more smoke and mirrors. We've heard that talked about lately. It will put us right back in the same position in a few months, requiring another vote to raise the debt limit, putting America into a further area where we might be able to see the potential downgrade, costing Americans $100 billion a year and $1 trillion over 10 years.

A short-term increase in the debt limit has already been rejected by economists and credit rating agencies, which have made it clear that this plan will likely result in an unprecedented downgrade to our credit rating, leaving higher interest rates for mortgages and student loans for all Americans. In addition, this reckless plan leaves the door open to the same damage as did the Ryan plan.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield for just one second, Mr. Speaker?

I would just like to ask the gentleman if he might cite where that is from, the quote of that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Mexico didn't yield.

Mr. DREIER. Oh, I'm sorry. I thought the gentleman had yielded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico controls the time.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order. I don't believe that I did yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico controls the time.

Mr. LUJÁN. After that interruption, may I ask how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield my friend an additional 15 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 25 seconds.

Mr. LUJÁN. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker.

In addition, this reckless plan leaves the door open to the same damage as the Ryan's plan, to attack Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, while protecting tax breaks for billionaires and corporations.

It is important that we talk to the American people about this and that we have this conversation. I urge my colleagues to reject the partisan

gamesmanship and seek a responsible and balanced solution to this crisis.

□ 1550

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm very happy to yield 2 minutes to the next Governor of Indiana, the gentleman from Columbus, Mr. PENCE.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to rise in support of the Budget Control Act of 2011, which is a negotiated compromise between the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and the Republican and Democratic leadership of the United States Senate.

Let me say that again: the Budget Control Act that we will bring to the floor today is a compromise. At a time when people across America long for a Washington, D.C., that is able to reach across the aisle, lower the volume, solve the problem, this legislation comes to the floor. And I'm proud to support it.

The truth is it is a difficult time for people across my beloved Indiana and all across this country. Our economy is struggling. Unemployment is at 8.3 percent in Indiana, 9.3 percent nationally. And I believe that runaway Federal spending by both political parties is a cause and a barrier to our economic recovery today. We simply must put our fiscal house in order.

Now, I know the administration wanted us simply to raise the debt ceiling without conditions, but that was rejected I think almost unanimously in the United States Senate, and we rejected it as well in this body.

What needs to be done today is we need to recognize that if you owe debts, pay debts. We have to raise the Nation's debt ceiling so that we have the money to pay the Nation's bills. But we also owe a debt to this generation of Americans struggling in this economy and to the next generation of Americans that we can only repay through fiscal discipline and reform, and the Budget Control Act does that.

The Budget Control Act does two things that I believe are worth highlighting.

Number one, it ensures in this first installment that there will be a dollar in budget cuts for every dollar in increase in borrowing authority by the United States. That's crucial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to yield my friend an additional minute.

Mr. PENCE. Secondly, the agreement around the Budget Control Act also ensures that there will be a vote in this body now tomorrow and a vote in the United States Senate this fall on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

There are other aspects of this bill that are meritorious—hard-spending caps, more enforceable than spending caps of the past; the creation of a bipartisan commission to negotiate spending discipline and reforms for the next installment of a debt ceiling increase.

But for my part, making sure that any increase in the debt ceiling is matched dollar for dollar with spending cuts in this bill and for the first time in 15 years bringing a bipartisan version of the balanced budget amendment to this floor of the House and soon to the floor of the Senate are worthy of note. And they should endorse this approach.

This is a very serious time, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the Budget Control Act as evidence that Congress can still compromise. We can still come together across the aisle. We can find a way to pay the Nation's bills and do so in a way that reflects our commitment to fiscal discipline and reform.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado, a former member of the Rules Committee, and we miss him, Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I think we've got to go back 10 years and just talk about where we were at that time.

Under Bill Clinton, this country had a surplus. Revenues exceeded expenses. Things were going along great. We were adding jobs by the millions. Then we have a Republican administration. Two tax cuts, couple trillion dollars, lower revenue. Two wars, couple trillion dollars, more expense. A crash on Wall Street, $3 trillion in expense to this country.

That's where this expense comes from. That's why we have bills to pay. We had a tough 10 years, most of it under Republican administration. We've got to pay those bills. But the Republican leadership has brought us to the brink of default—something the United States has had full faith and credit for 235 years and they want to bring that right to the brink of default.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are better than that. We have a responsibility. We can't live in turmoil. We need to rebuild the American Dream for people who want a shot at getting ahead in this life, not this brinksmanship.

This is a bad bill and must be defeated.

Mr. DREIER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia who serves on the Financial Services Committee, Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. America, we really need to pay close attention here.

First of all, this is a terrible bill at the wrong time. Here we are, the number one issue facing the American people is jobs, and this bill is a major job-killer of the highest magnitude. It will average a loss of 40,000 public service jobs in the public sector each month. All we have to do is look at the record from the month of June. In the month of June, the private sector created 58,000 jobs; but because of massive cuts in the public sector, there was a loss of 40,000 jobs each month.

In addition to that, this bill will drastically end Medicare. It will reduce Medicaid payments to the States, and it will severely cut back the checks to our Social Security recipients by an average of $1,000 each month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

And will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Well, since you've yielded 30 seconds, which you actually have already taken my last 30 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. I will yield the gentleman additional time if he needs it.

I just am asking my friend where in this bill he can point to where cuts in Medicare are going to take place. I've gone through it and I've not seen it.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. You know perfectly well, Mr. DREIER, that the announced cuts in this bill and the setting up with this commission, and, also, your party has already set your record on a road. Your number one target has been to end Medicare.

But let me go back, and I just wanted to answer your question.

It's very important, Mr. Speaker, that we also understand that the other dangerous part about this bill is that in 6 months we will be right back here again which will add greater instability to the markets and further undermine our credibility ratings.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds simply to say that there are in fact exemptions that are in this bill to ensure that Social Security and Medicare are not touched, and we need to remember that. When it comes to this sequestration process, it is not touched.

And for those who are saying that this measure will in fact bring about those cuts, they have not read the bill and are mischaracterizing it.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I must respond.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I would like to ask my friend from California a question, and then I would yield.

Is the gentleman saying that the text says that if the commission set up by this bill reports back a cut in Social Security benefits that that may not be enacted by the commission?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me say it's the sequestrations in this bill. Obviously, a bipartisan commission that comes forward——

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reclaim my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about the sequestrations. I'm talking about the fact that this commission's instructed to find $1.8 trillion in cuts and Medicare and Social Security are not exempted from those cuts. This is a roadmap, this is a users guide as to how to cut Social Security and Medicare. We reject it.

I yield to my friend.

□ 1600

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me say this is not a commission. Members should not refer to this as a commission, because the idea of a commission, some sort of outside entity, we're talking about our colleagues in the House and Senate who will be members of the Joint Select Committee who have a responsibility, as colleagues, to report this back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 10 more seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman is correct. This is not a commission. It is a committee that is empowered to cut Medicare and Social Security. We will not stand for it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say to my friend this is not a committee that is empowered to cut Social Security and Medicare. It is a committee, a joint select committee, that is empowered, for the first time, to submit to both Houses of Congress recommendations that we will have an up-or-down vote on.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill. This is nothing more than political posturing by the Republican majority. And I think it's important for the American people to understand that this majority has asked us time and time again to vote to end Medicare, to cut Social Security, to cut Medicaid, and they're doing it once again. No question about it. What's being offered up by this majority is nothing short of recklessness, absolutely nothing.

The Speaker and the Republican Party know that the President and the Senate are going to reject the bill. I don't even know why we're here on this floor, Mr. Speaker. Rather than spending the last several months developing a real plan that would avoid default, the Republicans have spent months stripping away health care protections, attacking the EPA, jeopardizing jobs, not creating jobs. And here we are, once again, ready to end Medicare, Social Security, cut away Medicaid benefits, and attack the most vulnerable in our communities.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, if it weren't sad, it would be laughable. The plan would require $2.7 trillion in deficit reduction over the next 10 years, cut $915 billion at the offset, and another $1.8 trillion in December. They're coming after Americans' Social Security checks. They're coming after Medicare. They're coming after Medicaid. That's what this majority is doing. Let's not be fooled by it. It's time for the American people to stand up.

The bill threatens our ability to pay our obligations. They're not interested in paying our obligations. These are debts that we've already incurred. And yet they won't take the money that they've given away to the wealthiest 2 percent of this country. No, they can't give up theirs. The oil and gas companies can't give up theirs. The companies that have offshored jobs can't give up theirs; but they're asking the American people to sacrifice Social Security, Medicare, education, Medicaid.

It's unfair, and we won't stand for it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say to my very good friend from Maryland, she has just adequately, very accurately described the measure that has been proposed by the Senate majority leader, HARRY REID.

With that, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my very good friend from Lafayette, Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a hardworking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I think there was a gross distortion of what's being proposed here. And again, the previous speaker just condemned the Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID's bill in the U.S. Senate. That's the only Democratic bill we've had. So it seems to me that there's a little bit of a fight going on on the other side of the aisle between their House Members and the Senate.

To my friend from New Jersey, this committee that's formed is a committee of active sitting Members of the House and Senate. So in order for anything to be recommended by this committee, it would require, in all likelihood, all of the Democrats to support it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOUSTANY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. If that committee wanted to close tax loopholes, would they need a simple majority or a two-thirds vote of the House?

Mr. BOUSTANY. It would be a simple majority.

Mr. ANDREWS. So it's your position that a simple majority of both Houses could raise taxes?

Mr. BOUSTANY. That's right. That's what we need. We need that to force some movement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time it's my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished assistant leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, while the clock is ticking, the Republican majority is dickering and the American people are hurting. Our financial markets are on pace for their worst week in nearly a year. State governments are bracing for downgrades in their borrowing capacities, and the gap between those in our society who have a lot and those who have very little is growing.

The Republican majority continues their efforts to divert attention from the self-inflicted crisis with manufactured controversies, holding the American economy hostage to their reckless and dispassionate demands. As the clock ticks toward default and the pain it would bring to middle-income families and those who aspire to become middle income, my friends on the other side continue to play politics. Speaker BOEHNER does not even pretend that this is a serious attempt to solve the problem. He sold this bill to his conference by telling them that it wasn't bipartisan. And with divided government, a plan that isn't bipartisan is no plan at all. It's just a game.

The President and the Democrats in Congress as well as the American people have advocated a balanced approach to reduce the deficit by growing the economy and protecting the most vulnerable, including Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security beneficiaries. We have been willing to make tough, politically difficult compromises.

This bill on the floor today, just like the bill from last week, is yet another partisan time-waster. Our constituents are not interested in any of us voting to cut Medicare or cap Social Security or balancing the budget on the backs of Medicaid recipients. A 6-month extension is another waste of time.

We must resolve this matter now and ensure the full faith and credit of the United States. Let's defeat the Boehner bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of my friend how many speakers he has remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am the final speaker.

Mr. DREIER. I would encourage my friend to proceed, and then I will offer some closing remarks.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 3¼ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this bill does nothing to solve our long-term fiscal challenges because everybody here knows that this isn't going anywhere. Instead, it's a political stunt. Instead, it hurdles us closer and

closer to a devastating default. For years, Presidents and Congresses of both parties have raised the debt ceiling, recognizing that endangering the full faith and credit of the United States would be a grave mistake.

It's amazing to me how many Republicans I've heard who dismiss the potential of default as no big deal. No big deal? Tell that to the family who would have to pay higher interest rates on their mortgage, their car loan, their student loan. It would be a very big deal to them.

Many of my friends on the other side of the aisle didn't just stand by as we created these massive deficits. They were active participants. They voted for two huge tax cuts—mostly for wealthy people—that weren't paid for, two wars that weren't paid for, a massive prescription drug program that wasn't paid for, and now their solution is to punish the very Americans who can least afford it, all in the name of keeping their rich friends and their special interests happy.

The Boehner plan is unbalanced and unfair. It slashes programs like Social Security and Medicare that benefit the middle class and the poor. But the Republicans insist on protecting tax breaks for oil and gas companies. Just today, ExxonMobil announced profits of $10.7 billion for the second quarter. Do they really need special tax breaks? The American people sure don't think so.

Poll after poll shows that a vast majority of American citizens prefer a balanced approach. Yes, we need to cut spending. Yes, we need to reform our government. But everybody needs to chip in to do their part, including the very wealthy who have benefited the most.

□ 1610

Now, there are certainly places to save. How about ending wars that aren't paid for? Right now, we borrow $10 billion every month for military operations in Afghanistan alone, to prop up a corrupt and incompetent Karzai government.

How about ending wasteful subsidies to big agriculture companies?

How about asking billionaire hedge fund managers to pay the same tax rates as their secretaries?

The truth is that the best way to deal with our long-term fiscal situation is to grow our economy. That means creating jobs and putting people back to work. The last election, I thought, was about jobs. We haven't talked about jobs at all since the new Republican majority came to power. That means investing in things like education and infrastructure and green technology and medical research. That's the kind of economic future the American people deserve.

The Boehner default plan would take us exactly in the wrong direction, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject it.

[From Bloomberg, July 26, 2011]

REPUBLICAN LEADERS VOTED FOR DEBT DRIVERS THEY BLAME ON OBAMA

(By Lisa Lerer)

House Speaker John Boehner often attacks the spendthrift ways of Washington.

''In Washington, more spending and more debt is business as usual,'' the Republican leader from Ohio said in a televised address yesterday amid debate over the U.S. debt. ''I've got news for Washington—those days are over.''

Yet the speaker, House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell all voted for major drivers of the nation's debt during the past decade: Wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts and Medicare prescription drug benefits. They also voted for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, or TARP, that rescued financial institutions and the auto industry.

Together, according to data compiled by Bloomberg News, these initiatives added $3.4 trillion to the nation's accumulated debt and to its current annual budget deficit of $1.5 trillion.

As Congress nears votes to raise the $14.3-trillion debt ceiling to avert a default on U.S. obligations when borrowing authority expires on Aug. 2, both parties are attempting to claim a mantle of fiscal responsibility. They both bear some of the blame: Many Democrats contributed to the expenses that are forcing lawmakers to boost the nation's debt limit, as have Republican leaders at odds over how much borrowing authority to hand President Barack Obama and when.

''There's plenty of blame to go around,'' for the debt, said Robert Bixby, executive director of the Concord Coalition, an Arlington, Virginia-based group that advocates for balanced budgets. ''If there had been no Barack Obama, we would still be bumping up against the debt limit.''

DEBT HAS DOUBLED

Since 2001, the debt has grown from $5.8 trillion.

Republicans say the long-term growth of entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, along with depressed tax revenues due to the worst recession since the Great Depression, drive the current debt level.

''Blaming Bush for the structural deficits we've known would come since the early 1990s is beyond irresponsible.'' said Brad Dayspring, a spokesman for Cantor.

In his address yesterday, Boehner accused Obama of going on the ''largest spending binge in American history.''

Obama's 2011 annual budget, Republicans note, drove federal spending to a record $3.8 trillion. Non-defense discretionary spending also grew by 24 percent during the first two years of the Obama administration, they say, adding $734 billion in spending over the next 10 years.

RECESSION WORSENED DEFICIT

The recession, Obama said in a televised address from the White House yesterday, lowered revenue and required his administration to ''spend even more'' on tax cuts, unemployment insurance and state and local aide. ''These emergency steps also added to the deficit,'' he said.

Some Democrats also supported the Bush administration programs. In the Senate, Obama voted to finance the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and TARP. He signed legislation extending the Bush-era tax cuts for two years in December.

''Both sides are claiming they're fiscally responsible,'' said Rudolph Penner, director of the Congressional Budget Office under President Ronald Reagan. ''But I don't see much difference in that regard.''

BUSH TAX CUTS

The 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, which lowered tax rates on income, dividends and capital gains, increased the federal budget deficit by $1.7 trillion over a decade, according to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, a non-partisan left-of-center group in Washington that studies fiscal policy.

The two-year extension of those tax cuts that Obama signed will cost $857.8 billion, according to the Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation.

Boehner has defended the tax cuts, arguing that they didn't lead to the deficit.

''The revenue problem we have today is a result of what happened in the economic collapse some 18 months ago,'' he told reporters on June 10, according to The Hill newspaper.

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have cost almost $1.3 trillion since the terrorist attacks on Sept. 11, 2001, according to a March 29 analysis by the Congressional Research Service. Operations in Iraq have cost $806 billion, and in Afghanistan $444 billion. The analysis shows the government has spent an additional $29 billion for enhanced security on militia bases and $6 billion remains unallocated.

MEDICARE DRUG BENEFIT

The 2003 Medicare prescription program approved by President George W. Bush and a Republican-dominated Congress has cost $369 billion over a 10-year time frame, less than initially projected by Medicare actuaries.

Nine Senate Republicans, including Nebraska's Chuck Hagel, along with 25 Republicans in the House, voted against the bill. Hagel argued that it failed to control costs and would add trillions in debt for future generations.

''Republicans used to believe in fiscal responsibility,'' Hagel wrote in a 2003 editorial in the Omaha World Herald. ''We have lost our way.''

TARP, the $700-billion bailout of banks, insurance and auto companies, has cost less than expected. McConnell, Boehner, Cantor and Ryan all voted in October 2008 for the program, which stoked the rise of the Tea Party movement.

Many institutions have repaid the government. The latest estimated lifetime cost of the program is $49.33 billion, according to a June 2011 report by the Treasury Department. That figure includes the $45.61 billion cost of a housing program which the administration never expected to recoup.

Rank-and-file Republicans are eager to pin the blame on Democrats, frequently pointing to the economic stimulus signed by Obama in 2009. The total cost of the stimulus will be $830 billion by 2019, according to a May 2011 Congressional Budget Office report.

That's half the cost of the Bush tax cuts and less than two-thirds of what has been spent on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, as I listen to my friend from the other side of the aisle, Mr. MCGOVERN, talk about what has caused the problem that we're in right now, he failed to mention the failed stimulus bill. He failed to mention the failed health care bill, both horribly expensive.

But I think it's important for us to look at the facts on one of the items that he mentioned. They continue, Mr. Speaker, to engage in this class warfare, us versus them, the multibillionaires, all this sort of stuff over and over and over again.

We happen to recognize that we're all in this together, and there should, in fact, be shared sacrifice. That's why I think it's important for us to look at the facts. Let's look at the facts here.

As we continue to hear people decry the so-called Bush tax cuts, which, as we all know, are no longer Bush tax cuts, they are the Bush-Obama tax cuts. They became that last December when President Obama supported the extension of them.

Let's look at what happened with the 2003 growth-oriented tax cuts. In 2003, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government had $1.782 trillion in revenues. That was in 2003 before the growth-oriented 2003 tax cuts went into effect.

Mr. Speaker, in 2007, the Federal Government had a 44-percent increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury, by virtue of those 2003 tax cuts. They went from $1.782 trillion to $2.567 trillion. That's a $785 billion increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury after the now Bush-Obama tax cuts were put into place. So this malarkey about the notion of those who are successful are not paying their fair share of taxes is absolutely preposterous.

Now, I want to take the time that I have remaining to shatter a few myths that are out there. First of all, we know right now that we're facing a crisis. Both Democrat and Republican alike in these remarks have made it clear that we're facing a crisis. I have yet to hear anyone—I think maybe the minority whip mentioned the Reid plan. All anyone's done on the other side of the aisle is malign the Boehner plan and mischaracterize it quite frankly, Mr. Speaker. But I think it's important to look at what it is that we face.

We know that the President of the United States said that if we don't increase the debt ceiling by August 2, on August 3, he does not know whether or not the Social Security checks will actually go out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we all want to make sure that the Social Security checks go out. This is going to be our one opportunity to vote for a measure that will ensure that we increase the debt ceiling so that those checks will go out and, for the first time in the 75 times that the debt ceiling has been increased since 1962, we're going to get to the root cause of the problem.

In the past 4 years we've had an 82-percent increase, an 82-percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending. And guess what?

The American people last November said that has to come to an end. And you know what? It's going to come to an end when we pass this measure.

I also want to say that we know that the threat of default is out there, and if we don't take action, we know that our credit rating will be downgraded. We know that that will happen. All of the rating agencies have predicted that.

They've also said that simply increasing the debt ceiling is not adequate. We need to make sure that we get ourselves on a path that reduces the debt and reduces our deficits.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what we need to do is we need to recognize also that those agencies have said these proposals are that path. Now, there was a report that S&P had said that in fact if we didn't have $4 trillion in cuts, which I frankly wish we could, but in light of the fact that this is a bipartisan effort, we're not going to get that high, but they said that if we didn't have $4 trillion in reductions, that we would still threaten the credit rating.

Well, yesterday, Deven Sharma, the president of Standard and Poor's, testified before the Financial Services Committee and said while we must get on a path towards reducing the deficit and debt, it was inaccurate to say that it had to be a $4 trillion level. And that's why, as my friends have been quoting these different sources, I was trying to get them on record to say who, in fact, is saying this.

We have to increase the debt ceiling, and we have to get ourselves on a path that will, in fact, reduce our annual deficits and the national debt. The plan that we have before us is far from perfect. Speaker BOEHNER doesn't like it, I don't like it, I don't know of any Republican who likes it. But Speaker BOEHNER and the rest of us recognize that we have a Democratic President and we have a Democratic United States Senate. And so if we are going to increase the debt, and we are going to, for the first time ever, change the course on the issue of debt ceiling increases by cutting spending, we have to pass this measure.

It grew from this bipartisan compromise last weekend. HARRY REID no longer supports it. I've not heard anyone on the other side of the aisle say that they support it, but it was a bipartisan compromise that was the basis on which Mr. BOEHNER is proceeding.

Let's support this measure, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I come today in strong support of the Budget Control Act, a legislative approach that cuts out-of-control Washington spending and is a responsible and necessary plan to avoid a default on our Nation's debt.

As we all know, under President Obama we are experiencing our third straight year of deficits in excess of $1 trillion. In 4 years, President Obama's actions and projected budgets will add more than twice to our debt than was added during the previous 8 years. All told, the debt will double under President Obama's watch and reach a staggering $26 trillion by 2021. That's double the debt in half the time when compared with the previous administration. Congress must act to cut spending and get our debt under control, and that's what the legislation before us does.

First, the bill cuts more than $900 billion in Federal spending and meets the expectations of the American people that we cut spending more than we increase the debt limit.

Second, the bill guarantees the House and Senate will vote on a balanced budget amendment. More than half of the States have a balanced budget requirement, and it's time Washington's books are balanced as well.

And third, the bill also demands reforms to the way Washington works by setting up a joint House and Senate committee to find at least $1.6 trillion in additional savings. Its work product would enjoy expedited consideration in the House and Senate and could not be filibustered.

I'd also like to take a moment to point out that, despite what you've heard from the critics of this approach, that this is the most common way the debt limit is increased, for a short duration and tied to spending reforms. And history is pretty clear on this point.

Over the last 25 years, Congress and the President have acted 31 times to increase the debt limit. Twenty-two of those 31 times were for less than a year. Only 3 of those 31 increases lasted longer than 2 years.

These debt limit increases are often tied to spending reforms and are preceded by very short-term increases. Three examples of those include:

In 1987, there were three short-term debt limit increases prior to a longer term increase that included deficit targets and automatic sequestration provisions.

In 1990, there were six very short-term increases before a longer term increase that included PAYGO, discretionary caps, and other programmatic changes.

And in 1996, there were two very short-term increases to ensure full funding of Social Security and other Federal funds before a longer-term increase included in the Contract with America Advancement Act.

□ 1620

So what we're doing today is what has happened before.

I would also point out that the increase in the debt limit and the binding process to achieve spending reform in Washington is exactly what the financial markets need and expect from us.

Time is short, and this bill may be our last best chance to prevent a default. If we fail to act and the government defaults on its debt, the financial and economic shock waves that will ripple across this country are both unpredictable and unimaginable.

Finally, I want to say a few words about something that's not in this bill, and that's tax increases. While the President continues to insist that tax increases be a part of any debt limit legislation, he has failed to convince even his own party that tax hikes are a

good idea. In December of last year, when Democrats controlled both the House and the Senate, Congress refused to raise taxes. And now even Senator REID's own plan to increase the debt limit, which the President has now thrown his support behind, does not include tax increases.

Given the need to avoid default today and get our fiscal house in order for the future, we must pass the Budget Control Act. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. You know, as I've been listening to this debate, I think it's critical that the House needs some truth in speaking.

This bill is not bipartisan. The vote will soon show that. This bill is not a compromise. It does not seek bipartisan common ground. Indeed, it is orchestrated only to find enough common ground among House Republican partisans.

This bill does not reflect compromise. It would compromise, indeed, Medicare and Social Security. It forces massive cuts, consistent with the ideological Republican budget that was unanimously opposed by Democrats.

This bill does not promote certainty for our Nation's economy. Instead, it brings more uncertainty for families facing major financial decisions, for businesses deciding whether to invest or hire, for markets unsure when the next shoe might drop.

This bill is not balanced. Instead, it embraces the Republicans's one-dimensional mantra just again expressed by the chairman of our committee: no end to unjustified tax loopholes or to tax breaks for the very wealthiest, even as so many middle class families have been losing ground.

In a few words, our Nation's economy and jobs are too much to risk on a bill that is a bridge to nowhere between our two Houses.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1½ minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, we must act now to enact critical spending reforms. While the White House has refused to offer a plan, the Budget Control Act would accomplish this goal.

Will it solve all of our economic problems? No. But instead of discussing how much more Washington will spend, we're now talking about reducing our spending and how to live within our means, just like all Americans must do. For example, the Budget Control Act would cut nearly $1 trillion in spending over the next 10 years, establish firm spending caps, and require the Senate to vote on a balanced budget amendment.

I urge the Senate and President Obama to stop playing politics and support this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another member of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding the time.

This argument today is not about new spending. The argument today is about paying our bills. This is the credit card that has come due for the irresponsibility that we witnessed in this Chamber and across this Congress for 8 years of the Bush administration: two wars and $2.3 trillion worth of tax cuts, a prescription D Medicare drug bill that came due.

Lawrence Lindsey, the President's chief economic advisor at the time, said it was going to cost $300 billion in Iraq. They fired him. Dick Cheney said $60 billion in Iraq and in and out in 6 to 8 months. Ten years later, we're in Iraq.

We have created 2.2 million new veterans. They are going to need our care for years to come in our health centers for the VA. It's going to be expensive. Paul Wolfowitz: In and out of Iraq in 2 months, a few billion dollars. The bill, our friends, has come due.

We cannot send a message to markets anywhere that the full faith and credit of the United States of America is at risk. In the aftermath of World War II, when finances were strained as never before, President Truman had the vision not only to pay off the debt of World War II, but to embrace the Marshall Plan, one of the greatest achievements in American history.

Think of what Mr. Lincoln, who served in this Chamber, by the way, think of what Mr. Lincoln might have said in the midst of the Civil War, America's worst moment, that America would forfeit its expenditures as the bill has come due.

Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Hamilton met in New York with one of the most fateful decisions in American history, to accept the debt of the States, which moved us away from the Articles of Confederation to a constitutional system. And now, at this moment, a political party in our history that always embraced fiscal responsibility, the bill has come due, and it's our obligation to pay it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Chairman CAMP, the bill, ladies and gentlemen, has come due.

Because Congress holds the purse strings, we just ran the numbers. Since World War II, Democrats in Congress have run up 90 percent of the debt that's held by the public. Ninety percent of the debt that we owe to foreign countries, to other corporations, to you and me have been run up by one side of the aisle. Wouldn't it be great if Democrats joined us in paying the bills that they ran up? But they won't.

Today, Republicans will take responsibility for their mess. We're going to make sure this country pays its bills, but we're going to make sure we start cutting up the credit cards, we change the financial behavior of this country, and that we actually give our kids and grandkids a future that they can count on, that they can afford, a country that's much stronger than the one we're facing today if we don't address this debt problem.

As a conservative, you can't cut soon enough or deep enough for me, but the Budget Control Act starts us on the right step. It cuts $2.7 trillion in two steps. We cut more than we allow to be borrowed, we make sure there are no tax increases on our children, on our small businesses, on your families. We make sure there is finally a real straight up-and-down vote on a constitutional amendment to finally balance Washington's budget. We get more than half of the spending cuts in the Republican budget proposed by our Budget Chairman PAUL RYAN. More than half of those cuts are put in place because of this bill.

It doesn't solve the problems of America, but I'll tell you what: If you vote this bill down, all we've done is write a blank check to the President; we've given everyone a free ride in Washington until next election, and they will not be held accountable, no one in Congress, for getting our financial house in order.

This bill is the first step. It's the right step. It's where we need to move forward.

□ 1630

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my neighbors in Texas are saying work together to resolve this crisis without jeopardizing Medicare and Social Security. Adopt a balanced approach that balances the budget by closing some tax loopholes at the same time we cut spending.

But agreeing has not been possible so far when so many of our House colleagues pride themselves on being disagreeable. Instead of protecting the full faith and credit of these United States in the same manner as our Republican colleagues voted to do seven times for President George W. Bush, today's bill really represents little more than a ransom note from those who are using this critical issue to hold our country hostage.

As their price for ensuring our national creditworthiness, they demand that we jeopardize the security for the very young with educational opportunities, and for the old with Social Security and Medicare. Their ransom demands do not share the sacrifice, but they sure do spread the pain—to the young, to the old, to those who are trying to climb up the economic ladder or just not slide backwards.

They talk about tightening the belt. The only belt they're really tightening is right around the neck of the hostages that they've taken.

I believe now is the time to stand firm for those families and to affirm that America will always pay our bills by rejecting this bill and then moving forward with more reasonable legislation.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about the past and how we got here. The American people get it. We have debt, serious debt, a threat to our national security and a threat to our economic prosperity; and a default, putting the full faith and credit of the United States on the line, would make that worse.

This House has passed Cut, Cap, and Balance. We stood up to our responsibility and passed a bill. Now we have a second bill because it didn't get through the Senate. We have a second bill brought forward consistent with our principles. We're going to cut more than we're going to borrow. We're going to cap spending with real statutory caps, and we're going to ensure that there will be a vote on a balanced budget amendment in both Houses. That's what the American people want. They're demanding it. This is a solid first step to getting debt under control. We need to move forward now.

Let me be clear: this House must act now. The time is running out. The Senate must act on this bill, and the President must sign it. Let's uphold our responsibilities. We have a responsibility to the American people. Let's uphold our responsibility and do what's right for the country.

Mr. LEVIN. Could I inquire of our time, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this proposal that is brought to us today can be characterized by three words: reckless, hypocritical, and abusive.

It's reckless because for the first time in history we're having people play an elaborate game of fiscal chicken, threatening the full faith and credit of the United States for their own ideological agenda; 102 times we have increased the debt limit since 1917, seven times for George Bush, even though he was fighting unfunded wars and proposing massive tax cuts. People are already paying the price right now as we are starting to see the stock market slide, premiums are increased for ensuring our debt, and there is doubt about where we are going forward.

It is hypocritical because the Republicans have refused to actually back up some of their fanciful rhetoric in their Cut, Cap, and Balance amendment that would require massive cuts to budgets.

Earlier this week, one of our friends from the Republican Study Committee had the temerity to offer an amendment to the bill that is being debated this week on appropriations for Interior and EPA that would have been 11 percent. And what did the Republicans do when faced with a bill that would actually make them impose the cuts that they envision? They ran away from it; 104 of them voted with responsible Democrats saying we're not going to go that way. They don't want to go that way. They're not stepping up and actually doing the cutting. They want to do it far in the future.

Last, it's abusive. We have a divided government. The American public wants a balanced solution. They welcome tax reform and modest closing of loopholes to be able to avoid massive cuts in the future and to be able to get on a path to fiscal responsibility. But the Republican minority has decided, no, it is our way or the highway even if it means threatening our fiscal future.

Reject this sham.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, we need to cut spending today and reduce the deficit and avoid the dangerous prospects of putting America for the first time in default.

The bill before us today will accomplish that without raising taxes on the American people. With unemployment being what it is today, in terms of looking at small businesses, it also will not raise taxes on small businesses who are the job providers. I support the Budget Control Act because the time is now for Congress and the President to do what is in the best interest of the American people.

Our economy is struggling. Our current national debt is over $14 trillion, and we're adding $4.5 billion a day to our deficit and debt. Let me break that down. That is $188 million per hour to our deficits and debt, $4.5 billion a day.

This reckless pattern of borrowing and spending has put our country on the road to bankruptcy. Washington needs to show the American people that we can deal with these challenges today and in the future. I urge my colleagues to support the Budget Control Act.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest amount of respect for the chairman of our committee, the Ways and Means Committee. But I think you're wrong on what you're trying to do today.

Do you remember May 31 of this year, Mr. Chairman? We took a vote May 31. In fact, we took a vote on raising the debt limit. The vote was based upon a resolution introduced in this House by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; and he said when he introduced the piece of legislation on this floor that he hoped it would fail. He said we're not going to get enough votes to get this done. And so he set out to undermine his own resolution.

Now JFK said: I do not shrink from this responsibility; I welcome it.

I welcome my responsibility today and what I have to do. I'm going to have a pleasure to vote ''no'' because I know what has happened since May 31, a day of infamy. So we'll make it known that the bill couldn't pass so the American people understand that. The American people don't want us to tell them what they need or what they want. They should tell us what they need and what they want. We think we know, and most of the time we don't know on either side of the aisle.

They're choosing to extend the state of political and economic turmoil another 6 months in this bill. We want to go through the holidays doing this back and forth? Won't that be sweet. We'll make people think we're working.

It has been over 200 days and still not one piece of job legislation from the majority on this floor. Decades of the majority's policies exploded the deficit. You know what the cause of it is. The cost of just the Bush tax cuts will be 40 percent of the Federal debt by 2019. And when you add in the two wars, it'll be 47 percent. Who are we kidding here? The Republican budget bill this year added $6 trillion to the national debt.

I rest my case. Live up to your responsibilities. That's what the American people want us to do.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill. As a proud member of the freshman class that came to Washington, D.C., in November 2010, I can tell you the culture of this city is changing.

□ 1640

I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle put forth the argument that because we've raised the debt ceiling 102 times and seven times under President Bush that somehow it makes it right for us to raise the debt ceiling without dealing with the problem that's causing it to exist in the first place, and that is the uncontrolled spending that has gotten us to this point of $14.4 trillion of national debt.

As a member of the freshmen class, we have changed the culture of this place because now the debate is happening on the floor of this House, and we're going to take it to the Senate so that they take it to the floor of the Senate and for once openly and honestly debate the issues of the day. Yet they still in the Senate have not heard

that call, but through this process, they will.

We wanted more, but we realize that this is just a step in the process. The battle will go on. We will act responsibly today by passing this out of the House and cure the risk that comes from the risk of default.

But don't make any mistake about it: The battle will go on, and this is just the beginning.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from the great State of California, XAVIER BECERRA.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are way ahead of the politicians. They have been telling us over and over again: We want a balanced approach to reducing our deficits.

One in five Americans has said very clearly: We support the Republicans' slash-and-burn default plan that we see before us that only cuts services to Americans to try to help us balance our budget. But nearly three times as many Americans have been saying over and over again: We want to see a balanced approach between those cuts to very important services, a little bit of pain, but also tax increases on all those folks who have been taking advantage of those tax loopholes and making a ton of money.

The American people don't think it's a good idea to cut Medicare and Social Security and to cut Medicaid to protect tax loopholes for special interests. They've been saying that over and over.

But here's the biggest clue that our Republican colleagues aren't listening to: The American people have said over and over that the biggest deficit our country faces today is a jobs deficit. After 204 days as the majority, Republicans have only given us slash-and-burn politics that have created not one single job for hardworking middle class families. In fact, instead of creating jobs, their major pieces of legislation could potentially cost 2 million more Americans to lose their jobs.

The worst thing about this whole charade is that every single person here in this room today knows that this bill that we're discussing today won't go anywhere. We face the very real possibility of an historic default in under a week, and here we are spinning our wheels.

We all agree that our Nation must not default on its past obligations. The Republican Members here must abandon their ''my way or the highway'' approach and work across the aisle on a balanced, bipartisan agreement to reduce our deficit, create jobs, and protect our seniors and our middle class.

I say to my Republican friends: America is not short on work ethic; we're short on jobs. It's time for us to get to the business of America and create those jobs.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), who is a member of our committee and the chair of our caucus.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, the whole world is watching in on the United States Congress.

It is a sad day for the United States Congress. We in America, the preeminent military, economic, and cultural leaders in the world, are governing like we're a Third World country. It is a sad time for this body that we cannot come together. Sad is the American public who looks in at this and recognizes that it's theater, except that it's become the theater of the absurd.

In a frail recovery where Americans are already overburdened, what we have in front of us is a manufactured ideological crisis. Eighteen times the debt ceiling was raised for Ronald Reagan, eight times for George Bush, because they would never stand in this body to see a default on the full faith and credit of the United States. As the world looks in and we default on a global economy and we march towards defaulting on a national economy, the most ruinous thing is that we are defaulting on household economies.

What this body should be focusing on is dealing with this deficit and focusing, as Mr. BECERRA said, on the real default that's taking place in Congress: the lack of job creation, the need to put people back to work so that we can restore the dignity that only comes when people are able to sit across their dining table and look at one another and know that they have the dignity that comes from a job.

We need not go through this ideological hostage situation. Why are we holding the American people hostage? Let's put America back to work. We're a better Nation. We're a better body than that.

Mr. CAMP. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL. As a freshman Member of this distinguished body, I am completely disappointed in our failure to work together.

Our constituents sent us here to solve America's problems, not create more problems for them. The constituents of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama sent me here to make sure that I better their lives, not create fear and instability.

The entire world is watching us, and what are we showing them? We're showing them that we're completely detached from reality. We're showing them that we don't care about what their families, local governments, States, and businesses are facing.

America's debts are serious. We all know that. We have to put our fiscal house in order. No one is disputing that. It's how we go about it. No matter how we got here, we have bills to pay and we must pay our bills. That's what we, as Americans, do. We pay our bills.

The Republican bill that's before us does not do that. What it does is it holds hostage America's promise, the promise that we made to students and to seniors for Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid. It's unfair.

I ask my colleagues in this House to vote against the bill on the floor.

Mr. CAMP. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. In a few words, what is endeavored here is an abdication of responsibility.

This bill is going nowhere. It tries to bind the wounds of a divided Republican caucus. We should do better. We'll have to do better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have been listening to my friends on the other side over the course of this afternoon, and I would just say to them: Where is your plan? Where is your legislation to address the debt problems of the United States? Where are your ideas in legislation that is scored by the Congressional Budget Office so that you could bring your alternative to the floor? This isn't the direction that you want to go; where is your plan?

I notice in the other body, the majority has not passed a budget in more than 800 days. Frankly, if they passed a budget on the other side, we might not be in this situation because we would have the avenue of reconciliation potentially available to us. This is the second Congress the other body hasn't passed a budget. We've got no ideas from my friends on the other side on how to address this issue.

So this is the second proposal that we have put forward that has been in legislative form, that has been scored, where you can address the problems that are facing this country.

□ 1650

We've had lots of rhetoric from the other side, but no concrete plans. We've had lots of press releases from the other side, but no proposals. Even the President has not articulated one spending cut after giving us 3 years of trillion-dollar deficits, after putting us on a path to more than double the debt of this country in less than half the time of the previous administration.

So I would say this is the proposal that will get our country onto a fiscal path that will prevent default, that will address the long-term debt obligations that this Nation has run up, frankly, under both parties. But we need to address them now because the

trajectory has become so much worse in recent years. This is the plan.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be yielded to the Budget Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan's remaining 2 minutes will be yielded to the chairman of the Budget Committee.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. LANKFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to speak in support of this bill.

I came on as a freshman, and in January of this year we were already talking about this moment. For months, the conversation has been: How do we reach a point of agreement? There have been lots of different ideas floated around. Very few of those have been put down in writing. But the ideas that have been floated around seem to circle around a central theme: How can we find a middle ground to be able to resolve this issue? I propose this bill is that middle ground.

The debt reduction that's in it was a framework that was formed in the Biden talks. The Select Committee that's in it is something very important to the Senate, that HARRY REID raised that idea. The proposal to have a balanced budget amendment is very important to Republicans to say, Let's have a moment to be able to discuss that. And the statutory caps that are coming are very important to Republicans.

This is a bill that has been discussed in its essence and in its core in a bipartisan fashion. And while we search for a compromise, I would suggest we have found it. And we are about to vote on it. This is a moment to be able to look at it and say it is not the draconian monster that it has been described as. It allows a simple way to be able to handle one of the most difficult issues that we have dealt with in a very long time.

Ultimately, we bump up against an issue that is significant because of this one key truth: Why has this not been a problem before? Why haven't we passed it? Why haven't we just added to the debt ceiling year after year after year? We've done that. But now we have reached $14.3 trillion. We've now reached 100 percent of GDP. We have to start dealing seriously with how do we start paying down our debt. And not just paying our interest payments, but how do we start paying down our debt. At this moment in time it becomes a key moment to say, Let's resolve the problem, let's start dealing with difficult issues and work on these together, both parties both Houses, to be able to settle the issues. But let's do it in a way that forms long-term solutions.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It's high time that we stopped playing Russian roulette with the American economy and American jobs. And yet that is exactly what this measure does, for the following reason. It says, Okay, America, we're going to pay America's bills, but only for 5 more months—and only if we put in motion a plan that will end the Medicare guarantee and slash education. The proposal before us today will put the American economy and American jobs at even greater jeopardy over the next 5 months than they are today. It deliberately, by choice, keeps the economy under a cloud of instability and uncertainty. It chooses to risk higher interest rates and shrinking retirement funds that hit on every American family.

So why would we choose to intentionally keep this cloud hanging over the country and the American people? We're told that we have to do it in order to force this Congress to reduce the deficit. That's what we're told. But the actions tell a very different story. The actions suggest this is not about reducing the deficit. It's about reducing the deficit in a particular way—the way the Republican plan wants to reduce the deficit. That's why our Republican colleagues walked out of talks three times. That's why they've rejected the balanced approach and framework put forward by the President that says, Let's do $4 trillion in deficit reduction, and we'll do $3 trillion in spending cuts and $1 trillion in revenue. Three dollars of spending cuts to every dollar in revenue from cutting special interest tax breaks and asking the folks at the very top to go back to the rates they were paying during the Clinton administration.

Our Republican colleagues rejected that approach to reducing the deficit because they don't want to end these tax breaks for the purpose of reducing the deficit. In fact, we passed a piece of legislation just a week ago that says we're going to keep America from paying our bills unless we enact a constitutional amendment that makes it easier to cut Medicare and Social Security than it does to cut special interest subsidies. It would say a majority vote, let's just cut Medicare and education, but you need two-thirds, a supermajority, if you want to cut corporate tax breaks for the purpose of reducing the deficit.

So that's what it's all about. This particular issue on the debt ceiling is a manufactured crisis. We've all heard when President Reagan was President, he raised it 17 times. So this is a manufactured crisis in order to try and force and squeeze through a particular deficit reduction plan—a deficit reduction plan that would end the Medicare guarantee, cut education, and yet protect those special interest tax breaks and breaks for the very top.

If we want to be serious about the deficit, we need to do a balanced approach, but let's not hold the entire American economy hostage. Let's not put us on 5-month to 5-month interest rate and creditworthiness watches in order to jam through a particular idea on deficit reduction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I enjoyed listening to the talking points from my friend. I just don't think they apply to this bill.

Russian roulette. This is the second piece of legislation we've brought to the floor to responsibly raise the debt limit while cutting spending. Manufactured crisis. Who went on television to scare senior citizens that their Social Security checks might be in doubt? The President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the cuts in this bill were agreed to in a bipartisan group. The level of cuts in this bill that go into effect immediately are $2 billion off the Senate majority leader's cuts in his bill. These were agreed to on a bipartisan basis. We're cutting spending not as much as we want, but at least we're cutting spending. Russian roulette is raising the debt limit without getting borrowing under control. A manufactured crisis is trying to scare seniors and the country into giving this government another blank check to keep spending money we don't have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. GUINTA.

Mr. GUINTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the bill before us, the Budget Control Act of 2011. Mr. Speaker, this is about leadership. This is about an ability and a willingness of this body to do something right, not for partisan purposes, but for spending reductions and for the country. I hear from the other side that they are concerned about this component or that component. But what I don't see is a plan and a solution. We have not put one, but two different proposals. The one that I cosponsored, Cut, Cap, and Balance, I think is the best and most appropriate way to move forward. But the Senate has decided that they don't want to take up that piece of legislation. So we're here to compromise. We're here to work with the other side of the aisle to get something accomplished on behalf of real structural change in how we spend taxpayer dollars—other people's money.

□ 1700

I took an oath to make sure I uphold the Constitution. I will also make sure that I represent New Hampshire in the manner in which they would like me to represent them. I contend that they would like us to reduce expenditures, to reduce our debt, to reduce our deficit. This bill does that. They also want to see us cap spending. We all have to

live within the means we have. We take in $2.2 trillion a year, and we're spending about $3.7 trillion. Nobody in America has that type of balance sheet.

The time to act is now. No more partisan politics. No more baseless charges from Members of this body. Let's do the right thing. Let's make sure that we can send a message to the country that we can work in a bipartisan fashion to do what everybody in the country understands we need to do, which is to spend no more than we take in. That is the goal. That is the objective.

In exchange for that, we allow this President to raise the debt ceiling, to pay for the 41 cents of every dollar that we continue to borrow. That policy has to stop. Those days are over.

I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues here in the House and the Senate to do the same.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We keep hearing from our colleagues that there wasn't a proposal put forward by the President. The framework is pretty clear, and we can sort of solve this particular piece of it today, if possible. He said he will do $3 in spending cuts for $1 of revenue for deficit reduction. If someone wants to take us up on that offer while we're talking about it on the floor, that would be just terrific.

Because our Republican colleagues walked out of that discussion, Senator REID did put on the table a proposal that has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office. I have their score in my hand, dated July 27, 2011. It would reduce the deficit by $2.2 trillion, more than the $917 billion score in the Republican proposal. This is a nonpartisan, independent CBO score. The difference is he would raise the debt ceiling for 2 years so we don't keep the economy under a cloud, so we don't keep the threat of higher interest rates going into effect, which would be a hit on every American family.

Why we would choose to deliberately keep the economy under a cloud and put jobs at risk is a mystery. The only answer is our Republican colleagues want to use that as a forcing mechanism to ultimately put in place their budget plan, which does end the Medicare guarantee, which does slash education and does protect corporate tax loopholes.

With that, I yield 1 minute to a terrific member of the Budget Committee, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. We are faced with an important moment for our Nation: a moment of enormous economic uncertainty, a moment to significantly reduce our deficit and make the right choices for our future.

The Boehner bill does neither. As a result, it has little support from either side of the aisle because it does not seriously reduce the deficit. It will ensure uncertainty in the markets for many, many months ahead, and it cuts $1 trillion over 10 years.

Speaker BOEHNER had the opportunity, in working with the President, to reduce the deficit, not by $1 trillion but by $4 trillion, and he walked away from that plan. The Gang of Six made a bipartisan effort to reduce the deficit by $3 trillion, and he rejected that plan as well. This moment is about choices. Speaker BOEHNER made a choice to walk away from the plans that offered trillions of dollars in deficit reduction, and he substituted, instead, a political document with significantly less deficit reduction.

This is not a serious proposal, and we have little time to avoid default. Let's stop wasting time. Members from both sides of the aisle should reject this bill because it is an inadequate response to both deficit reduction and because of the harm it will do to our Nation's economy.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Every now and then, Mr. Speaker, you need to just step back and look at the record and put the rhetoric aside.

When this majority showed up in January of this last year, we found a situation where our friends on the other side had failed to write a budget for this year, had failed to pass any appropriations bills and had just sort of gone home.

We had a President who had appointed a debt reduction commission but yet failed to embrace any of their actions at all—not one. Then we heard the President come and address us in this Chamber in a state of the Union message, but for 35 minutes, he didn't bother to mention the looming debt crisis—35 minutes.

The first serious proposal we got from that President, our President, was for a $400 billion reduction over 10 years that was so laughable that, when it was brought up in the United States Senate, which is controlled by his party, it failed 97–0.

Then the President wanted to have a free vote on raising the debt ceiling. Let's just raise it. Go ahead and see what happens. We obviously don't support that as we think there ought to be some spending reductions, but we said, sure, you've got the vote. Fewer than 100 of my friends on the other side supported their own President when he asked for that vote. They clearly weren't sufficiently motivated to do that.

Now we've reached a point where, last week, we actually did raise the debt ceiling by $2.7 trillion. We did institute cuts that, frankly, are going to happen anyway—they coincide with my friend Mr. RYAN's budget—and we put caps on long-term spending. We said just give the American people a chance—just a chance—to vote on a balanced budget amendment. We're not asking that it pass, but don't you think they ought to have the right through their State legislatures to make that decision? We were denied that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE. Now we're at a point where we are about to, once again, raise the debt ceiling and to do it in a responsible way, in a way that I predict, frankly, will probably become the pattern in the future. This body should never raise the debt ceiling again automatically. We've certainly done it on our side, and our friends on the other side have done it. We should always couple it with spending restraint and reform, and that's exactly what we're doing in this measure.

This majority has enacted a budget. My friend has taken a lot of arrows for that budget, but I'm proud to be associated with him. This majority will have twice raised the debt ceiling and coupled it with historic spending cuts.

As for the President's plan that we hear about, I'd just like to see it, just once. I haven't seen anything or heard anything like this since Richard Nixon had a secret plan to end the war. The President must have a secret plan, because it's not on paper; it has not been scored, and it has not been publicly presented to anybody.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE. If the majority leader's plan scores at $2.2 trillion—and I take my friend's word on that—I guess we really have a $4 trillion deficit, because we have $3 trillion, and we don't even count the extra $1 trillion, which is automatic because the wars are ending. So I think we ought to up ours. We have a $4 trillion plan. We ought to give the majority leader the credit for finding that additional $1 trillion.

If you'll just vote for this, you'll have your magic $4 trillion plan done—our 3, Senator REID's 1. That adds up to what the President wanted. So let's pass this, give the Senate an opportunity to pass it, and give the President of the United States an opportunity to sign it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As I was listening to my friend, I really don't think the American people want us to be doing this every 5 months so that it becomes business as usual that we put the country through this crisis situation and with the threat of rising interest rates and all the other negative economic consequences that would happen.

Because the grand bargain is now off the table, Senator REID has put forward a proposal. Again, I have the CBO scoring of it right here: $2.2 trillion, with more cuts than in the proposal that's on the table here from our Republican colleagues, the big difference being he doesn't want to say every 5 months ''let's put the country into economic crisis'' and deal with all the uncertainty between now and 5 months from now that that will create.

With that, I yield 1 minute to a terrific member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the issues we want on the table here is revenue. The top 400 wealthiest people in the United States of America pay a 17 percent tax rate. My constituents in Youngstown and Akron, Ohio, pay a heck of a lot more than 17 percent.

□ 1710

We hear our friends on the other side say how all of these changes need to occur, how all of these problems need to be solved. But heaven forbid, Mr. Speaker, we ask the 400 wealthiest families in the United States of America to maybe be a little bit patriotic and help us out. And you'll say, Well, these are the job creators. These taxes aren't going into place for another year or two. We've got to get through this downturn.

But we need to send the message to the bond market that we are serious. And for us to be this irresponsible and not ask the wealthiest—what are they being asked to sacrifice here? The top 1 percent, what are we asking them to sacrifice?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One final point.

The debt that we now are debating was run up by our friends on the other side—two wars, the Bush tax cuts, and a prescription drug plan all on the credit card. And now the same people who've worked their way up in the leadership positions are saying, We're not going to pay the bill. This is irresponsible.

Let's solve this in a balanced way, and let's ask for some shared sacrifice.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The gentleman, my friend over from Maryland, keeps talking about the Reid plan, the Senate majority leader over in the Senate. His plan. I've got the CBO score, too. It says it's a $2.7 trillion increase. That means it doesn't raise the debt limit less than we cut spending, so it cuts less. But more importantly, $1.3 trillion of that money is accounting tricks and budget gimmicks.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of all of the accounting tricks and the budget gimmicks that go on in Washington. Let me explain what $1.3 trillion of this does. It says that imagine that we're at war for 10 years in Afghanistan and Iraq at surge levels. We assume we're going to be fighting this war for 10 more years with over 100,000 troops in Afghanistan and, oh gosh, wait. We're going to withdraw our troops in 2014. Trillion dollars in savings.

I've got a better idea. Let's pass a bill to cover the Moon with yogurt that will cost $5 trillion today. And then let's pass a bill the next day to cancel that bill. We could save $5 trillion. Wait. I got a better idea. Our debt is $14 trillion. Let's come up with a new plan to spend $14 trillion, then rescind it the next day and let's save $14 trillion.

This stuff is fiscal fantasy. You can't make this stuff up, Mr. Speaker. Suggesting that we're going to be in a war at these levels for 10 more years when everybody knows we've already decided not to do that, that does not get us $1.3 trillion in spending cuts. Only in Washington can you add up math like that. We need real spending cuts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional minute to say this is getting serious, Mr. Speaker, very serious. We can't keep spending money we just don't have. Now 42 cents of every dollar coming out of this place is borrowed money. It doesn't just threaten our children and grandchildren any more. It is hurting our economy today.

Half of that money is coming from other countries like China. Why on Earth do we want to give the President a blank check to keep doing that, giving our sovereignty and our self-determination to other countries to lend us money to fund our government. Those days have got to end.

This bill doesn't cut as much as we want. We passed a budget cut $6.2 trillion in real spending cuts. This cuts about a trillion.

Let's cut this trillion, bank that money, and then go cut some more. That's what we're trying to do to be responsible.

The problem in this town is not that we don't tax Americans enough. The problem is we're spending way too much money.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, of course we should be reducing the deficit. Of course we should make sure that we don't rely on the Chinese as our bankers any more, which is why it's so ironic that our Republican colleagues refuse to cut subsidies for oil companies by one penny for the purpose of reducing the deficit so we don't have to rely on borrowing from China anymore.

In fact, if you look at Exxon's quarterly profits today, they're through the roof. Now, I'm all for having Exxon make money. But why should they have taxpayer money on top of it? And yet our Republican colleagues get up here and they talk about how we're dependent on China. But they don't want to break that dependency if it means actually asking the top oil companies to get rid of their subsidies for the purpose of deficit reduction. So let's get serious.

Now, with respect to the plan that has been put forward by Senator REID. I listened to my colleague. I would point out to the body that if you look at the Republican budget and the documents that accompanied it when they pointed out what their savings were relative to the CBO baseline, they also show a trillion dollars in savings from the global war on terror. As my friend the chairman knows, that is a function of the way the Congressional Budget Office scores.

But it is also a fact that when the Republican budget was presented, they presented it both relative to the President's baseline and the congressional budget baseline. I would further make the point that even if you took that off the table, the proposal by Senator REID cuts immediately more on spending than the Republican proposal before us today, the difference being he doesn't keep the economy hanging under a cloud for 5 months and make this country go through this exercise just by the end of December.

With that, I would yield 1 minute to the distinguished Member of Congress from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Soon my colleagues will be quoting Dr. King's ''I Have a Dream'' speech, and here's a quote they will not read and they will ignore: ''In a sense, we've come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the 'unalienable rights' of 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

''It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note in so far as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the people a bad check, a check which has come back marked 'insufficient funds.' ''

But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. The problem, Mr. Chairman, is not that we spend. It's that we don't honor our obligations. We are a Nation that spends billions of dollars to put a man on the Moon, fund the war in Afghanistan, fund the war in Iraq, but we can't find the money in this Congress to put a man on his own two feet right here in America.

And there is something more fundamental, Mr. Speaker, that is going on here. This President is being treated differently than other Presidents. No other President has been ''stook up,'' shook down, or held hostage as this President of the United States over this debt vote. This is fundamentally unfair, Mr. Speaker, to change the rules in the middle of the game.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would respectfully ask that Members heed the gavel and only consume the amount of time yielded to them by the floor managers.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of

the House Republican Conference, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has a debt crisis not because we are undertaxed but because Washington spends too much. And here we are days before the President's August 2 deadline, and the President of the United States has yet to submit a plan to deal with the debt crisis. Here we are days away from the President's August 2 deadline, and the United States Senate has yet to pass a single plan.

Days before the President's August 2 deadline, not only have House Republicans passed their first plan, in a manner of hours we will vote yet again on another plan to deal with the debt crisis that we must remember is spending driven. It's the President's spending that brought us here.

Now, the bill that we're bringing to the House floor, Mr. Speaker, is not the ultimate solution. But, Mr. Speaker, it ensures that this Nation pays its current bills, like families, like small businesses have to. It gives us the opportunity to actually cut spending.

□ 1720

The amounts are not what they should be, but for the second year in a row, we will have the opportunity to actually reduce spending to save our country and save our children's futures. But most importantly, within this legislation is the opportunity that brings us the ultimate solution, and that, Mr. Speaker, is a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. Every family, every small business, almost every State has a provision that says, we have to balance our budget. Should we expect less of a great Nation? Maybe that's why we have the $14 trillion debt. We must act today, approve this bill, balance the budget for our Nation and future generations.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes at this time, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation before us today is a down payment. Does this cut the amount of spending we need to save the country from a debt crisis? No. Our budget does do that. This is two-thirds of the spending cuts we called for in this category of spending, discretionary spending. Is it 100 percent of the cuts we asked for? No, it's two-thirds of the cuts we asked for.

What does the President's budget do? It actually spends $130 billion more. I will take two-thirds of the step in the right direction instead of going in the wrong direction, the President's plan.

The Congressional Budget Office, we asked them to take a look at the President's framework. The CBO director told me under oath that they can't score speeches. This plan rejects the President's fiscal demands for tax increases, and it rejects his political demands for a blank check to get him through the election.

What we are doing here today is getting serious about getting spending under control. The spending cuts that are in this bill were already agreed to by bipartisan talks. Why are people hiding from that? This is the second bill we will have passed to avoid a default. That's responsible. It has been 820 days since the Senate even tried passing a budget.

The President, as we know, has yet to offer a plan to fix this problem. We passed a budget to fix this problem. We passed a plan to deal with the debt limit. And now we are passing another plan, based upon mutually agreed to spending cuts that get two-thirds of the cuts we already called for in this category of government. That's reasonable. That's responsible. And that is what we should be doing. Instead, we hear all this empty rhetoric and all this call for a blank check and all these accounting gimmicks and budget gimmicks from the other side who are trying to do everything they can to do anything but cut spending.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, just to be very clear, the Democratic Senate leader Mr. REID has put on the table a plan that would cut more immediately than the Republican plan before us today, even if you don't include the overseas contingency account funding. The difference is, he would not put our economy in jeopardy again just 5 months from now, as the Republican plan did.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we're talking about being serious. And here we're considering a $2 trillion bill, $200 billion a year, slapped together behind closed doors and sprung on the House less than 24 hours after it was printed, an up-or-down vote, no amendments, and is legislation that 53 Senators already say they are going to oppose.

We have a situation where last December, we passed $400 billion a year in tax cuts, and now everybody says we need $400 billion a year in deficit reduction. This bill does not cut anything. It has caps, promises for cuts in the future. And we don't know what those cuts are going to be. But we know in the continuing resolution, food inspection was cut, FBI agents, air traffic controllers, flu shots, clean water grants, schools, scientific research, community health centers, transportation—we can expect all of those to be cut in the future, all to preserve tax cuts, many for millionaires and oil companies. That's not right. Let's go through the regular process so we know what we're doing.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, you know what we've seen play out here is, a few years back, we provided the tax breaks that went disproportionately to the very wealthy in this country. Now all of a sudden—oh, well, we can't pay our bills anymore, a good part of that reason being the tax cuts. But how are we going to deal with those bills? We're going to sock it to middle class America, whether it's through cuts in education or cuts to Medicare, and all because we don't want to cut subsidies for the oil companies.

Again, as I said, just today, Exxon reported huge profits. God bless them for making all that money. But why do they need any of ours, our taxpayer money? And that is the rub of the issue. It's not whether we reduce the deficit; it's how.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. May I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 1 minute, and the gentleman from Maryland has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself 45 seconds just to say that we, as a body, need to do two things: Number one, we need to make sure the United States pays its bills. We need to make sure it pays its bills, and we shouldn't do it in a way that puts the American economy in jeopardy every 5 months. Just listen to the folks, the experts who have been monitoring this. They have said that if you do this on a 5-month period, you will risk interest rates going up. Second, we need to reduce the deficit. Of course we do. Let's do it in a balanced way. The President has proposed $3 in spending cuts to $1 in revenue, but we can't get our colleagues on the Republican side to get one penny—not one penny—of revenue from closing a corporate tax loophole if the purpose is deficit reduction. And there is the rub.

So let's reject this wrong approach. Senator REID has a proposal on the table. It cuts more than the one that the Republicans have, but it doesn't put the economy in jeopardy every 5 months.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the last minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI), the terrific Democratic leader in the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend him for his tremendous leadership. We couldn't be prouder of the way he has represented the values of the American people, both as the ranking member of the Budget Committee and also at the table in the bipartisan talks with Mr. CLYBURN under the leadership of Vice President BIDEN. It's too bad that the progress that was made in those meetings, to have a balanced, bipartisan initiative to bring to the floor, to give confidence to the markets, and to give confidence to the American people, did not succeed because the Republicans walked away from those talks.

Mr. Speaker, last week, our Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER, said he couldn't reach an agreement with President

Obama because they have different visions of our country. President Obama shares the vision of the American people. When we look to find our common ground and take it to a higher ground, I think all Americans agree that we want to educate our children for their own self-fulfillment but also to keep America number one by having innovation, which springs from education and from the classroom. I think all Americans share the higher ground, the common ground when it comes to the creation of jobs, good-paying jobs here in America for the economic stability of America's families and of our economy.

□ 1730

I think all Americans agree that we must have a dignified retirement for our seniors, where they have health and economic security. That's why Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security are so important to the American people.

I think all Americans agree that we must keep the American people safe, both in our national security and our economic security, and we must do so in a fiscally sound way without adding to the deficit. That is President Obama's vision of our country, and I'm sure that Speaker BOEHNER must share those views. So if that is the reason, the different vision of our country, maybe it is, hopefully it is not. Hopefully they share that vision.

Why are we where we are today? I believe it is because it wasn't about not sharing a vision for our country. I believe it is because the purpose of these talks was to reduce the deficit. My belief is that the Republicans came to the table not to reduce the deficit, but to go way beyond that and to dismantle decades of progress made in a bipartisan way for America's great middle class.

If, in fact, the purpose was deficit reduction in a very strong way, we were on that path. In the Biden talks and in the talks subsequent to it, we all agreed that there had to be substantial cuts, that we had to subject Federal dollars spent to make sure that we got our money's worth for U.S. taxpayers.

Democrats wanted revenue. We wanted sharing of the sacrifice in all of this. Republicans did not.

But we still could come to a place, as Senator REID did and as our distinguished ranking member referenced, to a place that used the proposals that Republicans had in the Ryan budget and in proposals that they had agreed to in the talks to reach a strong deficit reduction number that would enable us to come to agreement and to put this matter to rest until February of 2013, so we would remove all doubt in the markets that we were going to honor our debts, we were not going to default on previous spending. The purpose was not to lift the ceiling so we could spend more. The purpose was to lift the ceiling so we could pay for previous obligations, and that there would be that 18 months of certainty.

Instead, the Republicans have come forth with a proposal that, as I said, dismantled. This isn't about deficit reduction. This is about dismantling the public sector. And in doing so, they want to do it for 6 months, which means the minute this thing would be accomplished, and God forbid that it would be accomplished, we would have to start all over again.

I believe the American people are disappointed that this has taken so long, then angry that it is happening because of the uncertainty it brings to their lives, and, next, disgusted with the whole process. And they are so rightly so, because if our purpose is to reduce the deficit, we certainly can do that. If our purpose is to dismantle progress to the middle class, we won't be a party to it.

I think that the 6-month plan, not only in terms of uncertainty, is also a job killer. It has front-loaded cuts that will deter, impede the growth of our economy, our comeback, and, again, kill jobs. Every day that we are debating this is another day that we are not talking about job creation. Every day.

Republican bills that they have brought to the floor in the first 200 days of their majority, now it's 205, would amount to nearly 2 million jobs lost, just under 10,000 jobs a day lost by the proposals they have brought to the floor.

The American people's top priority is the creation of jobs. Jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs. Instead of this prolonged dismantling of the public sector attempt, we should instead have reached agreement—we still can—on a balanced bipartisan approach.

I want to say something as a mom about this dismantling of the public sector. I view my role in politics as an extension of my role as a mother and now a grandmother. As parents, all of us know that we want to do everything we can for our children to help them grow, be healthy, to learn, to reach their fulfillment, but there are things we can't do for them. We have to look to the public sector in order for them, and moms can identify with this, I'm sure, to make sure that they have clean drinking water, that the air they breathe is clean, that there is food safety. We can't do that ourselves. We can't do that ourselves. That is a public role.

The list goes on about the education of our children, the health security of our grandparents. Now, being a grandparent myself, but in terms of Medicare, Medicaid, all the things that are important to children, their health, their education, the economic security of their families, the pension security and health security of their grandparents, the safety of their neighborhood, some of these are private roles, some of these are public roles, some are public/private roles.

But, as a mom, I call upon all mothers across the country to understand what this bill does to the health and well-being of America's children. And really, it's quite ironic, because any speech that you hear on the floor, in meetings and all the rest, they say we must reduce the deficit because it's immoral to pass along deficits to our children. Well, I think it's wrong to pass along private or public debt to our children.

But what we are doing here is to pass along to our children a future less bright because of, again, I'll say it again, this dismantling of the public sector, which is an ideological goal long held by our friends. They would rather see seniors pay more for Medicare. They'd rather cut Medicaid and jeopardize Social Security while they give tax subsidies to Big Oil making record profits, tax breaks to corporations sending jobs overseas, and tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country at the expense of the education of our children and the health and well-being of our country.

I hope that the House will reject this measure. I know that people of good intention to reduce the deficit can find a path to do that. It can't be too late because we have a deadline on August 2.

But I want to pay my respects to President Obama, who has been respectful of every suggestion proposed by the Republicans, giving it the time and attention that they thought it deserved. He tried to accommodate all of those to have a balanced bipartisan approach. And what did the Republicans do? Walk away from the table.

Well, the American people know about this. That's why 50-some percent of the American people support the balanced bipartisan approach that the President says we should strive to achieve, and only about 19 percent of the American people support the proposal that is put forth by the Republicans.

□ 1740

This House should reject that. We should come together and use the work that has been done already to do something that will remove all doubt that we pay our bills, to remove all doubt that we are a strong economy that recognizes the role we play in the global economy, but also recognizes that all of this has an impact in the lives of everyday Americans as they sit around their kitchen table thinking about what they will do if the cost of credit goes up.

And that means their credit card bills, their car payment, their house payment, student loans and the rest are more expensive to them. This is very costly in terms of confidence and in terms of making ends meet.

Let's be responsible. Reject this bill and get back to work so that on Tuesday we will have met our obligations. That's the least that we can do for our children.

Mr. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to Speaker BOEHNER'S flawed plan to address our urgent need to raise the debt limit and our longer term challenge of reducing our nation's debt.

First, the Speaker's plan is a short-term band-aid, when our economy and markets need certainty. Under the Speaker's plan, we would be back where we are now in a few months, facing yet another possibility of defaulting on our debt. We should pass a debt limit extension that will take us through 2012. Playing with the creditworthiness of the United States is a game that never should have been started.

Second, this bill virtually guarantees cuts to Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security while protecting oil companies and the wealthiest in our country from any pain or paying their fair share. Billionaires are not being asked to pay more in taxes; loopholes that benefit the few are sacrosanct. But the programs seniors and children rely upon receive no such consideration.

Finally, this bill ignores the central problem facing our nation today: we need to put more people to work so they can afford to buy the products and services that will get our economy growing at a healthier pace. We need to make investments that will pay long-term dividends. Cutting funding for infrastructure, education, and child nutrition are short-sighted decisions that will hurt us in decades to come.

The people of Hawaii want Washington to change its ways. They want a compromise. They'd like a plan that is fair and balanced. They want us to reduce the deficit by cutting wasteful spending. They also want the wealthy to pay their fair share. Most of all, they want us to create jobs.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the ''Budget Control Act of 2011,'' which, like the previous debt-ceiling bills introduced by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, attempts to resolve our budget ceiling crisis by demanding sharp cuts to domestic programs that ask average Americans to make life-changing sacrifices while not asking America's wealthiest individuals and most profitable corporations to contribute their fair share.

In my lifetime, I have never seen such a concerted effort to ransom the American economy in order to extort the American public. While I support bipartisan efforts to increase the debt limit and to resolve our differences over budgetary revenue and spending issues, I cannot support a bill that unduly robs average Americans of their economic security and ability to provide for their families while constraining the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

The Budget Control Act of 2011 cuts $22 billion dollars from the Federal Budget for FY2012. Robert McIntyre, of Citizens for Tax Justice testified before the Senate Budget Committee that tax loopholes for corporations, big business owners and business investors cost the Treasury Department $365 billion dollars in FY2011.

We need to change the tone here in Congress. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said it best when he stated in a recently before the House Committee on Financial Services. ''We really don't want to just cut, cut, cut,'' Chairman Bernanke further stated ''You need to be a little bit cautious about sharp cuts in the very near term because of the potential impact on the recovery. That doesn't at all preclude—in fact, I believe it's entirely consistent with—a longer-term program that will bring our budget into a sustainable position.''

The Boehner plan does just that it will cut, cut, cut without taking into full consideration the serious cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. This bill is essentially a rehashed version of the same bill that President Obama promised to veto and the Senate vowed to reject. It asks for $917 billion in cuts from domestic spending for a $900 billion dollar increase in the debt ceiling while demanding nothing in revenue from the nation's wealthiest. This is nothing more than a ransom note, irresponsibly raising the debt ceiling for only a few months so that in just a short period of time, the American public will be hit again for $1.6 trillion in cuts from Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Veterans benefits. Anyone who believe that this plan will not result in a serious cut to Social Security should consider this . . . Social Security represents 20 percent of all federal spending, making it unrealistic to think such large cuts in mandatory spending will not affect Social Security benefits.

I state here today that the Boehner proposal is ill-conceived and fails to offer a balanced approach to decreasing the deficit. Instead of requiring shared sacrifice, the Boehner plan places the entire burden on the backs of seniors, the middle class and our nation's most vulnerable citizens, while doing nothing to close corporate tax giveaways and increase taxes on those most able to afford them.

The Boehner plan calls for large cuts in discretionary programs of $1.2 trillion over the next 10 years through strict new spending caps. Most experts predict that the first round of cuts would target discretionary programs, including education, infrastructure, job training and law enforcement. The Boehner plan would then require an additional $1.8 trillion in savings to be identified by the end of the year as a condition for raising the debt ceiling again at that time. Given the magnitude of these additional required savings, it would result in deep draconian cuts in federal entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. A repeal of health reform's coverage expansions. And a dramatic reduction in safety net programs for vulnerable Americans, such as food stamps and unemployment and disability insurance. This is unacceptable, and each is avoidable if corporations and the wealthy are required to shoulder a fair share of this burden.

The Speaker's plan requires a vote on an ill-advised constitutional balanced budget amendment in both chambers of Congress by the end of this year. The details surrounding exactly which proposed constitutional balanced budget amendment will be voted on are unclear. However, earlier proposals that have appeared in the House of Representatives, including H.J. Res. 1, would have a devastating impact on discretionary spending and on our modest economic recovery.

Passing an amendment to the Constitution is one of the most serious processes the United States Congress can undertake, requiring a two thirds supermajority of support in both the House and Senate and ratification by three-fourths (¾) of the States. The Founders purposely made the amendment process a long and arduous one. Do my Republican colleagues really expect Congress to capriciously pass an amendment altering our Nation's founding document on such short notice; an amendment that will fundamentally change our country without reasonable time for debate; without the opportunity for a hearing or questioning of witnesses; without any reports as to what impact it may have?

By tying the fate of whether the United States pays its debt obligations to the historically prolonged Constitutional amendment process, the Republicans who support this bill have demonstrated, at this critical juncture in American history, that they are profoundly irresponsible when it comes to the integrity of our economy and utterly bereft of sensible solutions for fixing it.

The Speaker's plan will result in for $2.7 trillion in deficit reduction and a $2.5 trillion increase in the debt limit in two stages, with the two debt ceiling increases being conditioned upon enactment of an initial set of spending cuts and a later, second deficit reduction measure.

I do not believe that Congress should yield its authority to what amounts to a Commission. BOEHNER's plan creates a 12-member joint congressional committee to develop a plan for an additional $1.8 trillion in deficit reduction that Congress would vote on in December. In addition the Speaker's plan authorizes the president to submit a $900 billion increase in the, $14.3 trillion debt ceiling immediately after enactment of this bill, and a $1.6 trillion increase if the $1.8 trillion deficit reduction measure is enacted. Both debt limit increases would take effect automatically unless Congress enacted resolutions of disapproval. The Speakers plan also requires the House and Senate to vote by the end of the year on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. As I have stated before this will tie the hands of congress.

Finally, as noted above, the Boehner proposal provides only a short-term extension of the federal debt ceiling. This means that the gridlock that now prevails in our government will continue for the remainder of the 112th Congress. According to the Center on Budget and Policy, recent reports have suggested that rating agencies will downgrade the U.S. credit rating if the Boehner proposal is enacted. This would result not only in higher interest costs to the federal government but also would raise the, interest rate paid by individuals and families on car loans, credit cards and mortgages throughout the United States. Taken together, all of these factors would undermine the nation's fragile recovery.

There has been a theme this Congress of focusing on cutting programs that benefit the public good and for the most at need, while ignoring the need to focus on job creation and economic recovery. This bill is wasting a tremendous amount of time when we should be focused on paying our nation's bills and resolving our differences.

In my district, the Texas 18th, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. We must not, we cannot, at a time when the Census Bureau places the number of American living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years, cut vital social services. Not in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and persistent unemployment, when so many rely on federal benefits to survive, like the Supplemental Nutrition Access Program (SNAP) that fed 3.9 million residents of Texas in April 2011, or the Women, Infant, and Children (WIC) Program that provides nutritious food to more than 990,000 mothers and children in my home state.

In 2009, there were 43.6 million Americans living in poverty nationwide. According to the

2010 Federal poverty threshold, determined by the US Census, a family of four is considered impoverished if they are living on less than $22,314 per year.

Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States poor population. In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the nation, 20.7% of America's youth. The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that there are currently 5.6 million Texans living in poverty, 2.2 million of them children, and that 17.4% of households in the state struggle with food insecurity.

There is no doubt that we must reduce the national debt, but my Republican colleague's desire for instant gratification through deep spending cuts to benefits, Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security is reckless and threatens the financial security of millions of Americans.

Instead of closing corporate tax loopholes to reduce the deficit, the Budget Control Act cuts discretionary spending, and requires Congress to draft proposals to cut at least $1.8 trillion from Medicare and Social Security. This is an outrage, and an insult to the American dream.

Forcing Congress to draft plans to cut 1.8 trillion from Medicare and Social Security forces Members to disregard the best interests of their constituents. Medicare guarantees a healthy and secure retirement for Americans who have paid into it for their entire working lives. Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors, including the 2.9 million Texans who received Medicare in 2010.

Any cuts to Medicaid would be just as damaging. Harris County has one of the highest Medicaid enrollment records in Texas. Limits and cuts to Medicaid funds would significantly hurt the citizens of Texas's 18th District. Harris County averages between 500,4300 and 600,000 Medicaid recipients monthly, thousands of people who may not have access to healthcare should Congress sacrifice Medicaid to cut spending.

Yes, we must take steps to balance the budget and reduce the national debt, but not at the expense of vital social programs. It is unconscionable that in our nation of vast resources, my Republican colleagues would pass a budget that cuts funding for essential social programs. Poverty impacts far too many Americans and social safety nets provide these individuals with vital assistance

Perhaps my friends on the other side of the aisle are content to conclude that life simply is not fair, equality is not accessible to everyone, and the less advantaged among us are condemned to remain as they are, but I do not accept that. That kind of complacency is not fitting for America.

As we continue to discuss the necessity of increasing out debt ceiling, I have heard the concerns of many of my constituents and the American people regarding the size of our national debt and the care with which taxpayer money is spent. I, too, am concerned about these issues; for to burden future generations of Americans with tremendous amounts of debt should not be a way to avoid our fiscal responsibilities to the American people. However, the task of resolving our debt ceiling crisis must take precedence over other concerns, including political ideology. The game is up, and the American people understand that increasing the debt ceiling has nothing to do with any new spending and everything to do with paying off the obligations that we have already agreed to and promised to pay.

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the federal government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

To address this need, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the federal government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior Congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade. Congress last came together and raised the debt ceiling in February 2010. Today, the debt ceiling currently stands at $14.3 trillion dollars. In reality, that limit has already been eclipsed, but due to accounting procedures by Treasury Secretary Geithner, the debt limit can be artificially avoided until August 2nd.

Congress must act now in order to avert a crisis. Never in the history of America has the United States defaulted on its debt obligations.

We must be clear on what this issue means for our country. America has earned a reputation as the world's most trusted borrower. United States Treasury bonds have traditionally been one of the safest investments another country or investor could make. For investors around the world, purchasing a U.S. Treasury bond meant that they held something virtually as safe as cash, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States government.

In turn, with the proceeds from the bonds, the federal government of the world's largest economy is able to finance its operations. If the United States defaults on its debt obligations, the financial crisis that began in 2008 would pale in comparison, according to economic experts. The ensuing economic catastrophe would not only place the U.S. economy in a tailspin, but the world economy as well.

The fact that Congress, a body that typically has its fair share of political battles, has never played political chicken when it came to raising the debt ceiling should give us all pause, and is a testament to the seriousness with which we must approach this issue. However, this time around, my Republican colleagues have created an impasse based upon an ideological commitment to spending cuts. While I understand and share the concern of my Republican colleagues with respect to deficit spending, and will continue to work with them in order to find reductions, now is not the time to put ideology over pragmatism. The reality is that, on August 3rd, the United States will begin to default on its debt obligations if the debt ceiling is not raised.

This unnecessarily places the American public and the economy between a rock and a hard place. Either Congress sides completely with the radical agenda of the Tea Party, which irresponsibly pulls the chair out from under the average American while polishing the throne of the wealthiest.

This detour into a spending debate is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present.

Moreover, the impending crisis would have already occurred were it not for the extraordinary measures taken by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, including the suspension of the investment in securities to finance the Civil Service retirement and Disability Fund, as well as the redemption of a portion of those securities already held by that fund.

If the United States defaults on its obligations on August 3rd, the stock market will react violently to the news that for the first time in history, America is unable to keep its promises to pay. Not once in American history has the country's full faith and credit been called into question.

Once America defaults, investors who purchase U.S. bonds and finance our government will be less likely to lend to America in the future. Just as a person who defaults on a loan will find it harder to convince banks to lend them money in the future, a country that defaults on its debt obligations will find it harder to convince investors to lend money to a government that did not pay.

Showing the world that the United States does not pay its debts makes the purchasing of that debt less desirable because it requires the assumption of more risk on the part of the investors. The proponents of this bill are putting the country at serious risk of losing its status as the world's economic superpower. Our allies will lose faith in our ability to manage global economic affairs. Our status in the world will be diminished, which will undermine our leverage on the world stage that allows us to command the respect and compliance of other nations when it comes to decision-making. This bill will reduce America's ability to compete with a surging China.

Furthermore, any investors that do continue to purchase U.S. Treasury bonds will demand much higher interest rates in order to cover the increased risk. Once a default occurs, investors figure that the chance of the United States defaulting again is much greater, and will require the government to pay higher rates of interest in order to make the loan worth the risk for investors to take on.

Imagine the impact on our stock market if we do not pay our debts. As we have seen throughout the recent financial crisis, a bad stock market hurts not only big businesses and large investors on Wall Street, but small businesses and small investors as well. Families with investments tied to the stock market, such as 401(k)s, pension plans, and savings, will once again see the value of their investments drop. The American people are tired of the uncertainty of the value of their retirement accounts. We must not allow another wild fluctuation to occur due to default and add to the uncertainty still lingering in the minds of citizens.

The Speaker's plan is a short term fix for a long term issue. It is a patch rather than a proper repair. BOEHNER's plan requires that Congress address debt-ceiling once again in a short span of time, which will once again lead to market uncertainty in a time when we are trying to rebuild our nation. This plan is not good for Wall Street and it is not good for the American People. The Speaker's bill is a short-term debt limit increase that will only ensure that Congress will go through this exact

same standoff again in the next few months. Short-term proposals risk further uncertainty and the potentially damaging downgrade of the U.S. credit rating. The markets have made it clear that a short-term extension is not sufficient and could result in very serious consequences. While Democrats support deficit reduction, we support doing it in a balanced way that provides certainty to the economy.

As if another stock market crisis were not enough, the housing market would take another hit if America defaulted. Higher mortgage rates in a housing market already weakened by default and foreclosures would cause a further depression of home values, destroying whatever equity families might have left in their homes after the housing crisis. Moreover, the long-term effects would reduce spending and investment in the housing market.

Increasing the debt ceiling is the responsible thing to do. Congress has already debated and approved the debt that an increased ceiling makes room for. However, my Republican colleagues have chosen to use this as an opportunity to hold the American people hostage to their extreme agenda.

Even prominent Republicans like Senator JOHN MCCAIN and Christine Todd Whitman have criticized the radical elements of their party who insist upon holding up the entire political process in order to flaunt their extreme, irrational, and unrealistic ideology. Senator MCCAIN has called the Tea Party's stance and the way they have conducted themselves during this manufactured crisis ''bizarre'', and I am inclined to agree. Their agenda for this country is even too radical for Speaker BOEHNER, with the Tea Party vowing to reject their leader's own bill.

They live in a world that is not the world that the American people live in. In their world, they believe that taxes are always too high, even on people making over a billion a year in a struggling economy; that any increase in revenue is fundamentally wrong, even if it comes from large corporations who use tax loopholes at the expense of our job-creating small businesses; that investing anything in our economic future above tax revenues is impermissible, even in the midst of an economic downturn; and that tax cuts for the wealthy are always the nation's top priority, even at the expense of people that depend on Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Veterans benefits to survive.

These beliefs place them on the fringe of American society, and yet due to the nature our political process, they have held up the entire government and placed our economy on the precipice of a turbulent second recession.

If Congress cannot find a resolution then Congress will open the possibility that the President may invoke the Fourteenth Amendment to United States Constitution, Section four, which states ''the validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be questioned.'' The argument can be made that if Congress will not resolve our nation's pending default then the President to protect the interest of our nation must act. The President would then have to consider his powers under the Fourteenth Amendment which may grant him the authority to raise the debt ceiling, on his own through executive order and if Congress fails to raise the debt limit by the August 2, 2011 deadline. As a body we should not place the President or our country in this position.

For those reasons I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents in their home districts who would be hurt by this bill. I urge my colleagues to return to the world in which the vast majority of Americans live; in a world in which our shared destiny is determined by reasonable minds and good faith efforts to compromise. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned that defaulting could ''throw the financial system into chaos,'' and ''destroy the trust and confidence that global investors have in Treasury securities as being the safest liquid assets in the world.''

Instead of injecting ideological spending cuts and Constitutional amendments into the traditionally non-political business of raising the debt ceiling, we must work quickly to pass a bill that makes good on our debt obligations and restores confidence in American credit.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, with six days left until we default on our national debt, there is simply no excuse for the partisan gridlock that has blocked all progress toward a fair and balanced agreement. This week, Congressional switchboards lit up and websites crashed under the sheer volume of outreach from citizens who wanted their voices heard in this debate. I hope my colleagues were listening. The resounding message I received from Rhode Islanders was that they are tired of political games. They want their leaders to work together to solve this problem in the best interests of the country. We have an opportunity to do that, and we literally can't afford to squander it with the usual Washington politics.

Our surest path to success includes a balanced approach of spending cuts and revenue increases that will reduce our budget deficit, stabilize our rising debt, reassure global markets and create greater economic certainty to bolster our fragile recovery. I will not support a plan that forces benefit cuts in Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid or places the entire burden of deficit reduction on middle-class families, seniors, the disabled and others already struggling through the effects of a deep recession. We must all be willing to share in the sacrifice, and that includes multinational corporations and the richest 2 percent of income earners who received the lion's share of tax breaks under the Bush tax cuts. This approach has bipartisan support in the Senate, as well as from officials in previous Democratic and Republican Administrations.

However, my Republican colleagues in the House have opted to turn a deaf ear to reason, choosing instead to put forward ''The Budget Control Act,'' a politically motivated proposal that makes clear their willingness to drive our nation into default rather than compromise in the best interests of Americans. This short-term extension contains arbitrary spending caps and a Balanced Budget Amendment so conservative in nature that it would deem unconstitutional the fiscal policies of Presidents Reagan and Bush, as well as the budget passed by the Republican House earlier this year.

The most egregious part of this legislation is that it only offers a short-term fix that will force Congress to revisit this same debate in a few months, setting the stage for another partisan fight as lawmakers gear up for the next election. It's hard to imagine how things could get much worse in Washington, but I can promise you we will find out if we have to replay this battle again next year. Moreover, it is exactly the wrong message to be sending the American people and the world. A short-term extension would fail to establish economic certainty, reassure businesses or provide market confidence. In fact, ratings agencies have warned that under the Republican proposal, the U.S. credit rating could still be downgraded, leading to higher interest rates and a tax on all American families.

The Senate is considering legislation that, while imperfect, protects our most vulnerable citizens, cuts more than $2 trillion, and ensures we avoid a repeat of this dangerous game in a few months. While it may not represent my preferred approach of including both spending cuts and revenue increases, it at least offers a compromise that a majority of members should be able to accept. It is time for both parties to put their differences aside, if not for good, then for long enough to agree on a balanced approach to pay our nation's bills, reduce the deficit and give businesses and markets renewed confidence in the full faith and credit of the United States. They should never have had to doubt it in the first place.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Budget Control Act and urge its adoption.

America pays its bills. Default on those obligations, by not raising the debt limit, would be dangerously irresponsible.

However, the $14.3 trillion national debt is utterly unsustainable. Consider the fact that total government spending at all levels has risen to 37% of gross domestic product today from 27% in 1960—and is set to reach 50% by 2038. Today, our national debt has reached 100% of the size of our economy, up from 42% in 1980.

These are trends that, left unchecked, will saddle future generations with burdensome debt and a lack of jobs and opportunities. In this regard, our efforts this week to raise the debt ceiling while firmly addressing the debt crisis is as much a moral as an economic decision.

Over the past several months, we have told the President that we will not support his request to increase the debt limit without serious spending cuts, binding budget reforms and we will not support higher taxes on families and small businesses we are counting on to create jobs.

Last week, I supported the ''Cut, Cap and Balance Act,'' legislation designed to immediately cut federal spending to 2008 levels, before all the ''bailouts'' and the failed ''stimulus'' bills. That measure also sought to put the federal budget on a glide path to spending no more than 20 percent of our economy and requires that Congress pass a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution.

Unfortunately, the same Senate Leadership that has not proposed a budget in over two years, will now not even allow a debate on this common-sense bill.

Today, the House considers the Budget Control Act. While far from perfect, this measure finally begins to turn back the tide of federal red ink in several important ways:

It cuts spending by $917 billion and does not raise taxes that would fuel additional spending. That is a vast improvement over current law.

It keeps the pressure on the President and Congress to cut spending further by providing another opportunity later this year to debate and keeping the pressure on to cut spending.

It creates a process that keeps our underlying fiscal policy problems front-and-center for the foreseeable future rather than ignoring them until 2013.

Contrary to some published reports, the bill contains serious reductions. This legislation cuts $22 billion in FY 2012 and $42 billion in FY 2013. Yes, these are still small numbers when placed in the context of overall federal spending. One reason is that the 2012 and 2013 budgets are the only ones that will actually be under the control of this 112th Congress. But even more important is the greater reduction in the budget glide path that will be used in future years. In the years beyond the 112th Congress, the budget savings multiply.

I would add that the Budget Control Act also keeps the focus on cutting spending, requiring a plan by December that cuts at least $1.8 trillion more.

It is important to note that the debt fight we're engaged in today has set an important precedent. From now on, increases in the debt ceiling will need to be accompanied by equivalent or greater cuts in spending.

On this point, I would remind everyone of the words the President uttered just days ago in the White House briefing room. When asked about the current debt negotiations, he said, 'I don't want to be here doing this. I'd rather be here talking about new programs . . .'

'New programs'? Translated: 'new spending.' Clearly, the President has not listened to the American people.

That is why it is so important to prevent him and his Congressional allies from finding new ways to spend the taxpayers' money. This bill locks in spending cuts for the future.

Of course, the next logical step is to enact permanent budget reforms like a Balanced Budget Amendment to our Constitution. I voted for a balanced budget amendment over ten years ago and I voted for the ''Cut, Cap and Balance'' bill last week. I look forward to voting for another balanced budget amendment in coming days and would urge my colleagues to give the American people the opportunity to weigh in on this common-sense reform.

Some well-meaning Americans have opposed the bill because they think it does not cut enough. While $900 billion+ of spending cuts is a genuine deficit reduction, I completely agree that it is far from sufficient to solve our underlying budget problems. In that respect, this House bill is a step in the right direction, nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, I want deeper spending cuts and greater deficit and debt reduction. However, given the stubborn insistence of the President and his Congressional allies on a debt limit increase coupled with new taxes and still more spending, I cannot see how we achieve greater savings at this time.

I, for one, will not give the President a blank check and urge approval of the Budget Control Act.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S. 627, Speaker BOEHNER's refusal-to-compromise, short-term bill that moves us closer to an unprecedented default.

This bill is not designed to become law. The Senate has made clear the votes aren't there for passage. If it did somehow reach the President's desk, he's publicly declared his intent to veto it.

Yet, here we are in the House of Representatives, wasting what little time we have left before the August 2nd deadline for default, considering this pointless piece of ideology just to appease the Tea Party.

If this doesn't make clear to the American public that the House Republican Majority is incapable of governing, I don't know what does.

The Boehner bill fails to address the number one crisis facing our nation: the instability of our financial standing. By providing only a short term debit limit increase—and guaranteeing we are in this same battle in a few short months—this bill would still lead to a downgrading of U.S. credit which would lead to higher interest rates and a tax on all American families.

The Boehner bill forces our country into this dangerous predicament solely to drive the extreme Republican agenda that demands protection of special interest tax breaks at the expense of vital public programs which people's lives depend on: namely, Medicare, Social Security and Medicaid.

By making clear their refusal to consider any tax increases—even proposals to end corporate welfare for Big Oil and tax breaks for corporate jet owners—BOEHNER's ''solution'' puts a target on Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. Because the immediate savings in the bill would decimate discretionary spending for the next decade, the only other place to turn will be these social insurance programs that people have paid into their whole lives. Medicare, Social Security and Medicaid would be mined for savings at levels never before seen. The ability of these programs to continue to guarantee financial and health security to senior citizens, people with disabilities, and—in the case of Medicaid, families with low incomes—would be in serious jeopardy.

Avoiding default is critical. It's something Presidents and Congresses from both sides of the aisle have always worked together to do. Unfortunately, Speaker BOEHNER's bill is strictly partisan. It fails to meet the goal of long-term stability and, at the same time, endangers fundamentally important programs that Americans depend upon.

A yes vote on this bill means you don't think the threats of default are real and that you don't believe in guaranteeing Medicare and Social Security for our nation's seniors. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in vigorous opposition to this ill-conceived legislation. Speaker BOEHNER's plan is not the answer to the urgent issue of raising the debt ceiling. If it becomes law, it will eviscerate the well-being of the American people.

It is, in fact, a disgrace that we are considering this measure at this late hour when we are days away from defaulting on the full faith and credit of the United States. The Republican leadership should have reached a compromise with President Obama and Senator REID weeks ago.

When President George W. Bush was elected, he inherited from President Clinton a surplus of tens of billions of dollars. But during his Presidency, two wars, a series of tax cuts, and a pharmaceutical benefit plan that no one paid for increased our national debt by over $5 trillion.

After years of irresponsibility, the Republican leadership now wants working families, seniors, pregnant women, children, and the poor to pay for their spending binge.

And they are using the debt limit to try to enforce their extreme Tea Party agenda.

Most of this terrible burden will fall on the programs that provide health and economic security to American families: Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security and the Affordable Care Act.

These are programs I have fought for and supported throughout my service in Congress.

But they face a terrible toll, inflicted in two cruel steps.

First, the Republican plan imposes immediate cuts approaching $1 trillion. Then, Congress is required to legislate, later this year, another series of massive spending cuts of at least $1.6 trillion.

These Republican budget cuts would have severe consequences.

They would end Medicare as we know it, ending its guarantees of coverage for hospital care, chemotherapy, doctor's visits, and prescription drugs. In its place, the Republicans want to substitute a voucher system where seniors would be forced into the private market to buy health insurance with only limited financial support from the government.

The Republican budget plan already approved by the House will increase premiums and cost sharing by at least $6,000 per person. The cuts required by this legislation would be even deeper.

The Republican budget cuts will destroy Medicaid too. Their budget, approved by the House, would cut Medicaid in half by 2022, leaving tens of millions of people without access to care. People in nursing homes would be cut off. The Republican budget would also slash support for the Children's Health Insurance Program which, together with Medicaid, cover over one third of America's kids.

Medicaid is the primary payer for long-term care and the home and community-based services that help people stay out of nursing homes. Who will now bear the $72,000 per year cost of a nursing home for an 85-year-old grandmother who collects $10,000 a year in Social Security benefits? Her children will try, but only the rich will be able to afford the costs in today's economy.

Social Security is next in line. The Republicans claim this legislation doesn't affect Social Security. But with budget cuts of this size—and no new revenues—Social Security will be on the chopping block. This bill gives a new 12-member committee a blank check to raise the retirement age, cut benefits, and squeeze the poorest retirees even harder.

The Republican cuts also go to the heart of other public health programs that are so essential to all of us. Budget cuts of the magnitude sought by the Republicans mean severe funding reductions in biomedical research to fund the cures we need for diseases like cancer, heart disease and Alzheimer's. Food safety enforcement will be curtailed. Programs to discourage tobacco use and prevent the marketing of tobacco to children will be threatened.

It is almost unthinkable that we find ourselves in this position today. We are on the

brink of a fiscal emergency. If we do not pass a debt limit extension, the United States Government will default next week. Yet there still is no compromise.

The President, the Treasury Secretary, and others have outlined in explicit detail that default risks another catastrophic financial crisis and severe harm to American families, including the stoppage of Social Security checks, paychecks to our armed forces, and government contracts with the private sector. Food stamps, disability and veterans payments, paychecks to federal workers, IRS tax refunds, and black lung disease benefit payments are all vulnerable to interruption. In all, 70 million people and companies will be affected beginning next week.

In addition, we will lose, for the first time in our history, our AAA credit rating that establishes the United States as the world's safest investment. As a result, it will cost more to borrow money across the board, and this will have the effect of a huge tax increase on American households across the country. Municipalities and counties in every state will face this same stark reality—as will small businesses, millions of American homeowners, and countless others.

Speaker BOEHNER's legislation is fatally flawed because it provides for a two-step process to raise the debt limit. This is exactly the wrong approach. We need legislation that is long-term and balanced. That is the only thing that will provide the certainty and stability and confidence our economy needs and that the markets require. Keeping the debt limit on such a short leash only ensures that it will persist as the overriding, unresolved domestic policy issue for the next several months—perpetuating uncertainty and anxiety and discouraging investment and job creation.

By distracting this House from coherent action on what we urgently need to do today—raise the debt ceiling—the Republicans are courting disaster for every American who makes a house payment, or a car payment, or is paying off a credit card balance, or who has a business loan or a personal line of credit.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a very serious point. This is not the moment to engage in fantasy. This House must take its responsibilities seriously and do its proper duty for the nation. And that duty is not to wrap the budget and the American economy in a straightjacket. That proper duty is to authorize the payment of the debts we have incurred, restore certainty, and end the fear and anxiety their brinkmanship has instigated.

The bill before us is a vicious assault on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, along with public health, scientific research and environmental protection. It is a prescription for default, a recipe for financial chaos, and a checklist of hardship and woe for the American people.

I urge its defeat.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican Default Act.

I oppose this bill because it does nothing but guarantee another default crisis in six months. It's nothing more than another partisan gimmick that will quickly be voted down in the Senate.

The majority says it wants a plan to address our nation's deficit, and the President has worked with them to achieve this goal. He has negotiated in good faith and put everything on the table, demanding only that the plan be balanced and responsible. And how did the majority respond? They refused to compromise and walked out of negotiations . . . twice.

Clearly, the majority is more focused on pushing their ideological agenda to end Medicare and preserve tax breaks for Big Oil and Wall Street than forging a good faith compromise to avoid default.

Mr. Speaker, compromising is what the American people send us here to do. As the President said, they voted for a divided government, not a dysfunctional one. It's time to stop the gimmicks and ensure our country does not default on its obligations.

Default would destroy close to 700,000 jobs, spike interest rates on credit cards and mortgages, and cause untold damage to our struggling economy.

Ronald Reagan took the necessary steps to avoid default 17 times. George W. Bush did it 7 times. No games. No gimmicks. Just a clean vote to avoid default and maintain the full faith and credit of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to come back to the table and forge the balanced and responsible compromise the American people deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of S. 627 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REED). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote of the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CHARLES ''CHIP'' LAWRENCE CHAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2548) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, as the ''Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2548

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CHARLES "CHIP" LAWRENCE CHAN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the ''Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2548, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, as the ''Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building.''

This bill was reported from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. I thank the gentleman and my good friend from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this legislation to designate the Federal post office located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, as the Charles ''Chip'' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, we are quickly approaching the 10th anniversary of the horrific attacks of September 11, 2001. And while as Americans we can recall the events of that tragic day like they were yesterday, I offer this legislation in remembrance of all those Americans who died on that day. Specifically, this legislation would honor the life and sacrifice of Peoria, Illinois, resident Charles ''Chip'' Chan.

On September 11, 2001, Chip was a 23-year-old bond trader working for the brokerage firm of Cantor Fitzgerald on the 105th floor of 1 World Trade Center when terrorists flew an airplane into his building, killing thousands of individuals like Chip.

Chip graduated from my alma mater, Richwoods High School, in Peoria in 1995 and went on to attend the University of Illinois College of Commerce and Business where he graduated with a degree in economics. Soon after graduating, Chip received his first official job in, of all places, New York City. When trying to describe to family members or friends which tower he worked in, Chip would often say, The one with the antenna on top.

Chip was a member of the St. Thomas Catholic Church in Peoria Heights and was the son of John and Julie Chan. He was the oldest of six boys, brother to Christopher, Craig, Matthew, Mark, and Michael Chan.

When describing his son only days after September 11, his father John described Chip as a good athlete, a good learner, someone who was outgoing in

nature and with quick wit, always reading a book on business or economics to help him learn his trade.

Martin Luther King, Jr. once said that one of life's most urgent questions is What are you doing for others? Well, Chip, through the tragic and needless way that his life ended, along with close to 3,000 other Americans that day, did more for others in a way that united our country unlike ever before than many could imagine to achieve in 10 lifetimes.

As we approach the 10th anniversary of September 11, it is my hope that as a country we will remember what brought us together as a country in the days, weeks, and months after that horrific day. Today, I hope we draw upon that common unity, that sense of patriotism and pride for fellow mankind, as we look our neighbors and complete strangers in the eye and respect that while we may believe in different paths, that in the end we all share the same vision for a strong, secure, fair, and free America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 2548.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues in support of H.R. 2548, which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, as the Charles ''Chip'' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building.

H.R. 2548 was introduced by our colleague, Representative AARON SCHOCK of Illinois, on July 14, 2011. And I, along with the entire Illinois delegation, are proud cosponsors of the underlying bill. The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform unanimously agreed to report out H.R. 2548, given the sad circumstances that led to the death of the bill's designee.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2548 will rename the post office in Peoria in honor of a young man who was unfortunately a victim of the tragic events of September 11, 2001.

□ 1750

Chip, as he was affectionately known to family and friends, gave the full measure of the greatest devotion that one can display: He gave his life in support of his country and in service to his country.

I have no further speakers, Mr. Speaker, and so I urge passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a wonderful way to be able to honor someone, and this is something that we can do together as a Congress, to be able to honor this individual. I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 2548.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2548.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

CORPORAL STEVEN BLAINE RICCIONE POST OFFICE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2244) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 67 Castle Street in Geneva, New York, as the ''Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2244

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CORPORAL STEVEN BLAINE RICCIONE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 67 Castle Street in Geneva, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2244, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 67 Castle Street in Geneva, New York, as the Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office.

The bill is cosponsored by the entire New York State delegation and was reported from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2244, which designates a post office in Geneva, New York, as the Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office.

I introduced this legislation to extend long overdue recognition to a national hero from the 24th Congressional District.

Corporal Steven Riccione was a native of Geneva, New York. He was a Geneva High School graduate who volunteered to join the Army in 1967 during the Vietnam War.

While on a search and destroy mission with his platoon in Vietnam, Corporal Riccione came under intense enemy fire and became pinned down. Riccione, then a private, saw a machine gunner in his platoon get wounded. As Major General E.M. Strong described in his October 1967 account: ''Private Riccione, with complete disregard for his own safety, rushed from his covered position through a vicious hail of enemy fire to aid his wounded comrade.

''He continuously exposed himself to the withering hail of enemy fire, standing up at times, to place effective fire on enemy positions. When his weapon was struck by an enemy bullet and was demolished, he undauntedly picked up a machine gun and charged an enemy bunker, killing two enemy soldiers.

''Shortly after, Private Riccione was mortality wounded while helping to evacuate wounded personnel under heavy enemy fire.

''Private Riccione's devotion to duty and personal courage were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army.''

Corporal Riccione was killed in action while helping to evacuate wounded American soldiers.

As a result of Private Riccione's actions, Major General Strong recommended him for the Bronze Star Medal with Valor Device, and the Bronze Star Medal with First Oak Leaf Cluster, which he was posthumously awarded. He was also promoted to corporal.

Mr. Speaker, Corporal Riccione is a source of great pride to his family, his community in Geneva, my congressional district, and indeed to a grateful Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that Corporal Riccione's memory may be honored in his own hometown of Geneva, New York, for generations to come.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform minority, I am pleased to

present for consideration H.R. 2244, which would rename the United States Postal Service facility at 67 Castle Street in Geneva, New York, as the Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office Building.

The measure before us was first introduced by Representative RICHARD HANNA from New York on June 21, 2011 and, in accordance with committee requirements, is cosponsored by all members of the New York delegation. Further, H.R. 2244 was taken up by the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22, 2011, where it was favorably reported out of committee by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly highlight some of the achievements and honorable service of Corporal Riccione.

Corporal Steven Riccione was 20 years old when he volunteered to join the United States Army during the Vietnam War. A native of Geneva, New York, and a graduate of Geneva High School, Corporal Riccione served our Nation admirably up to the point of his death in the Quang Tin province of South Vietnam on September 27, 1967. Corporal Riccione died in action while helping evacuate wounded soldiers after a fierce battle with North Vietnamese troops.

No greater gift can one give than to give his life in service to his country and his fellow men. I urge passage of H.R. 2244.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is a privilege to be given this chance to honor a great individual who gave his life for our Nation, and I join with the entire delegation of New York to encourage this House to pass this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2244.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1800

SERGEANT JASON W. VAUGHN POST OFFICE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2213) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Eastport Street in Iuka, Mississippi, as the ''Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2213

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SERGEANT JASON W. VAUGHN POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Eastport Street in Iuka, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the ''Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2213, as introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Eastport Street in Iuka, Mississippi, as the Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office.

This bill is cosponsored by the entire Mississippi State delegation and was reported from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22.

I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled today to rise in memoriam of Army Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn of Iuka, Mississippi, who gave his life in defense of freedom.

Sergeant Vaughn was assigned to the 5th Battalion, 20th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division, Fort Lewis, Washington. He was only 29 years old.

Sergeant Vaughn was killed in action on May 10, 2007, when a roadside bomb exploded near his vehicle in Baqubah, Iraq, during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

He joined the Army in 2002. Sergeant Vaughn first served in Iraq from November of 2003 until 2004. In fact, he was serving his second tour of duty when he was killed in action.

He was the recipient of the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terror Expeditionary Medal, and the Global War on Terror Service Medal. Sergeant Vaughn was buried with full military honors at Oak Grove Cemetery in Iuka, Mississippi, on May 19, 2007. He held the rank of specialist, and he was posthumously promoted to sergeant and awarded the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart, and the Combat Infantryman Badge. He was a graduate of Tishomingo County High School. By all accounts he was a loyal friend and a great leader.

His father, Walter Vaughn, told the Associated Press, ''He had friends all over the place. He was an outgoing type of person. The world lost a leader. My son was a born leader.''

RaNae Smith Vaughn spoke proudly of her son: ''Jason was a handsome man on the outside and, more importantly, on the inside. We will always remember his smile, bear hugs, love of life, positive attitude, and his way of making everyone around him feel special. His greatest attribute may have been his kind heart. Jay was always extremely considerate of the needs of his family and friends. He never forgot to call and give his mother and his sister a special greeting on birthdays and other special occasions. We as his family are so grateful for the opportunity to have had him in our lives. Jason will live on in our hearts and minds forever.''

Sergeant Vaughn also left behind his wife, Contessa W. Vaughn; his stepdaughter, Ashley Martin; and a brother and a sister.

I want to thank my colleagues in the Mississippi delegation and the 112th Congress for their support of H.R. 2213 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Eastport Street in Iuka, Mississippi, as the Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office.

We cannot bring back a husband or a son, but this bill honors his memory and his sacrifice. And it will serve as a constant reminder to the people of Tishomingo County that freedom is not free.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in support and consideration of H.R. 2213, which would rename the United States Postal Service facility located at 801 West Eastport Street in Iuka, Mississippi, as the Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office.

H.R. 2213 was introduced on June 16, 2011, by our colleague Representative ALAN NUNNELEE from the State of Mississippi. Currently the bill is cosponsored by all four members of the Mississippi delegation and was favorably reported out of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22, 2011, by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, the achievements and honorable service of Sergeant Jason Vaughn are certainly worth noting. The son of Walter Glenn and Llalanda

RaNae Vaughn, Sergeant Vaughn grew up in his hometown of Iuka, Mississippi, where he graduated from Tishomingo County High School in 1996. Following graduation, Sergeant Vaughn enrolled in Northeast Mississippi Community College before going on to attend Mississippi State University. In 2003 Sergeant Vaughn made the decision to serve his country by enlisting in the U.S. Army. Shortly thereafter, Sergeant Vaughn became a member of the 5th Battalion, 20th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division, which is based out of Fort Lewis, Washington.

While serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Sergeant Vaughn was tragically killed by an improvised explosive device on May 10, 2007, right outside of Baqubah, Iraq. This heroic soldier was only 29 years of age when he lost his life in service to our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of this young man's bravery and accomplishments, I ask that we pass the underlying bill without reservation and pay tribute to the commitment and sacrifice made by Sergeant Jason Vaughn.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 2213, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2213.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SERGEANT MATTHEW J. FENTON POST OFFICE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 789) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Main Street in Little Ferry, New Jersey, as the ''Sergeant Matthew J. Fenton Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 789

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SERGEANT MATTHEW J. FENTON POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Main Street in Little Ferry, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the ''Sergeant Matthew J. Fenton Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Sergeant Matthew J. Fenton Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days with which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 789, introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Main Street in Little Ferry, New Jersey, as the Sergeant Matthew J. Fenton Post Office. The bill was cosponsored by the entire New Jersey State delegation and was reported from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22.

Sergeant Fenton served his country as a United States marine, training fellow marines as a reserves inspector and instructor. Tragically, Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 2006, Sergeant Fenton passed away at the Naval Medical Center in Bethesda after suffering wounds he received as a result of a suicide attack in Anbar Province, Iraq.

Prior to serving his country, Matthew was no different than many of us. He enjoyed watching baseball, playing poker, and loved his hometown of Little Ferry, New Jersey. He enjoyed rooting for his favorite teams, the Yankees and Giants, but his true goal was always to serve those that were around him. Matthew had a dream of becoming a police officer and serving his local community. His mother, Diane, said that he talked about wanting to become a police officer. She even sent him a civil service book to prepare for that test while he was in Iraq.

□ 1810

He finally has achieved his goal. The Little Ferry Police Department made him an honorary officer posthumously. Sergeant Fenton is a true American hero, making the ultimate sacrifice for those he was proud to serve.

I urge all Members to join me in strong support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. It is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the author of this legislation, the gentleman from the Garden State of New Jersey, Representative STEVE ROTHMAN.

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. I thank my ranking member, Mr. DAVIS, for his work on this bill. I would like to thank the chairman for all of his support as well. It is very greatly appreciated by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true American hero, Marine Sergeant Matthew Fenton of Little Ferry, New Jersey. At just 24 years of age, Matthew Fenton made the ultimate sacrifice for our country. It happened during his service in Iraq's al Anbar province in 2006. Matthew was struck by shrapnel after alerting his comrades to the presence of a suicide bomber. All of them escaped except for Matthew. He passed away 9 days later at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland, as a result of his wounds, a day after he received the Purple Heart for his bravery.

I attended Matthew's funeral in 2006, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that 5 years later I still vividly recall the pain and deep sadness of his parents, his family, friends, and, yes, the entire community over the loss of this wonderful young man. Matthew represented the best our country has to offer.

Matthew planned to return home to Little Ferry, as has been said, after his service in the Marine Corps. He wanted to continue serving his community as a police officer. There is no doubt in my mind that just as Matthew was an outstanding marine, he would have made an outstanding police officer. Recognizing this fact, the Little Ferry Police Department made Sergeant Fenton a member of the Little Ferry police force after his untimely death, and then they permanently retired his badge number—number 44.

It is a humbling privilege for me to have played a small part in honoring Marine Sergeant Matthew Fenton, having sponsored the legislation naming the post office in his hometown of Little Ferry, New Jersey, the ''Sergeant Matthew J. Fenton Post Office.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and join me in ensuring that Marine Sergeant Matthew J. Fenton is recognized for his selflessness, his courage, and his patriotism, and that he will always be remembered.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for introducing this thoughtful measure and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 789.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 789.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

FIRST LIEUTENANT OLIVER GOODALL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1975) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 281 East Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena, California, as the ''First Lieutenant Oliver Goodall Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1975

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FIRST LIEUTENANT OLIVER GOODALL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 281 East Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena, California, shall be known and designated as the ''First Lieutenant Oliver Goodall Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''First Lieutenant Oliver Goodall Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1975, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 281 East Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena, California, as the ''First Lieutenant Oliver Goodall Post Office Building.'' The bill was introduced on May 24 and was reported out of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22.

Oliver Goodall was born May 28, 1922. After the United States entered World War II, he joined the United States Army Air Corps at Tuskegee, Alabama, in February 1943. By 1944, he had earned the right to fly as a multiengine pilot and was assigned to the 477th Bomber Group based at Godman Field, Kentucky.

In 1945, First Lieutenant Goodall was among a group of African American officers that were arrested for trying to peacefully integrate an all-white officers' club. This event later came to be known as the Freeman Field Mutiny. This act of courage was an essential step in the movement towards the full integration of the U.S. Armed Forces, which took place in June 1949.

Mr. Goodall moved to Los Angeles after World War II, where he began his career as a postal service employee. After decades of service to both his country and his community, Mr. Goodall was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 2007. Sadly, in November of last year, Mr. Goodall passed away at 88 years old.

Mr. Speaker, First Lieutenant Goodall is a very worthy designee of this postal facility naming, and I urge all Members to join me in support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the author of this measure, Representative ADAM SCHIFF from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank the chair and ranking member for their support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the bill to designate the U.S. Postal Service building located at 281 East Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena, California, as the ''First Lieutenant Oliver Goodall Post Office Building.'' Doing so will honor Mr. Goodall's decades of service to the community and country as a Tuskegee Airman, public information officer, and postal worker.

It's my pleasure to honor the contributions of an inspirational man who answered his country's call to service in the face of immense adversity.

Oliver Goodall and his fellow Tuskegee Airmen fought the injustice of fascism abroad while combating racial segregation at home. The Tuskegee Airmen enlisted as America's first African American military pilots at a time when segregation infused both the armed services and much of the country. The Tuskegee Airmen exhibited commendable spirit and will in serving their country with extraordinary courage and sacrifice even as their every achievement was met with criticism or obstruction.

In June 1941, the Tuskegee program officially began with the formation of the 99th Fighter Squadron at the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. The first class graduated in 1942, and the program would eventually graduate 994 pilots, many of whom would go on to serve with valor in the war efforts in Europe.

Goodall entered the service at Tuskegee in February 1943. In October 1944, he graduated as a multiengine pilot and was assigned to the 477th Bomber Group at Godman Field, Kentucky, in January 1945, where he attained his first pilot's rating in 6 months.

Despite an excellent service record, including a Silver Star, 150 Distinguished Flying Crosses, 14 Bronze Stars, and 744 Air Medals by war's end, the Tuskegee Airmen faced rigid segregation on Air Force bases. White and African American officers and enlisted men were separated in almost all activities, including admittance into the officers' club.

On April 5, 1945, at Freeman Airfield in Indiana where the 447th Bomber Group was stationed, Oliver Goodall and 60 other African American officers challenged the segregation of the officers' club, brushing past the base provost marshal into the all-white officers' club. All of the officers were arrested. Most were soon released. But all of the African American officers on the base were ordered to sign an order that indicated they understood the regulation that officially barred them from the club and established a separate officers' club for African Americans. Goodall and all but eight of the African American officers on the base refused to sign the order and to enter the African American officers' club. Asked why he refused to sign the order, Goodall responded: Because it's just another form of segregation.

The officers that refused to sign the order were arrested again. They were released on April 19, 1945. By then, news of the incident and the dignity that Goodall and the other officers had displayed in entering the whites-only officers' club and refusing to sign the order had spread across the country.

□ 1820

The ensuing protest compelled the War Department to establish the McCloy Committee to investigate segregation in the Armed Forces. The McCloy Committee played a critical role in the abolishment of segregation in the military.

World War II ended in September 1945, and after the conclusion of the war, Oliver Goodall moved to southern California and took a job with the U.S. Postal Service where he worked until he retired. He was an active member of the community, serving as fund-raising chairman of the Tuskegee Airmen Foundation Scholarship Fund, which assists financially disadvantaged and deserving students interested in the fields of aviation, aerospace and science to achieve academic success. In 1961, he bought a home in Altadena, where he lived until he passed away in October of 2010.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1975 to designate the post office as the ''First Lieutenant Oliver Goodall Post Office Building.'' This legislation is a small but fitting way to honor the legacy of Oliver Goodall and of the other Tuskegee Airmen who bravely stood by

their country at a time when few would stand by them.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from California for his introduction of this very thoughtful measure. I can't help but recall the fact that I was given a Tuskegee Airmen jacket by the DODO Club, the DODO Chapter in Chicago. I wear it whenever I get a chance in honor of Lieutenant Goodall and his fellow Tuskegee Airmen.

I urge the passage of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is a worthy man to be able to honor—a life that served many people and a life that stood up and made a real difference, so I urge the Members to support the passage of H.R. 1975.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1975.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

JOHN PANGELINAN GERBER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1843) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 489 Army Drive in Barrigada, Guam, as the ''John Pangelinan Gerber Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1843

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JOHN PANGELINAN GERBER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 489 Army Drive in Barrigada, Guam, shall be known and designated as the ''John Pangelinan Gerber Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''John Pangelinan Gerber Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1843, introduced by the gentlelady from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 489 Army Drive in Barrigada, Guam, as the ''John Pangelinan Gerber Post Office Building.'' The bill was introduced on May 11, and was reported from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22—and I look forward to hearing the gentlelady say the name correctly.

Sergeant John Gerber was born on May 31, 1951, in Ordot, Guam. He was not only known for serving in the Marine Corps during the Vietnam war, but also for his hospitality and assistance towards his fellow marines in later years. During Operation Desert Storm, Sergeant Gerber assisted our troops by offering to host any individual or group associated with the 3rd Marine Division who was en route to the Middle East. His offer was accepted by many marines, and over time, nearly 20,000 marines had visited him.

Later in life, Sergeant Gerber led a campaign to rename Route 1 in Guam from ''Marine Drive'' to ''Marine Corps Drive'' to recognize the 1,548 marines who had lost their lives and the 6,000 marines who were wounded during the Liberation of Guam. In 2008, he established the Pacific War Museum on Guam to display World War II memorabilia and educate the public on the War in the Pacific.

As a result of his dedication in educating citizens on Marine Corps history, Sergeant Gerber was the 2011 recipient of the Colonel John H. Magruder Award. Sadly, he received the award following his death in 2010 at just 58 years old. He is survived by his wife, Mel, and his four children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. It is my pleasure now to yield such time as she may consume to the author of this measure, the delegate from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1843, a bill that honors the life and the service of John Vincent Pangelinan Gerber. This bill would rename the ''Guam Main Post Office Facility'' to be the ''John Pangelinan Gerber Post Office Building'' as a tribute to his tireless work of advocating for veterans on Guam and for educating the public of Guam's importance during World War II and of the role of the United States Marine Corps in liberating our island. John, himself a proud marine and lifetime resident of the village of Ordot, Guam, died on May 4, 2010, at the age of 58.

John was a patriotic American who took pride in his island and his Chamorro heritage. After graduating from high school, he quickly enlisted in the Marine Corps and completed basic training at the Marine Corps Depot in San Diego. He was subsequently deployed to Vietnam where he served with the Fleet Logistics Command in support of the 1st and 3rd Marine Divisions. When he completed his tour in Vietnam, John was assigned to the Bravo Company at Marine Barracks Guam, where he remained until he was honorably discharged as a corporal on June 3, 1975.

Following his service in the Marine Corps, John worked as a radio disc jockey. His show, ''Wireless Rock,'' was the most popular of its time on Guam. He opened the Wireless Rock Music Box, a record store in Guam's capital city of Hagatna, and later established a charter boat tour company. He led tourists through the island's best fishing and dive spots, making him one of the pioneers of what is now recognized as ''culture-based eco-tourism'' on Guam. John then attended the University of Guam where he received a degree in public administration. The marines, however, were never, ever far from his mind.

In 1992, John joined the Guam Chapter of the 3rd Marine Division Association, and devoted his time to helping his fellow marines and veterans. He strove to promote and preserve the story of the 3rd Marine Division to memorialize its role in the War in the Pacific and particularly with regard to the Liberation of Guam during World War II.

John extended this generosity to active duty marines and servicemembers who visited Guam on temporary duty or other deployments. With help from the Guam Chamber of Commerce's Armed Services Committee and other veteran organizations on the island, John hosted numerous fiestas at his home in Ordot, welcoming more than 20,000 marines, sailors, soldiers, airmen, and guests to partake in the Chamorro culture and hospitality.

His home, which became known as Gerber's Ranch, contained his collection of World War II vehicles, weapons, uniforms, and artifacts. These items would later be transferred to the Pacific War Museum, which John established to educate the public about the Marine Corps' role in the Liberation of Guam. John opened the museum to the public on July 21, 2008, for the 64th anniversary of the Liberation of Guam.

In 2004, John led the effort to rename Guam's main thoroughfare, Route 1, from ''Marine Drive'' to ''Marine Corps Drive'' in order to ensure that the sacrifices of the marines who liberated

Guam are never forgotten. He saw this opportunity to honor the 1,548 marines who lost their lives and the 6,000 marines who were wounded during the Liberation of Guam from enemy forces during World War II. The defining moment in this effort came when he pulled a handcart with a billboard—demanding action—the entire 27 miles from Andersen Air Force Base to Naval Base Guam. In doing so, he rallied support for his issue and spurred many Guam residents to advocate for recognizing those who fought and died for Guam.

□ 1830

On the day after his march, Route 1 was officially named Marine Corps Drive.

A year after this victory in 2005, the Department of Defense announced that the marines from the 3rd Expeditionary Force would be relocating from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam. So John, along with many others on Guam, viewed this relocation as a homecoming, and he was the first to defend the Marine Corps and the strategic importance of this realignment.

Although John will not be able to greet these marines as he had done for so many servicemembers who had visited Guam, his legacy will continue through his work with our community and in the Pacific War Museum.

These efforts were recognized this year when the Marine Corps Heritage Foundation bestowed on John the Colonel John H. Magruder Award for his excellence in depicting and perpetuating Marine Corps history.

Mr. Speaker, John Gerber was an extraordinary man whose greatest dream was to ensure that our veterans, those who made the greatest sacrifices for our country, would not be forgotten. Renaming the Guam main post office facility will serve as a permanent tribute to his legacy. I urge my colleagues to cast their vote to support this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentlelady for her introduction of this measure. I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I join the others that have already stood before you to support the passage of H.R. 1843, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1843.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MATTHEW A. PUCINO POST OFFICE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2062) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Meetinghouse Lane in Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts, as the ''Matthew A. Pucino Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2062

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MATTHEW A. PUCINO POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Meetinghouse Lane in Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts, shall be known and designated as the ''Matthew A. Pucino Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Matthew A. Pucino Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2062 was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING). It would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Meetinghouse Lane in Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts, as the Matthew A. Pucino Post Office. The bill was reported from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22.

Matthew Pucino, a United States Army Special Forces soldier, born in Hudson, Massachusetts, was killed in Afghanistan on November 23, 2009, when his vehicle struck an improvised explosive device.

Matthew enlisted in the United States Army in 2002 as a Special Forces candidate and went on to earn the Green Beret as an engineer sergeant. Matthew was conducting a combat patrol in eastern Afghanistan near the Pakistani border when his all-terrain vehicle was struck.

He was an intelligence sergeant with the 20th Special Forces Group, and he had been on his second deployment. He had also served in Iraq with the 5th Special Forces Group. As a result of his bravery in his first deployment in Iraq, Matthew was awarded the Purple Heart, Bronze Star, Army Commendation, and Global War on Terrorism Service Medals.

According to his cousin, Anthony, Matthew joined the military after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks because he wanted to help protect America and Americans.

Mr. Pucino was 34 years old. He left his wife, Crystal; his parents, Albert and Kathryn Pucino of Orlando, Florida; and his sister, Lisa.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to the author of this measure, Mr. KEATING of Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman for yielding his time.

I rise today to honor Sergeant Matthew A. Pucino of Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts, who lost his life on November 23, 2009, after his vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device while conducting a mounted patrol in Afghanistan.

Sergeant Pucino enlisted in the U.S. Army in 2002 as a Special Forces candidate. He went on to complete the Special Forces qualification course and earned the coveted Green Beret as a Special Forces engineer sergeant. In July of 2009, he deployed for the third time in support of Operation Enduring Freedom as a member of the Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force in Afghanistan.

Sergeant Pucino was highly decorated, which is a testament not just to his abilities as a soldier, but to his true character. This includes such honors as the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon, Army Service Ribbon, NATO Medal, Combat Infantryman Badge, Parachutist Badge, and the Special Forces Tab.

In tribute to Sergeant Pucino's ultimate sacrifice for our country, I have joined with my colleagues in the Massachusetts delegation in introducing H.R. 2062 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Meetinghouse Lane in Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts, as the Matthew A. Pucino Post Office.

I respectfully urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation in honor of Sergeant Pucino—a hero, not just to the citizens of Massachusetts, but to all Americans.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts on this very thoughtful measure, I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. I join with the gentleman to urge all Members to pass H.R. 2062, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2062.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

CECIL L. HEFTEL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2149) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4354 Pahoa Avenue in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the ''Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2149

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CECIL L. HEFTEL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4354 Pahoa Avenue in Honolulu, Hawaii, shall be known and designated as the ''Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2149, introduced by the gentlelady by Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4354 Pahoa Avenue in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building.

This bill was introduced on June 13 and was reported from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22.

Cecil L. Heftel was born September 30, 1924. He was an accomplished businessman and a politician who served his community for many years. Mr. Heftel was a well-known figure in Honolulu, Hawaii, and served five terms as a Member of the House of Representatives.

In the 1960s, Mr. Heftel began his career in Hawaii when he started Heftel Broadcasting and took over the KGMB television station. In 1976, Mr. Heftel ran for Congress, won five consecutive terms and then resigned from Congress in 1986 to run for Governor, but was defeated in the primary.

Mr. Heftel returned to the broadcasting business until 2004. He then returned to his community to serve as a member of the board of education. Cecil Heftel died February 4, 2010, at the age of 85. His service to the Honolulu community will never be forgotten. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of the bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1840

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. It is my pleasure to yield such time as she might consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA), the author of this measure.

Ms. HANABUSA. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the ranking member for affirmatively looking upon H.R. 2149.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tremendous career of the late Representative Cecil L. Heftel. H.R. 2149 is a bill which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4354 Pahoa Avenue in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building.

Representative Heftel was a very unusual person and a very accomplished man. He was known for his prowess in building radio and television broadcasting stations in Hawaii. Many of us grew up in Hawaii with his creations, like ''Checkers and Pogo,'' which was the most popular children's show; J. Akuheab Pupule, one of the most popular radio personalities; and the legends themselves, who still rule our airwaves in the show of ''Perry & Price,'' Michael W. Perry and my good friend Coach Larry Price. They still are the first and the highest-ranking radio shows in Hawaii.

Cecil Heftel was elected to the 95th Congress to represent the First Congressional District of Hawaii. While in Washington, Representative Heftel's first assignment was to the Education and Labor Committee and, ironically, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Representative Heftel was reelected four times, serving for a total of five terms in this body. During the 96th Congress, Representative Heftel was elected to the Ways and Means Committee where he stayed until his resignation in 1986 to run for Governor of our beautiful State of Hawaii.

While in office, Representative Heftel sponsored 160 bills, and it is important to note this because these bills evidenced his vision and farsightedness. He was a champion of tax reform and energy independence, an issue that is very popular today, but may not have been as popular back then, always showing aloha for his constituency.

In response to President Reagan's tax cut proposal, Representative Heftel said, ''I cannot support a tax proposal which would benefit me so much more than those of my constituents who earn less than $30,000 a year.'' Similar statements are being made today. This is what defined Cecil Heftel both as a Member of Congress and a person from Hawaii.

In 1983, Representative Heftel was involved in a car crash near the Lincoln Memorial which left him with severe injuries. The accident occurred before cars were legally required to have airbags. This experience helped shape Representative Heftel's view of government regulation and the private sector. Remember where he came from, a very successful businessman. After the accident, Representative Heftel unsuccessfully filed suit against General Motors, blaming his accident on faulty breaks in his Oldsmobile. It is important to note that after the accident, he received a letter saying there may be something wrong with his brakes.

Though Representative Heftel, as a businessman, probably was not in favor of regulations, it is important to note that in the 99th Congress, he introduced legislation that would provide criminal penalties for manufacturers who failed to notify owners of motor vehicle safety defects, something that we have all come to expect and are protected by today. This shows you who Representative Heftel was and the fact that he always placed the public, the people, and his constituents first. He went through his service here in the Congress displaying this kind of independence and courage, looking to these important issues.

I want to say that on a personal note, I was able to meet Mr. Heftel in the year 2004. It was at a dinner event where, actually, I met his daughter Susan first. And when we spoke of her father, she told me, I think my dad would like to meet you. So we sat at dinner first and had several meetings after that. And he told me about his experiences in Congress.

But more important than that, he shared with me his passion for education and how he believed that he still had it in him to come and make change in the education system in Hawaii.

So in that same year, at the age of 80, Cecil Heftel was successfully elected to the State Board of Education for the Oahu-at-large seat, and there he served for 4 years, making an effort to leave his mark on education, as he did as a Member of Congress and also as the greatest communications person we will see in the State of Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2149, naming the facility

of the United States Postal Service located at 4354 Pahoa Avenue in Honolulu, Hawaii, in honor of Cecil Heftel. I do this not only to honor him and to pay our respects to someone who served the State so well, but I do this because I want for especially the youth of today, when they go by that post office and they see the name Cecil L. Heftel to ask, Who was Cecil L. Heftel? And I believe that when they learn his story and they see how he served in this body and how over time his experiences shaped his legislation, legislation that we may not have thought that would be something he would have supported, and how he put his constituents first, and also his genius, his absolute genius in communications and his creation of all the legends over time, that they will be inspired, and that among them, one day, we may see another Cecil L. Heftel.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlelady for her introduction of this very thoughtful measure, I urge its passage, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 2149, and I also yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Congresswoman HANABUSA's bill to designate the post office in the neighborhood of Kahala in Honolulu as the Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building.

Cec Heftel, as he was known to everyone in Hawaii, is remembered for his keen business sense, his pursuit of excellence as a broadcaster, and his decade of service representing Hawaii's 1st Congressional District. He passed away in February 2010.

In looking over the legislation that Congressman Heftel introduced during his tenure, I was interested to see that he introduced forward-looking bills to provide incentives for renewable energy and to establish a comprehensive research and development program for domestic hydrogen fuel capability. He also introduced legislation to restore the wartime recognition to the Filipino veterans of World War II to entitle them to the benefits they earned. The Congress finally acted on this issue in 2009, giving these veterans a measure of long-awaited justice.

I am sure that the naming of the post office in Cec's memory in the community where he lived means a great deal to his widow, Rebecca Heftel, his children, grandchildren, and his many friends, former colleagues, and employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2149.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES ''CHIP'' LAWRENCE CHAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will now resume on H.R. 2548.

The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2548) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, as the ''Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2354

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 11 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.

IMPACT OF INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION FAILURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2056) to instruct the Inspector General of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to study the impact of insured depository institution failures, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–185) on the resolution (H. Res. 382) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1188. An act to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the designation of the year of 2011 as the International Year for People of African Descent, Committee on Financial Services.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on June 28, 2011 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2279. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 29, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the second and third quarters of 2011 pursuant to Public Law 91–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GEORGIA, UKRAINE, KYRGYZSTAN, AND MONGOLIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 4, AND JUNE 11, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. David Dreier	6/04	6/07	Georgia		894.00		Milair[3]				894.00
Hon. David Price	6/04	6/07	Georgia		737.00		Milair[3]				737.00
Hon. Susan Davis	6/04	6/07	Georgia		894.00		Milair[3]				894.00
Hon. Brad Miller	6/04	6/07	Georgia		894.00		Milair[3]				894.00
Rachael Leman	6/04	6/07	Georgia		894.00		Milair[3]				894.00
John Lis	6/04	6/07	Georgia		894.00		Milair[3]				894.00
Asher Hildebrand	6/04	6/07	Georgia		794.00		Milair[3]				794.00
Hon. David Dreier	6/07	6/08	Ukraine		355.25		Milair[3]				355.25
Hon. David Price	6/07	6/08	Ukraine		355.25		Milair[3]				355.25
Hon. Susan Davis	6/07	6/08	Ukraine		355.25		Milair[3]				355.25
Hon. Brad Miller	6/07	6/08	Ukraine		355.25		Milair[3]				355.25
Rachel Leman	6/07	6/08	Ukraine		355.25		Milair[3]				355.25
John Lis	6/07	6/08	Ukraine		355.25		Milair[3]				355.25
Asher Hildebrand	6/07	6/08	Ukraine		355.25		Milair[3]				355.25
Hon. David Dreier	6/08	6/09	Kyrgyzstan		317.00		Milair[3]				317.00
Hon. David Price	6/08	6/09	Kyrgyzstan		317.00		Milair[3]				317.00
Hon. Susan Davis	6/08	6/09	Kyrgyzstan		317.00		Milair[3]				317.00
Hon. Brad Miller	6/08	6/09	Kyrgyzstan		317.00		Milair[3]				317.00
Rachel Leman	6/08	6/09	Kyrgyzstan		317.00		Milair[3]				317.00
John Lis	6/08	6/09	Kyrgyzstan		317.00		Milair[3]				317.00
Asher Hildebrand	6/08	6/09	Kyrgyzstan		317.00		Milair[3]				317.00
Hon. David Dreier	6/09	6/11	Mongolia		332.00		Milair[3]				332.00
Hon. David Price	6/09	6/11	Mongolia		226.00		Milair[3]				226.00
Hon. Susan Davis	6/09	6/11	Mongolia		332.00		Milair[3]				332.00
Hon. Brad Miller	6/09	6/11	Mongolia		332.00		Milair[3]				332.00
Rachel Leman	6/09	6/11	Mongolia		332.00		Milair[3]				332.00
John Lis	6/09	6/11	Mongolia		332.00		Milair[3]				332.00
Asher Hildebrand	6/09	6/11	Mongolia		226.00		Milair[3]				226.00
Committee total											12,818.74

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. DAVID DREIER, JULY 13, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO DENMARK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 3 AND JULY 5, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Steny Hoyer	7/03	7/05	Denmark		1,029.50		10,898.80				11,928.30
Mariah Sixkiller	7/03	7/05	Denmark		1,029.50		10,898.80				11,928.30
Committee total											23,856.60

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. STENY H. HOYER, July 18, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO COLOMBIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 18 AND APR. 20, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Steny Hoyer	4/18	4/20	Colombia		764.00		([3])				764.00
John Hughes	4/18	4/20	Colombia		764.00		([3])				764.00
Committee total											1,528.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. STENY H. HOYER, July 22, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Rob Woodall	6/04	6/05	Kuwait		432.05		([3])				432.05
	6/05	6/06	Iraq		0.00		([3])				
	6/06	6/07	Pakistan		81.00		([3])				81.00
	6/07	6/09	Afghanistan		28.00		([3])				28.00
	6/09	6/10	Germany		123.00		([3])				123.00
Committee total					664.05						664.05

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Chairman, July 13, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Richard Nugent	6/04	6/05	Kuwait		456.15		(3)				456.15
	6/05	6/06	Iraq		0.00		(3)				
	6/06	6/07	Pakistan		91.80		(3)				91.80
	6/07	6/09	Afghanistan		39.06		(3)				39.06
	6/09	6/10	Germany		189.82		(3)				189.82
Committee total					776.83						776.83

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Chairman, July 27, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Louie Gohmert	6/06	6/09	Philippines		630.00		(3)				630.00
	6/09	6/10	Qatar		296.00		(3)				296.00
	6/10	6/11	Kuwait		83.00		(3)				83.00
	6/11	6/13	Turkey		207.00		(3)				207.00
Committee total					1,216.00						1,216.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, July 20, 2011.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2011

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nick Rahall	4/02	4/04	Egypt		410.50		6,925.90				7,336.40
Hon. John Duncan	4/21	4/23	Beijing		632.00		(3)				632.00
Hon. Tim Holden	4/21	4/23	Beijing		632.00		(3)				632.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	4/21	4/23	Beijing		632.00		(3)				632.00
Hon. Dan Lipinski	4/21	4/23	Beijing		632.00		(3)				632.00
Jimmy Miller	4/21	4/23	Beijing		632.00		(3)				632.00
John Anderson	4/21	4/23	Beijing		632.00		(3)				632.00
Ryan Seiger	4/21	4/23	Beijing		632.00		(3)				632.00
Joseph Wender	4/21	4/23	Beijing		632.00		(3)				632.00
Caroline Califf	4/21	4/23	Beijing		632.00		(3)				632.00
Hon. John Duncan	4/23	4/25	Hong Kong		878.00		(3)				878.00
Hon. Tim Holden	4/23	4/25	Hong Kong		878.00		(3)				878.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	4/23	4/25	Hong Kong		878.00		(3)				878.00
Hon. Dan Lipinski	4/23	4/25	Hong Kong		878.00		(3)				878.00
Jimmy Miller	4/23	4/25	Hong Kong		878.00		(3)				878.00
John Anderson	4/23	4/25	Hong Kong		878.00		(3)				878.00
Ryan Seiger	4/23	4/25	Hong Kong		878.00		(3)				878.00
Joseph Wender	4/23	4/25	Hong Kong		878.00		(3)				878.00
Caroline Califf	4/23	4/25	Hong Kong		878.00		(3)				878.00
Jimmy Miller	4/25	4/27	Seoul, Korea		700.00		(3)				700.00
John Anderson	4/25	4/27	Seoul, Korea		700.00		(3)				700.00
Ryan Seiger	4/25	4/27	Seoul, Korea		700.00		(3)				700.00
Joseph Wender	4/25	4/27	Seoul, Korea		700.00		(3)				700.00
Caroline Califf	4/25	4/27	Seoul, Korea		700.00		(3)				700.00
Hon. John Duncan	4/25	4/27	Seoul, Korea		700.00		(3)				700.00
Hon. Tim Holden	4/25	4/27	Seoul, Korea		700.00		(3)				700.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	4/25	4/27	Seoul, Korea		700.00		(3)				700.00
Hon. Dan Lipinski	4/25	4/27	Seoul, Korea		700.00		(3)				700.00
Committee total					20,300.50		6,925.90				27,226.40

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN L. MICA, Chairman, July 18, 2011.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2631. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—2-Propenoic acid, 2-methyl-, phenylmethyl ester, polymer with 2-propenoic acid and sodium 2-methyl-2-[(1-oxo-2-propen-1-yl)amino]-1-propanesulfonate(1:1), peroxydisulfuric acid ([HO)S(O)2]202) sodium salt (1:2)-initiated; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0327; FRL-8878-4] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2632. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Maneb; Tolerance Actions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0327; FRL-8878-6] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2633. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Modifications to Indiana Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Non-attainment New Source Review Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-1002; FRL-9430-7] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2634. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; New Jersey and New York; Final Disapproval of Interstate Transport State Implementation Plan Revision for the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R02-OAR-2010-1025; FRL-9436-2] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2635. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Control of Gasoline Volatility; Correction [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0976; FRL-9430-5] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2636. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Volatile Organic Compound Reinforced Plastic Composites Production Operations Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0036; FRL-9430-9] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2637. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Kansas; Final Disapproval of Interstate Transport State Implementation Plan Revision for the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R07-OAR-2011-0279; FRL-9436-1] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2638. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Missouri; Final Disapproval of Interstate Transport State Implementation Plan Revision for the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R07-OAR-2011-0215; FRL-9435-9] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2639. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire and Rhode Island; Infrastructure SIPs for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R01-OAR-2008-0639; EPA-R01-OAR-2008-0641; EPA-R01-OAR-2008-00642; EPA-R01-OAR-2008-0643; A-1-FRL-9431-2] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2640. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas [EPA-R07-OAR-2011-0304; FRL-9434-3] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2641. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [EPA-R07-OAR-2011-0309; FRL-9429-1] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2642. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Nebraska [EPA-R07-OAR-2011-0310; FRL-9434-4] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2643. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana and Ohio; Disapproval of Interstate Transport State Implementation Plan Revision for the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0805; FRL-9435-8] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2644. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Approval of Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Permit Issued to Cape Wind Associates, LLC (EPA Permit Number OCS-R1-01) [A-1-FRL; 9431-8] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2645. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Deferral for CO2 Emissions from Bioenergy and Other Biogenic Sources under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Title V Programs: Final Rule [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0083; FRL-9431-6] (RIN: 2060-AQ79) received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2646. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Correction [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0512; FRL-9430-6] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2647. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure to Submit Section 110 State Implementation Plans for Interstate Transport for the 2006 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0338; FRL-9435-7] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2648. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for Iowa State Implementation Plan Revision [EPA-R07-OAR-2010-1083; FRL-9434-7] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2649. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of State, Local and Tribal Affairs, Executive Office Of The President, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting the Office of National Drug Control Policy High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program Report to Congress June 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 382. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 112–185). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 2677. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue regulations to reduce helicopter noise pollution in residential areas of Los Angeles County, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. BASS of California):

H.R. 2678. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out programs to provide youth in racial or ethnic minority or immigrant communities the information and skills needed to reduce teenage pregnancies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2679. A bill to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 2680. A bill to establish a commission to conduct a comprehensive review of Federal agencies and programs and to recommend the elimination or realignment of duplicative, wasteful, or outdated functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 2681. A bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for cement manufacturing facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2682. A bill to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas):

H.R. 2683. A bill to require that members of the Armed Forces who were killed or wounded in the attack that occurred at a recruiting station in Little Rock, Arkansas, on June 1, 2009, are treated in the same manner as members who are killed or wounded in a combat zone; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 2684. A bill to establish a competitive pilot program that utilizes community, innovation, and technology to improve physical fitness education and curriculum in elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 2685. A bill to increase the statutory limit on the public debt by $750,000,000,000 upon the adoption by Congress of a balanced budget constitutional amendment and by an additional $750,000,000,000 upon ratification by the States of that amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 2686. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to exclude child care from the determination of the 5-year limit on assistance under the temporary assistance for needy families program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 2687. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands within Fort Pulaski National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2688. A bill to amend the Crime Control Act of 1990 to require certification of State and law enforcement agency reports related to missing children, to require that certain information be provided to individuals reporting a missing child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2689. A bill to amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to authorize the use of grant funds for dating violence prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2690. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation to conduct an annual independent financial audit of the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2691. A bill to amend title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to encourage and support parent, family, and community involvement in schools, to provide needed integrated services and comprehensive supports to children, and to ensure that schools are centers of communities, for the ultimate goal of assisting students to stay in school, become successful learners, and improve academic achievement; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2692. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to modify the procedures governing the closure or consolidation of postal facilities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DREIER:

H.R. 2693. A bill to cut spending, maintain existing commitments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. DENHAM):

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 377. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself and Mr. HOLT):

H. Res. 378. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that strong consideration should be given to the role of science education in the educational accountability system as it works to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. COHEN):

H. Res. 379. A resolution condemning the terror attacks on government buildings in Oslo, Norway, and a youth camp on Utoya Island, Norway, on July 22, 2011, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BERG, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H. Res. 380. A resolution condemning the July 22, 2011, attacks in the Kingdom of Norway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHILLING (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H. Res. 381. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the memorial park on Hero Street USA, in Silvis, Illinois, should be recognized as Hero Street Memorial Park and should continue to be supported as a park by the Town of Silvis at no cost to United States taxpayers; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 2677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the authority delineated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 2679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 2680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 2681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 2682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 2684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 2685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. The Congress shall have Power . . . to pay debts. . .''

Article V. The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution. . .

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 2686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 2687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 2688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause I and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power***To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) (1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DREIER:

H.R. 2693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of section 8 of article I.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 58: Mr. PENCE and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 280: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 282: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 287: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 298: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 333: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 422: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 436: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 451: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 605: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 674: Mr. RIVERA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HALL, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 683: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 687: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 704: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 735: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 787: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 808: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 835: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 942: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1048: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1106: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1138: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1161: Mr. TERRY and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1164: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1179: Mrs. SCHMIDT and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1195: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1206: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GIBSON, and Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1351: Mr. DICKS and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1375: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1461: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 1464: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1466: Mr. CLAY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1511: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1550: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1558: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1580: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1614: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1639: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1697: Mr. HOLDEN and Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1700: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 1706: Mr. WATT.

H.R. 1755: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 1761: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1775: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1780: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1847: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1865: Mr. BOREN and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1876: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1931: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1951: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1966: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1983: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1994: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2000: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 2016: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2032: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2088: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 2092: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 2104: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2107: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2108: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2115: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2159: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2164: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HALL, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 2167: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 2182: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 2190: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2200: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 2214: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 2247: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2250: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2255: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 2257: Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2271: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 2306: Mr. STARK, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2377: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2387: Ms. HANABUSA and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 2395: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2397: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2407: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2418: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 2421: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2447: Mr. TURNER, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2482: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 2492: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2500: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2501: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2505: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2529: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2540: Mr. FARR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2543: Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2545: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 2547: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 2561: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. QUAYLE.

H.R. 2563: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2566: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 2567: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2568: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2575: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2580: Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2592: Mr. SCHILLING.

H.R. 2594: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 2599: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2602: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 2617: Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 2639: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 2644: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2651: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 2653: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HANABUSA, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2659: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2662: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 2663: Mr. CLAY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FALEMOAVAEGA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. HOCHUL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2664: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 2670: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2671: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H. J. Res. 2: Mr. LANKFORD.

H. Res. 25: Mr. GIBBS.

H. Res. 111: Mr. FINCHER.

H. Res. 136: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 216: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 238: Mr. COBLE.

H. Res. 342: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 364: Mr. BERG, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. WEBSTER.

H. Res. 369: Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H. Res. 374: Mr. DREIER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 79: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. For an additional amount for ''Smithsonian Institution—Salaries and Expenses'' for the National Museum of African American History and Culture (as authorized By: sections 7(b)(2)(B), 8(c), and 11(a)(2) of the National Museum of African American History and Culture Act (20 U.S.C. 80r–5(b)(2)(B), 80r–6(c), and 80r–9(a)(2))) there is hereby appropriated, for ''Smithsonian Institution—Facilities Capital'' for construction of a building for the Museum (as authorized By: section 8(c) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 80r–6(c))) there is hereby appropriated, the amount otherwise provided for ''Smithsonian Institution—Salaries and Expenses'' is hereby reduced by, and the amount otherwise provided

for ''Smithsonian Institution—Facilities Capital'' is hereby reduced by, $5,000,000, $65,000,000, $5,000,000, and $65,000,000, respectively.

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 80: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available By: this Act may be used to carry out sections 431(b), 435, or 438 of this Act (relating to stationary source greenhouse gas prevention, waters of the United States, and silvicultural activities, respectively).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 81: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available By: this Act may be used in contravention of section 104(k), or section 128, of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k), 9628).

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 82: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available By: this Act may be used to purchase lands that would result in a net increase in Federal land holdings (other than lands acquired to be held in trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2011 No. 115

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Holy God who inhabits the praises of Your people, look with favor upon us today. Lord, You have been our God from the beginning, so stay close to us and save us from ourselves. In times of tension and strain, keep our lawmakers calm in spirit, clear in mind, and pure in heart. Empower them to perform faithfully and well the duties of their calling. Inspire them with love for You as You give them the wisdom to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with You.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TOM UDALL led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

Following morning business, I will be recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1938

Mr. REID. Mr. President, H.R. 1938 is due for a second reading, I am told.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1938) to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL Oil pipeline, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would object to any further proceedings at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have 5 days remaining until a few extremist Republicans—and note I say ''a few''—drive our economy off a cliff because they are too radical and inexperienced to compromise. Financial experts are begging Congress to come to an agreement that averts a first-ever default on this Nation's financial obligations.

This is what one financial analyst said yesterday about the need to avert a default crisis which would spark a global economic depression.

The market is saying we need a deal. Default is starting to seep into the marketplace.

It will not be long, they say, before our financial markets severely react to continued stubbornness by the tea party Republicans, tanking our economy. Wall Street had a very bad day yesterday—its worst in months—largely based on the news that Congress still has not found a path forward.

That does not only affect big investment banks or wealthy investors; all around the country, ordinary Americans with 401(k)s and college savings accounts lost money yesterday. Their life savings took a hit because a small group of radical Republicans who do not represent mainstream Americans have refused to move even 1 inch toward compromise.

Yesterday's bad economic news should be a sign to those Republicans who deny reality. Default will rock our financial system to its core. Many reasonable Republicans realize time is running out. They have urged their colleagues to compromise.

Yesterday on the Senate floor, JOHN MCCAIN, the Republican senior Senator from Arizona and President Obama's opponent in the last Presidential election, asked his own party to return to reality. It ''is not fair to the American people to hold out and say we won't agree to raising the debt limit. . . . ''

He called the radical Republican approach—saying up is down and denying

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

the sky is blue—''unfair'' and ''bizarro.'' Those are quotes from JOHN MCCAIN. He further said:

It's time we listened to the markets. It's time we listened to the American people and sit down and seriously negotiate.

He was talking to his fellow Republicans and, in particular, to a tea party that does not seem to realize Republicans control only one-half of one branch of government. That faction of the Republican Party is holding our economy hostage. That is an understatement.

My counterpart, Senator MCCONNELL, also urged a return to reason.

We cannot get a perfect solution, from my point of view, controlling only the House of Representatives. So I'm prepared to accept something less than perfect because perfect is not achievable.

That is from Senator MITCH MCCONNELL. Both sides know neither side will get everything it wants. That does not mean we should not come together to find a compromise that gives each side something it needs. Republicans have drawn the line at ending wasteful tax breaks for corporate jet owners and oil companies making record profits. They have vowed to protect corporate welfare at taxpayer expense. Democrats have vowed to protect senior citizens who rely on Social Security and Medicare benefits. We will not allow them to suffer while Republicans protect tax breaks for billionaires.

The compromise plan we are considering in the Senate protects both of these priorities—both parties' priorities. Whether one agrees with the priorities, the legislation I have on the floor in the form of an amendment protects those priorities—Democratic priorities and Republican priorities.

Unfortunately, in a concession to Republicans, we did not ask millionaires and billionaires to contribute their fair share. We would have loved to have done it. But the line has been drawn by the Republicans and we followed that. But it does protect seniors who Republicans insist should feel the pain.

It would also avert a default crisis while cutting $2.5 trillion from the deficit. That is twice as much as the Boehner plan. Yet House Republicans refuse to support the Senate compromise. I am happy to talk to any of my Republican colleagues—I have talked to several of them, I am happy to continue that—to listen to reasonable suggestions to make the Senate compromise legislation even better. That would require tea party Republicans to admit ''compromise'' is not a bad word.

Legislation is the art of compromise, and they need to learn that. A significant number of House Republicans said their party would rather see this Nation default on its financial obligations than cooperate with Democrats. That says it all. It is hard to comprehend that, but there has been a spate of these Members of the House of Representatives who have said they would rather see the Nation default on its financial obligations than cooperate.

This kind of thinking has been roundly rejected by the American people. Nearly three-quarters of Americans want Congress to compromise, even if neither side gets everything it wants. The American people know we cannot get everything we want.

This thinking has also been rejected by reasonable Republicans. I had the good fortune of serving with the very famous American, Fred Thompson from Tennessee. He was famous before he got here. He is a movie actor. He served in the Senate admirably and went back to do his acting. Former Senator Fred Thompson—by the way, he is a Republican—urged members of his own party in an open letter to the House GOP to recognize a good deal when they see it. That is what he said. ''I respectfully suggest that you rake in your chips, stuff them in your pockets, and go home.''

The proposal on the table would cut the deficit by $2.5 trillion. If their goal is to rein in spending, they already won. That is what Fred Thompson said: ''If their goal is to rein in spending, they've already won.'' Declare victory and leave. Republicans should know—this is Fred Thompson—''when to take their chips and walk away.''

American writer Elbert Hubbard said, ''It is easy to get everything you want, provided you first learn to do without the things you cannot get.'' That is what this is all about. ''It is easy to get everything you want, provided you first learn to do without the things you cannot get.''

There are things that either side cannot get. Accept that and move on. Republicans cannot get the short-term Band-Aid they will vote on in the House today. It will not get one Democratic vote in the Senate. All 53 members of the Senate Democratic caucus wrote to the Speaker last night—the letter was hand-delivered to him—to tell him why we will not vote for it.

The economy needs more certainty than the Speaker's proposal would provide. We must not be back in 6 weeks doing the same thing I have been involved in for 7 or 8 months. We do not need to do that. Washington has been locked down with this debt crisis debate. The White House is not doing all they need to do. We are not doing the things we need to do. We cannot come back to this in just a few short weeks. That is what would happen.

We must not be back here in 6 weeks or 6 months debating whether to allow our Nation to default on its financial obligations for the Republican right-wing that seems to be controlling so much of what they are doing in the House.

It would be easy for Republicans to get nearly everything they want if only they embraced the Senate's true compromise plan and stop, as Senator MCCAIN put it, deceiving the American people—his words not mine.

The question remains, will my Republican colleagues be wise enough to end this stalemate?

SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM EXTENSION AND REFORM ACT OF 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2608.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Landrieu substitute amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 588) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration'', approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742), as most recently amended by section 2 of the Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–17; 125 Stat. 221), is amended by striking ''July 31, 2011'' each place it appears and inserting ''July 31, 2012''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 30, 2011.

SEC. 3. REPEALS AND OTHER TERMINATIONS.

(a) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2011.

(2) RULE.—Nothing in this section shall affect any grant or assistance provided, contract or cooperative agreement entered into, or loan made or guaranteed before October 1, 2011 under a provision of law repealed or otherwise terminated by this section and any such grant, assistance, contract, cooperative agreement, or loan shall be subject to the applicable repealed or otherwise terminated provision, as in effect on September 30, 2011.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF TEMPORARY EXTENSIONS.—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall have effect notwithstanding any temporary extension of programs, authority, or provisions under the Act entitled ''An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration'', approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742).

(4) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any savings resulting from this Act and the amendments

made by this Act shall be returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

(b) POLLUTION CONTROL LOANS.—Paragraph (12) of section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(A) The Administration'' and inserting ''The Administration''; and

(2) by striking ''research and development'' and all that follows and inserting ''research and development.''.

(c) SMALL BUSINESS INSTITUTE.—Subparagraph (E) of section 8(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)) is repealed.

(d) DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE GRANTS.—Paragraph (3) of section 21(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (R) by adding ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (S) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (T).

(e) CENTRAL EUROPEAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.—Section 25 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 652) is repealed.

(f) PAUL D. COVERDELL DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM.—Section 27 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 654) is repealed.

(g) PILOT TECHNOLOGY ACCESS PROGRAM.—Section 28 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 655) is repealed.

(h) NATIONAL VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 33 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657c) is repealed.

(2) CORPORATION.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the National Veterans Business Development Corporation and any successor thereto may not represent that the corporation is federally chartered or in any other manner authorized by the Federal Government.

(i) LEASE GUARANTEES AND POLLUTION CONTROL.—Part A of title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 692 et seq.) is repealed.

(j) ALTERNATIVE LOSS RESERVE.—Paragraph (7) of section 508(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 697e(c)) is repealed.

(k) SMALL BUSINESS TELECOMMUTING PILOT PROGRAM.—Subsection (d) of section 1203 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (15 U.S.C. 657h) is repealed.

(l) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.—Section 411(i) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) Without limiting the authority conferred upon the Administrator and the Administration by section 201 of this Act, the Administrator and the Administration shall have, in the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties conferred by this part, all the authority and be subject to the same conditions prescribed in section 5(b) of the Small Business Act with respect to loans, including the authority to execute subleases, assignments of lease and new leases with any person, firm, organization, or other entity, in order to aid in the liquidation of obligations of the Administration hereunder.''.

(2) TITLE 10.—Section 1142(b)(13) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and the National Veterans Business Development Corporation''.

(3) TITLE 38.—Subsection (h) of section 3452 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''any of the'' and all that follows and inserting ''any small business development center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), insofar as such center offers, sponsors, or cosponsors an entrepreneurship course, as that term is defined in section 3675(c)(2).''.

(4) VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999.—Section 203(c)(5) of the Veterans Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development Act of 1999 (15 U.S.C. 657b note) is amended by striking ''In cooperation with the National Veterans Business Development Corporation, develop'' and inserting ''Develop''.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF EMERGING LEADERS PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective October 1, 2011, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may not carry out or otherwise support the program referred to as ''Emerging Leaders'' in the document of the Small Business Administration titled ''FY 2012 Congressional Budget Justification and FY 2010 Annual Performance Report'' (or any predecessor or successor document).

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 2608), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; further, that at 5 p.m. I be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the clock is ticking. In just a few days, the U.S. Government will no longer have the ability to borrow money to pay its bills—a situation the President and his advisers said would trigger an economic Armageddon.

I was shocked last night when 53 Senate Democrats issued a letter saying they intend to vote against the only piece of legislation that has any chance of preventing all this from happening. Even more shocking is the fact that Democratic leaders and the President himself have endorsed every feature of this legislation except one, and that is the fact that it doesn't allow the President to avoid another national debate about spending and debt until after the next Presidential election. Every other feature of the House bill was essentially agreed to earlier except for one—the President wants to avoid having another discussion about deficit and debt before the election. This assurance is the only thing the President and Senate Democrats are holding out for right now.

The Democrats can try to justify their opposition to the House bill any way they want. They can claim they are worried about a stalemate 6 months from now. They can ignore the fact that of the 31 times Congress and the President have raised the debt limit over the past 25 years, 22 of those debt limit increases lasted less than a year. President Reagan, in 1984, signed three bills in the course of his election year that raised the debt ceiling. It was not unusual. In fact, what is unusual is to ask for $2.7 trillion in debt limit increase. That is unusual. That is unprecedented.

So what is worse, a default now or a potential default 6 months down the road? Because if those 53 Senate Democrats follow through on their threat to filibuster the House bill, that is what they will be doing—ensuring default now rather than working with us to prevent it later. Why would you want to do that? The answer is, to make the President's reelection campaign a little bit easier.

It is inconceivable to me that the President would actually follow through on this threat. After all, the President's first responsibility is to do what is best for the country, not his reelection campaign. The same goes for our friends on the other side of the aisle. It is inconceivable to me that they would actually block the only bill that would get through the House of Representatives and prevent a default right now. Inconceivable. It is inconceivable to me that they would do this for no other reason than to help the President avoid having another debate before the election about the need for Washington to get its fiscal house in order. But that is precisely what we may be headed for this weekend—guaranteed default or a bill that takes the specter of a default off the table, while giving us another opportunity to address the very deficits and debts that caused this crisis in the first place.

Senate Democrats are playing with fire, and it is hard to conclude they are doing it for any other reason than politics. So I urge our friends on the other side of the aisle this morning to rethink their position and join Republicans in preventing default.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise this morning to speak to the need to come to an agreement. We need to come to an agreement on how we handle the debt ceiling. We need to come to agreement on addressing our Nation's deficit and debt.

Let us review where we are right now. If you look at our fiscal situation, right now the Federal Government takes in revenues on an annual basis of $2.2 trillion—$2.2 trillion—a year, but at the same time we are spending $3.7 trillion. That is a shortfall, or a deficit, of more than $1.5 trillion a year.

I look at these young people here in this Chamber—these great pages from all over the country—and I think about what that means not only for us today—for our economy, for our standing in the world, for the security of our country—but I think about what it means for future generations. What is it we leave them? Do we leave them a country that was founded on the concept of freedom and liberty, that people could pursue life on their own terms, raise their families the way they wanted to raise their families, live the way they wanted to live, do the work they wanted to do, have an opportunity to start a business, to build a life, and be successful and pass something of value on to their children?

I think that is what we all want. That is the Nation we have—the Nation we have had for over 200 years. That is the Nation we want to pass on to these great young people.

So we have had tremendous debate for an extended period of time—for a long time. Many good ideas have been brought forth by both sides of the aisle, by Republicans and by Democrats, on how we should address this debt ceiling agreement, how we should address the deficit and the debt. Nobody has the corner on good ideas. There have been many good ideas brought forward, but now is the time we have to realize we have to come to agreement. The American people want us to come to an agreement.

Today the House is considering the Budget Control Act of 2011, referred to as the Boehner proposal, and they are over there working on it right now. As with any agreement, somebody can certainly find something to criticize. That is always true. No agreement is perfect. But it does represent many of the ideas that both sides have brought forward as a way to come to agreement on this debt ceiling and, more importantly, as a way to start to get our fiscal house back in order. Let's talk about it for just a minute.

Under the proposal, first there would be a reduction in spending, a savings of more than $900 billion, and that would also provide for a $900 billion increase in the debt ceiling to get us past this immediate issue. Then, at the same time, it appoints a committee—not a commission but a committee—of Senators and Representatives, 12 members—6 Senators, 3 Republican, 3 Democrat; 6 House Members, 3 Republican, 3 Democrat—who are required to find at least another $1.8 trillion in savings. Those savings have to be found before there is another increase in the debt ceiling.

That is the right way to do things. That is getting the horse in front of the cart, not the reverse. So they have to find those savings in a bipartisan way, and they have to bring those concepts back to the House and to the Senate, and the House and the Senate will have a straight up-or-down vote—the elected representatives of the people doing their job for the people in an open and transparent way.

Think about this committee for a minute. Again, there are 12 members: 6 Republicans, 6 Democrats; 6 Senators, 6 Members of the House. They can bring forward all of these great ideas that have been debated in recent months. They can bring forward ideas from the Simpson-Bowles Commission that have gained support. They can bring forward ideas from the Gang of 6 that people believe are meritorious. They can bring forward ideas for savings. They can bring ideas forward for reform. They can bring ideas forward for tax reform that don't raise taxes but actually eliminate loopholes, reduce rates, create a progrowth environment, and the revenues come from a growing economy, not from higher taxes. They can come forward with all of these ideas and more.

But the important point is they must come forward by November with $1.8 trillion in savings to help get us back on the right path, the right path to good fiscal management. The debt ceiling is not increased in that second step until they do. That is making sure we fulfill our responsibility and do things in the right order.

Then this bill also provides that we have a vote on a balanced budget amendment, and that vote on the balanced budget amendment must be sometime between October 1 and the end of the year. Myself and others have cosponsored a balanced budget amendment, and I strongly believe that is what we need.

I understand there are differences of opinion, but when we look at the situation we recognize we need that fiscal discipline in Washington, DC. If we just think about it for a minute, a balanced budget amendment, how does it work? Well, it works in a way that gets everybody involved, not just in Washington, DC, but throughout this great Nation—because what are we doing? By passing a balanced budget amendment in the Congress, which we have to do with two-thirds of the Senate and two-thirds of the House, what we are doing is starting that balanced budget amendment on its way traveling throughout this country and saying to the people of this good country: What do you want to do?

Why not ask the people? That is how our democracy works. Why not ask them: Do you want to make sure we have a balanced budget that requires Congress to see that, year in and year out, we are living within our means?

Forty-nine States have either a constitutional or statutory requirement to balance their budget to live within their means. Cities do, counties, families, businesses. Since three-fourths of the States would have to ratify that balanced budget amendment as well, we say to them: Look, we think we need a balanced budget, and we are going to make sure you have an opportunity to say what you think. I believe that is exactly what we should do.

I bring experience as a Governor. I served as a Governor for 10 years, and we were required to balance our budget every single year. We went to the people and we talked to them.

We said: Here is the plan. We don't have the dollars right now to fund all the things you want. This was back in 2000–2002 when we actually had to reduce our budget, make reductions across the board. We said: But do you know what we are going to do? We are going to make sure we live within our means and we create a progrowth environment, legal taxes and regulatory certainty that will enable business expansion, business growth, entrepreneurship, private investment, and get this economy growing, get jobs, get economic growth. Then with that growth we will make sure each year we fund our priorities; that we set some aside, some reserve aside for a rainy day, and that we do our best to continue to reduce the tax burden on our hard-working citizens. It doesn't happen in a week, it doesn't happen in a month, a year, or 2 years. It takes time to build to the position that you want. But we can do it. We have done it before.

If we look at the late 1980s, coming out of the stagflation of the 1970s and the early 1980s, in the late 1980s we had stagflation—meaning high inflation, meaning high unemployment, an economy that was moribund, people weren't working, a growing deficit. But by creating a progrowth environment and good fiscal management from the late 1980s over into the decade of the 1990s, we not only put people back to work, we eliminated that deficit and we built a surplus. We can do it again. It is all about the right approach.

So here we are today. Today we need to take that first step, and I come back to where I started. It may not be the plan exactly the way everybody wants it, but it is a plan that we can approve, and it brings together concepts that people on both sides of the aisle have brought forward. So now we need to come together and do our work for the American people. We need to come together and pass this agreement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the looming August 2 deadline. This is when the Department of the Treasury estimates the Federal Government will officially hit the $14.2 trillion debt ceiling. We all know we are at the point where we are because we have a fundamental difference in principle on how our government should be run. At the same time, most agree that our country cannot go into default, so we are in a very tough situation with a very short time period.

That is why I am concerned about the delay on this issue. Delay means harm—harm to Americans and harm to our economic recovery, especially as we grapple with a 9.2-percent unemployment rate, which is the elephant in the room. We must address jobs if we are going to have an economy that is thriving and in a recovery period. A jobless recovery is not a recovery.

The administration's reluctance to resolve this crisis has brought the very real potential of a downgrade in our country's triple A bond rating. As we get closer to next Tuesday, Standard & Poor's and Moody's and other rating agencies await the details of the final debt agreement. Then they will determine if our Nation's triple A credit rating will be downgraded. The implications of the rating could affect consumers at a very bad time. It could include a rise in interest rates on home loans, on small business loans, on student loans, and credit cards.

Yesterday the stock market fell nearly 200 points, a 1.6-percent drop. That was the third straight day of stock market decline. It leaves the Dow Jones Industrial Average down 3.3 percent and nearly on track for its worst week since August of 2010.

The threat of a downgrade is also hurting our dollar. The dollar's value fell and hit a new 2011 low against the Japanese yen and a record low against the Swiss franc.

Two things are clear. First, uncertainty and anxiety are prevalent, domestically and in the global markets. Second, this anxiety underscores the need to address our debt ceiling and deficit reduction simultaneously. While the fundamental principles on which we base our solutions to this crisis are vastly different, I do believe that both sides of the aisle in Congress and both Houses of Congress share the same goal.

The Senate majority leader and the House Speaker have put forward plans. I believe we must find a common ground between the House and the Senate with the proposals that have been put out by the Group of 6, by the majority leader, by the minority leader on our side as well as the Speaker on the House side. There have been a lot of proposals and there have been good parts in several of these proposals where we need to come together and find the best parts that we can agree on, knowing we are a divided Congress and a divided government, and move forward to a conclusion.

We can get meaningful immediate spending cuts as well as caps on future spending. That would be a very important achievement. It would be a major step forward because that is not where we were when we started. Spending cuts and caps on future spending would be a major step in the right direction. We can allow the debt limit to increase in proportion to the cuts, the real cuts. We can do this without tax hikes, because the fact is, the idea that we can tax our way out of debt has been completely repudiated. So we can cut spending, we can cap future spending, we can raise the debt limit in accordance with those caps, and without any new taxes.

That is a significant achievement as well because certainly the President was talking about increasing taxes, increasing taxes, increasing taxes when this whole negotiation began. We on our side have stood firm against new taxes, knowing this is a very fragile economic time in our country. If we want people to be hired, if we want the unemployment rate to come down, we cannot saddle our small businesses with new taxes.

We can send a clear message to the markets and to our debtors that we can stop spending too much so we will not need to tax any more, and we certainly do not want to borrow as much and have the drag we see on our economy. Americans know that in Washington we are spending too much, we are taxing plenty, and we are borrowing too much.

There is more we can do. We will not get to a balanced budget without looking at entitlements because the discretionary spending is such a small part of our total budget. Our entitlement programs are the major part of the need for reform. Our entitlement programs are nearly bankrupt. If left unchanged, our promises to current and future beneficiaries will be broken.

Mandatory spending is the long-term driver of our debt problems. The Federal Government spends approximately $2.1 trillion a year on entitlement programs, about two-thirds of our total Federal budget. I have introduced a bill, the Defend and Save Social Security Act, that would put that very important program on a fiscally sound path without cutting core benefits or raising taxes. My proposal will cover the 75-year shortfall, and anyone who is currently 58 years old and above will have no effect whatsoever with the gradual increase in retirement age. The beginning of the increase in retirement age would start with people who are under 58, and then it would be only 3 months a year. So if you are 57 you would only retire 3 months later. If you are 56 it would be 6 months later to start on Social Security.

The Senate majority leader and the House Speaker have offered proposals that call for a bipartisan, bicameral congressional committee to fix the fiscal imbalance in our Nation's finances. It is imperative that this joint committee—if it is passed by both Houses of Congress—confront entitlement reform. Entitlement reform is at the core of any long-term solution to our Nation's financial problems. If we act now, we can make progress in a very gradual way, and if we wait, it is going to be much more stark and much more problematic for people who depend on Social Security or Medicare. The opportunity to raise our debt ceiling is a defining moment in the future of our government. Let us confront the problem today and not delay the inevitable.

The more we delay, the harder it is going to be, and we have seen how hard it is already. We know this has not been an easy process because the talks between the White House and Members of Congress have fallen apart. The talks between Members of Congress on both sides of the Rotunda have fallen apart. We know this has been hard, so let's try to act now to stop it from being harder in the future, which it will be if we don't address our entitlement reforms.

I support a two-step approach. Let's take the first major step—a downpayment of almost $1 trillion. That is the first step for all of us—to cut spending by nearly $1 trillion. The second step is long-term deficit reduction that will cut more spending over a 10-year period and address entitlement reform. This can be done in a gradual way but without touching the core benefits, but we have to act now. If we don't, it will not be able to be done.

The financial viability of our country is at stake. The time is here—it is past here—to take the necessary steps to get our fiscal house in order, and I implore my colleagues to take those steps now.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I have served in this body for 19 years, and I will say I have never been more dismayed, more concerned, or more frustrated than I have been these past few days. Every day it gets a little bit worse because day by day our country grows closer to defaulting on our sovereign debt. That is something which has never, ever happened in the history of this country.

The repercussions of this protracted and public debate on whether our government will honor its financial obligations are already evident. This is what

we know for sure: The stock market has seen several days of decline as investors sell off securities. The United States is at high risk of a credit downgrade. Gold prices are climbing as people try to protect themselves from a rating downgrade and a drop in the value of the dollar. In short, default may well have catastrophic economic consequences domestically and internationally.

What is the message we are communicating to the world? Secretary Clinton told me in an evening conversation I had with her—she had just returned from visiting five countries. She said everybody was asking her: What is wrong in your country? What are you going to do?

This is now a worldwide crisis and one we must address. What we are seeing here is, in a sense, a broken government that can't take care of the affairs of its people in a prudent and practical way.

It is absolutely amazing to me that 20 to 70 Members of the House of Representatives believe they can run the government of the United States despite the fact that the Presidency and the majority in the U.S. Senate are controlled by another party. Essentially, they appear willing to allow this great Nation to default rather than compromise and reach a practical solution.

What are the consequences of default for American families? For sure, default would raise interest rates, driving up costs for everyone. For sure, the cost of owning a home, buying a car, buying food, filling a gas tank, and sending children to college will become even more expensive. It will squeeze already tight family budgets and damage this fragile economy. Many people predict a second dip recession. In essence, default causes an immediate tax increase in the form of these rising interest rates on families.

The talk of default is disrupting financial markets and will trigger a sharp fall in the stock market, causing huge losses in retirement accounts and wiping out the gains of 2 years. This morning, I saw a TV story about a man who was selling his mutual funds because he has no confidence in our ability to resolve this crisis—not a good thing to do.

Higher interest rates will also drive up costs for both the Federal and State governments because every 1 percent increase in interest payments for the Federal Government means an additional $100 billion cost to the government. A default will be devastating for State governments that would see their borrowing costs dramatically increase because their ability to borrow is tied to the interest rates paid by the Federal Government.

The cost of borrowing for States, for municipalities, and for local water districts will all rise. Let me give you an example. My own State of California recently took out a $5.4 billion loan from five major investment banks ahead of a possible default to ensure itself against rising interest rates. Here is the sixth largest economy on Earth worried that their interest rates are going to jump, so they take out a $5 billion loan from investment banks to be able to meet any increased interest on obligations owed.

For the broader economy, default would mean hundreds of thousands of jobs lost every year, according to the Federal Reserve. Chairman Bernanke said:

> The economy may be thrown into reverse and employers would start cutting jobs if Congress fails to raise the Nation's legal borrowing authority.

I have heard some say that on August 3, the Treasury will still have enough money to meet our obligations and avoid default. That is simply false. According to the Bipartisan Policy Center, the U.S. Government has $306.7 billion in payments due in August and will take in an estimated $172.4 billion in revenue for the month. That is a $134 billion shortfall for the month of August, so the Treasury will not be able to pay its bills. In other words, 44 percent of U.S. Government bills will go unpaid if the Federal Government fails to raise the debt ceiling by the August 2 deadline.

Treasury would be forced to spend all income inflows covering just six major items: interest, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, unemployment insurance, and defense vendors. That would mean entire Federal Departments would have no funds, including Justice, Labor, and Commerce. It would mean no funds for veterans' benefits, Active-Duty military pay, IRS refunds, special education, Pell grants, and more. There is simply no way to escape it.

Let me give you an example. On the next day, which is August 3, the Treasury will take in $12 billion in revenues, but it will still owe $32 billion in revenues. Let me tell you what that includes. It includes $23 billion in Social Security payments. I understand 45 million checks are ready to go out during those days. It is $2.2 billion for Medicare, $1.8 billion for education, and $1.4 billion for defense.

If the debt ceiling is not raised by August 2 or if we only reach an agreement for a short-term extension, the already-spooked credit rating agencies could react unfavorably. And here is the problem: Do you want to go back to this same situation in 6 months and go through this all over again? It makes no sense. If the marketplace wants stability and constancy, they are clearly not going to get it knowing this is going to be coming up in 6 months again.

Moody's has said it is possible our credit rating would go down with a short-term increase and warned that an agreement should get us through the year 2012. All right, don't pay attention to it, but that warning is out there. It is going to take getting through the year 2012, according to at least one of the rating houses.

Fitch has said a deficit deal must be credible and sustainable or U.S. ratings could still be downgraded. Does anybody believe it is credible and sustainable to do this for 6 months and be right back where we are today? I don't think so.

Standard & Poor's has said it may lower the country's long-term credit rating if it concludes that future adjustments to the debt ceiling are likely to be the subject of political maneuvering—not my words, their words. Do you want to go through this in 6 months again with the same results and creating all of the uncertainty for the 6 months between now and then? I don't think so.

In other words, these rating agencies have very real questions about the willingness and ability of this Congress and the administration to timely honor scheduled debt obligations.

Now, I have to say this—and I have been here for 19 years—I have never seen a time when Republicans just do not want to come to an agreement with this President. The President, I think by any standard, has bent over backward, and still Republicans walk away from the negotiating table. Well, let me tell you, I have done a lot of negotiations in my time with big labor strikes and work stoppages——

I would ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORKER. I was given an 11:10 time and saw that we were alternating. I have a conference call. I am glad for the Senator to finish, but if she could make it even shorter than that, it would be appreciated.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. How about 3 minutes?

Mr. CORKER. OK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request for 3 minutes? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, there were 2 months of negotiations with the Vice President, and Majority Leader CANTOR walked out. There were negotiations with the President and Speaker BOEHNER, and the Speaker walked out. House Republicans do not like Simpson-Bowles, nor do they like the Gang of 6 plan. These are the two big plans which offer a solution for the future. Instead, they want massive cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and discretionary spending and absolutely nothing from those Americans who are doing very well in this economy—actually, the top 1 percent.

Well, I represent 37 million people. California is bigger than 21 States and the District of Columbia put together. Fifteen million to twenty million people in my State depend on programs the Republicans want to take a meat axe to—not a scalpel, but a meat axe—SSI, Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare. We have gotten these numbers. We have looked at them for overlapping, and I can truthfully say the

number is 15 million to 20 million. Well, look, I want to know how a cut is going to affect these programs.

We could do this if we agree to take 6 months, draft in bill language from the Gang of 6, mandate the hearings, and fast track a bill to the floor of the Senate. Every Member of this body knows it is bill language that spells out what we need to look out for. I need to look out for what happens to the Medicare provider tax because so many hospitals in my State depend on it. If it lasts until 2014, it is OK, but I don't know.

I very strongly believe there is a solution and that reasonable people can work it out, and I hope the leadership of this body will talk with the leadership of the other body.

I thank the Chair, I thank Senator CORKER for his courtesy, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, it is interesting. I have some of the same concerns, maybe with different outcomes, as the Senator from California, but I agree we have not done our work.

Over the course of a little over a year, I have been traveling around the State of Tennessee making citizens aware of the unsustainable deficits our country has. I am sure people on the other side of the aisle have been doing the same. After townhall meetings all across our State in almost every forum my colleagues can imagine—I am sure the Presiding Officer has done the same—people are very aware in my State, as they are across the country, of the fact that we are on an unsustainable course. We are now beginning to have investor publications—the Wall Street Journal this morning wrote an editorial about the fact that no matter what we do regarding the actual proposals before us today, it is likely our country is going to be downgraded. So, here we are, faced with a situation where the types of legislation we are looking at—in both Chambers, I might add, in both Chambers—probably will take us to a place where our country's debt is downgraded.

I wish to first applaud both leaders—Senator REID for bringing forth a proposal today or over the last few days, and Speaker BOEHNER, the leader of the House, for doing the same on the House side. What I wish to say about that is while to me they don't meet the goals or don't meet the test our country needs to have met at this time, at least we are finally talking about proposals that will reduce spending in this country and put us back on a sustainable path. So I appreciate the leadership of both bodies. Finally, after many months, we are on the right topic.

What I have said all along is that as we approach the debt ceiling, we need to dramatically change the character of spending in this country. My concern is that our work is not quite done. The fact is there is no question of the deadline coming up. Everybody agrees it is, at least the minimum, August 2. I don't think there is any dispute that we have until August 2 to deal with this issue. I also don't think we have yet come up with a solution we need to come up with to dramatically change the character of spending in this country.

What I would say is, look, our work is not quite done. The House has a bill that basically reduces spending over the next decade by $1 trillion. Candidly, I think we all know that is not a solution that is going to prevent a downgrade in this country. It does have the goal of kicking this to a select committee of some kind that is going to try to incorporate another $1.8 trillion in cuts. Candidly, that is a big step back from where I think we were a weekend ago, where at least on the cut side—even on the cut side—even the President had agreed to at least $3 trillion in cuts. That is our understanding. So what we have coming out of the House right now is a bill that doesn't cut as much as the President had agreed to last weekend. We have on this side a bill that cuts about $1 trillion after it has been scored. Again, I applaud the leader of the Senate for putting forth a bill that at least begins moving us in the right direction, but, again, it is $2 trillion short of where the President had been with leaders a week ago, or at least that is our understanding, and I am pretty sure that understanding is correct.

We also know the general mantra adopted by Wall Street and by people who are looking at our country around the world is that we need to do something that is at least a $4 trillion solution.

I would say to the Senator from California who just spoke, I couldn't agree more. We have not addressed this situation the way we should. I don't think there is anything anybody—well, there may be a few—the vast majority of this body does not want to see our country default on its obligations. I don't know of anybody who wants to do that. I want to see dramatic changes in the character of spending for our country, and many people have sought that. Our work is not yet done.

What I would say is, let's have a short-term extension. There is no question that we do not want the sovereign debt of this country to be downgraded because we default. Nobody wants to see that happen. We are at least finally on the right topic. We are talking about spending reductions. We certainly haven't done the work necessary to achieve the goal we need to achieve in this body. But I couldn't agree more. Let's have a short-term extension. Let's extend it another week or 2 weeks or 3 weeks. A lot of people say, Well, the fact is that will roil the markets. I don't think it will roil the markets. I think they are used to us waiting until an hour before the deadline to work out a solution. I think that has become customary, if you will, in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

So what I would say is if we don't do the work now—we have a historic opportunity right now. Right now, the whole world, all of our country, all of our citizens are all frustrated. The Members of the House and the Senate are all focused on one thing and that is what kind of a package can we put forth to actually cause our country to be more solvent at this time.

We are finally on the right topic, yet we haven't even, in these aspirational bills that are laid out—we know that with all the actuarial assumptions that exist, with Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid, that if we don't touch trying to make them solvent for the longer haul, we haven't even done our work. The bills before us don't even have as an aspirational goal—for instance, the House bill that is coming over with a select committee that I know Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL have been involved in—and I thank them for their work—doesn't even lay out that one of the things we are looking at is ensuring Social Security is actuarially sound. The future of these young pages who potentially down the road—not potentially, hopefully—will benefit from Social Security, I think they would like to know that during this historic time we are actually looking at the real issue.

What I am afraid of is we are missing the opportunity for this to be the seminal moment we all thought it was going to be because we don't yet have a product that solves the problem. The product we are looking at in both bodies—and I thank the leaders of both bodies for bringing them forth—does not meet the test. It doesn't dramatically change the character of spending in Washington. It doesn't even stave off a downgrade in U.S. sovereign debt.

We are on the brink of actually doing something great for our country. And because we now have our country's focus and everybody in both bodies is focused on this problem, let's have a short-term extension. I agree. Let's don't default. Let's move back a week or 2 weeks or 3 weeks. But let's don't miss this historic opportunity to do something great for our country, which is exactly what we are doing now.

It is hard for me to believe, seriously, that what we have before us is a $1 trillion downpayment. It is also hard for me to believe, candidly, that we are going to set up a select committee that is going to report back in 4 or 5 months when all of us know what the issues are. We understand the math. I know we get ridiculed a lot for the way we act in this body, but I think most of us candidly pretty well understand what the solutions are. We all know nobody gets to work on anything around here until there is an imminent deadline. So even with this committee being potentially set up by mutual discussion down the road—I know there are a lot of negotiations—to me they should report back. I agree with the Senator from California. Let's report back at the end of this fiscal year, September

30—there is no reason to wait—and if that type of bill were to pass where we have a two-stage process, let's go ahead and get the work out of the way.

I want to go back to the bigger picture for a moment and I will conclude momentarily. We have an opportunity right now where we have never been focused in the way we are right now—in the 4½ years I have been here—on something as important as this as it relates to us getting our house in order. We have never been this focused. What I am afraid of, in the name of political efficacy—people saying, Hey, look, let's take what we can get and get on out of here so we don't mess up our potential, on both sides of the aisle, for the 2012 elections—take what you have on both sides. Basically, let's think about it. For the other side of the aisle, the way all of the proposals before us are laid out, there is no dealing with trying to make the entitlements sustainable, so they can run in 2012 on the entitlement issue. With all of the proposals laid out right now, we don't deal with spending appropriately, so our country is probably going to have its debt downgraded, so Republicans can run on the fact that we haven't reduced spending enough. So if we look at it, this works well for everybody, except the citizens of our country.

Again, we are finally on the right topic, which is a rarity here. We are finally focused on the problem. We have two bills that don't go far enough. Again, I applaud both the Democratic leader and the Republican leader for putting forth proposals. We all know they don't do what they need to do—either proposal. We know the aspirational goals of each proposal don't take us far enough.

I would say to all: I agree. Let's don't default. Let's don't buck up against August 3. Let's pass a short-term time extension. Let's take us through the end of August or the first 2 weeks in September, or let's take a week, but let's finish our work in this body. Let's don't miss this seminal opportunity where everybody in this country and everybody in this world is looking at how undisciplined we have been and the opportunity we have before us to actually be disciplined and send a signal to the world that our future is not the future that Greece is seeing today; our future is the continuation of American exceptionalism all around this world. We are squandering that opportunity right now in this body at a time when we are finally focused on the right topic.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Presiding Officer, as I always do.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, Senator TOM HARKIN is on his way from the meeting the Presiding Officer and I were just at because we both want to talk more about this National Mediation Board crisis and also the fact that the FAA is on hold, that we cannot do anything with it. What the House did—you see, one of the revelations of the modern era, which hopefully will last only a couple years, is that the folks in the House are willing to say ''no'' to the very end. In other words, the question I would raise is that my plan is to raise the stakes on the airlines, doing quite dreadful things to them, in hopes they will engage with the House Members to say we have to have an FAA bill.

As I said yesterday, all I seek is a clean bill of extension. That has been done 20 times on this FAA bill. It has taken us 4 years, and we have not been able to reauthorize it. There are some things to work out, but they can all be worked out.

The House sent over a message saying they did not like what we were doing on the essential air service. Well, the Presiding Officer knows what the essential air service means for rural communities, which is to have it in order that communities have an economic future of any kind at all. But, on the other hand, we have been willing to make reforms. In fact, the reforms we have suggested are more dramatic reforms than the House has suggested: put a cap on the number of airports—some quite dramatic things I actually hate doing in order to try to get agreement on that subject.

But what is more interesting is, that is not what they care about. Mr. MICA, who is my counterpart in the House, has often said he does not have a dog in the essential air service fight. Yesterday I was meeting with him and Secretary LaHood, who is completely with the Senate in our desire to get this done and to break the intransigence of the House, and my counterpart simply said—I said: Why did you send that over when that is not what you care about? He said: Well, sometimes it is a little political thing.

I was not shocked by that because that is why I knew he had done it, but what it says is they are willing to tank the Federal Aviation Administration unless the Senate caves to their position on the National Mediation Board, which would undo 75 years of labor law and which would take an extraordinary situation, which Senator HARKIN, when he gets here, if he gets here, is going to talk more about.

But the principle they want and they like is the fact that if you have an election—it could be a union election, it could be any kind of an election, but let's say for the purposes of this it is a union election—and people do not show up to vote, as is always the case. Then for those people who did not show up to vote, their vote is automatically characterized as a ''no'' vote on the idea of certifying to get a union.

This is purely the work of Delta. Most of the legacy airlines are unionized. Delta is not. Delta's CEO makes $9 million a year, their top management another $20 million a year. They could practically pay for the whole Essential Air Service Program themselves. But they do not want to fool around with this language to protect their antiworker ambitions.

They have had four union elections in the last several years. They have prevailed. The airline has prevailed in all four of those elections. But they still want this language changed so that if you do not vote, you are put down as a ''no'' vote; that is, not to be able to organize. That is un-American. It is unprecedented in American history. And it goes against, as I said, 75 years of labor law. That is very dangerous.

What we have to do is to try and make it clear—frankly, the other airlines have been rather tepid in their support of my position. Airlines are a close group and they tend to stay together. They have to stop that. They have to make the House understand that if they persist in this rule, we will have a Federal aviation system that will shut down altogether. I am talking about air traffic controllers. I am talking about the whole deal. It is not a long process. It is a horrible process. It is an antiworker process which they are dumping in our laps. They want to see that happen. They are willing to see that happen. They will not compromise on the National Mediation Board. They will not compromise. They have said that. I have often talked with my counterpart over there, and he says: Well: I do not make those decisions. Those are made at a higher pay grade. He uses that word. Why does somebody run for public office if they simply take orders from other people? Well, that is sort of the way they do things over there in the House, but it is extremely dangerous.

The truth lies in the fact that the House provision that cuts the Essential Air Service Program by $16 million—that is what it does. At the same time, the House has been willing to let $150 million drain from the airport trust fund in less than a week. Every day we do not get this bill resolved, $25 million drops out of the airport trust fund, which is flush for now but is becoming very unflush very quickly.

The FAA extensions are very necessary. They are not something which people walk around here talking about all the time, but if they find they do not have flights to get to their homes on the west coast or in the South or anywhere else, they will be very angry. People will be very angry. I do not know of any alternative but to ratchet up the pressure, to make those who are blocking this understand they are

causing a national disaster and they need to back off from that position.

They have said they will not. Well, will that be the final solution? It may very well be, and we have to understand that. But you cannot negotiate something which is so antiworker. You cannot negotiate that. The President has said he will veto it if it appears in the bill in any form. The House has voted for it. The Senate has voted against it. We have been very clear that it cannot pass over here and will not pass over here. So why are they playing that game?

The airlines are not now even paying for their use of the national airspace system. The carriers also do not appear to care about the impact on the dedicated FAA workforce that serves them—once again, 4,000 already having been furloughed. Most of the airlines are not even passing any savings on to the customers they serve. Why do I say that? Because they are having a tax holiday now because our extension ran out. So all of a sudden they do not have to pay taxes on jet fuel and a number of other things, so they are getting a lot of money. But what will you do with that money? Would you keep it for yourself or would you turn it over to the trust fund or would you keep ticket prices the same and not raise them? Well, they keep it. Frontier Airlines, I think Alaska Airlines, Virgin, all have kept their fares exactly where they were. They are trying to protect the consumer.

Delta and the other airlines are raising ticket prices as fast as they can, even though, because the time has run out on the agreement, they are getting endless millions of dollars. They are choosing to keep it and make a profit for themselves. That is unconscionable behavior in terms of national policy.

What are the real benefits to Delta from what they are doing? How badly were they harmed by the decision, the NMB decision? After the change, several unionization votes were held among components of their work force, which I have already said. None of those units voted to organize. So what is their game? It is a game. It is politics. It is theology. You cannot let that stand. You cannot allow people to get furloughed who are serious about their jobs, who are engineers and technical people—the first 4,000. Many of them will not come back. They will choose to figure: Well, they will never get this settled. They will go out and find other jobs, and they will be able to get other jobs. It is unconscionable. It is almost you cannot believe you are in this situation, that you are in some ''Disney World'' somewhere where people do not take life seriously and do not take policies seriously.

I want to reiterate that the Senate appointed conferees—which is sort of necessary to try and reach resolution—on the very day the House sent over its FAA package for us to consider. We appointed conferees. More than 100 days later—1–0-0 days later—the House still dragged its feet. The House has still not named any conferees.

What am I to make of that? They are not serious about this. So if they are not serious about it, do we then buckle because they are not serious or do we stand for what is right and what is fair for the people who work for the Federal Aviation Administration and also, frankly, for consumers of aviation all over this country?

I will tell you, you wait until some of these air traffic control systems shut down, the towers shut down because there is nobody to man them. Then business, American business and these airlines are going to understand how bad it is going to be. The only policy I know how to adopt is to try and drive home to them what they are actually doing to their own futures. They will shut themselves down if they continue on their course.

We can still get this process working again, but we need to get the FAA stable first. We should pass a clean extension, that which we have done forever. All extensions are clean. Senator CORKER was just talking about a clean extension on something else. We should pass a clean extension and then get to work finding a compromise on our remaining differences.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and await the presence of Senator HARKIN who will be speaking on this subject.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, first, I wish to thank Senator ROCKEFELLER for his leadership on the FAA issue. It is so important in rural areas. It is so important to attract and retain a workforce. It is so important to the local economies in large cities like Cleveland, Cincinnati and Columbus and in smaller communities too. As Senator ROCKEFELLER said, our aviation system is absolutely critical for economic development.

People in big cities might make fun of small airports that they do not have all the hustle and bustle. But we do know medium-sized and smaller airports matter a great deal.

With the refusal of the House to take up a clean extension of FAA, nearly 4,000 employees across the country have been furloughed and dozens of construction projects have come to a halt. In this economy, some radicals in the House of Representatives have decided—because they have a political mission and ideology that does not quite fit with the majority of Americans—they are going to again hold hostage something that simply needs to be done; that is, what is called reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration.

As Senator ROCKEFELLER said, these furloughed employees may be forced to look elsewhere for jobs to meet their mortgage payments or pay for groceries—these are very skilled technicians and engineers. And what does this mean to these construction projects? FAA helps to pay, all over the country, for modernization of airports—rebuilding air traffic control towers, improving runways, and making countless safety improvements.

We have all heard stories—I do not recall that I have ever seen it, but we have heard stories of the Beijing or Shanghai airports or some of these airports—I have not seen them in the last many years—about the new technologies and the modern features of those airports. As a country we cannot afford to fall behind. We have to keep up.

Not passing a clean extension of the FAA bill is exactly the wrong thing to do. The unemployment rate in the construction industry is nearly double the national average. Yet we are idling cranes and we are idling bulldozers all because of a political mission, an ideology that some Members of the House—some radical Members of the House—have decided to inflict on us.

A clean extension of FAA has been done 20 times. All of a sudden it is not. I hope the House gets serious. I hope they appoint conferees and come to the table and work this out. I appreciate very much Senator ROCKEFELLER's leadership. He is making a difference on these important issues, and our House colleagues need to follow.

SUPPORTING AMERICAN MANUFACTURING

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I wish to talk also about another issue where we should have done a clean extension—as we have done dozens of times in this country. In the past three decades alone, we have avoided default by addressing the debt limit 38 times; 34 of those were with Republican Presidents. That is almost 90 percent of the time we have raised the debt ceiling—more precisely, avoided default—it has been under Republican Presidents.

A lot of us did not like it. We maybe made a public statement saying we did not like their fiscal policy, but we never stood in the way, we never tried to take hostage—take the government hostage or each other hostage by saying—almost like children—if I do not get my way, then I am going to block this and I am going stop—I am going to potentially throw our financial system and our economy into turmoil. What kind of behavior is that for adults?

Then, when I hear Speaker BOEHNER and some of his radical kind of cheerleaders on the far political right say we should do this again in 6 months, I wonder what are they possibly thinking, when we go through this right now.

I spend a lot of time with manufacturers around my State. I love seeing

things made. My State is the third largest manufacturing State in the country, exceeded in production only by California, three times our population, and Texas, twice our population. I talk to manufacturers, and some of them are not investing now for a variety of reasons. Mostly they do not see the demand for products because the demand is still anemic in our society, in our economy, for companies to grow.

But they also talk about the uncertainty. They talk about the uncertainty in the economic environment. This is the worst kind of uncertainty we are going to inject into our economy if we are going to say let's do this in 6 months. Do they think anybody in North Carolina or Ohio or around the State, around the country, any businesses are thinking: This is a great time to invest, right when Moody's and Standard & Poor's might downgrade us, right when we do not know what is going to happen in the next week with a potential default.

Do they think anybody is going to make a major investment decision right now? Of course, they are not. So let's do it again in 6 months? When I heard Speaker BOEHNER—I like JOHN BOEHNER personally. He is from my State. Our offices obviously work together in places such as Butler County, Preble County, and the Dayton-Cincinnati areas. But I would have thought people would have laughed when he said: Yes, let's do this again in 6 months because we do not have a jobs problem to worry about. Clearly, we should get this done with and focus—that means cutting the budget. I understand that. We have to work toward a balanced budget.

We knew how to do it in the 1990s. In the early 1990s, President Clinton—I came to the House the year he was elected President. We faced a terrible budget situation and an unemployment situation. But you know what. We cut spending. We increased taxes appreciably for only a relatively few number of people, the wealthiest people in our society. We continued to make investments in education, health care and infrastructure and our economy.

We had almost 8 years—not quite, maybe 7 years some months—of regular economic growth, and 21 million new jobs were created. So we know how to do this. But this crowd wants to hold the government hostage saying, if you do not do it exactly our way, we are going to let the government go to default, and once we solve that, let's do it again in 6 months.

I just think it does not make sense. What we should be doing instead is focusing—I know what an important manufacturing State the Presiding Officer represents in North Carolina, as in Ohio—on manufacturing. We are still a country that makes things. My State is particularly a State that makes things.

The year after what is called the American Recovery Act passed, my State got more new jobs in clean energy than any State in the United States of America. My State is a leader in aerospace. It is a leader in auto and steel and chemicals and cement and paper and aluminum and glass. Yet we are also in the kind of traditional industries, and we are also, as I said, a leader in solar, in Toledo, OH, and other places.

We are a leader in wind turbine component manufacturing, especially in the northeast but all over Ohio. We are a leader in aerospace, as I mentioned. We are a leader in biomedical and biotech, in large part because we have great universities and great teaching hospitals in, I was going to say, prominently in northeast Ohio but also Columbus, also Cincinnati, also Toledo—all over our State. Clearly, we know how to do these things. But what we have seen in the past three decades is a shift in our Nation. Thirty years ago, manufacturing was 25, 26, 27 percent of our gross domestic product. Basically, one-fourth of the dollars in our economy were all about manufacturing.

That created great wealth, because the way to create wealth is to make something, to grow something or to mine something, preeminently. So 30 years ago, manufacturing was some 23, 24, 25, 26 percent of our GDP. Financial services was only 11 percent in those days. Today, it is almost the reverse. Financial services makes up about 20 or 22 percent and manufacturing makes up only about 11 percent of our GDP and even a slightly smaller percent of our workforce.

Why does this matter? It matters because we know when we make things it creates wealth. Manufacturing jobs pay 20 percent more, on average, than service jobs. We know the difference between retail versus making steel or the difference between fast food restaurant work versus making cars or chemicals or glass or biotech.

We know manufacturing jobs have a strong multiplier effect. So if we have an auto company—let me give an example. The Chevrolet Cruze is a car my daughter just brought—by and large, an Ohio car. It would not have happened if we had not done the auto rescue that so many of my colleagues opposed for ideological reasons, not substantive, practical, let's-make-it-work reasons. Nonetheless, we know the auto industry is coming back and we know manufacturing jobs have increased—far too anemically, but they have increased over the last year.

But the Chevy Cruze, the engine is made in Defiance, OH, and the bumper is made in Northwood, OH, and the transmission is made in Toledo, OH, and the steel comes out of Cleveland, OH, for much of the car. The aluminum wheels come out of Cleveland, OH. The stamping is done in Parma, OH. Some of the other stamping is down in Lordstown, OH. The assembly is done in Lordstown, OH. There are 5,000 people working just on the assembly alone. So that is the multiplier effect. When we assemble in Toledo, we assemble the Jeep. Chrysler assembles the Jeep in Toledo.

Some 3 years ago, only 50 percent of the components for the Jeep were American made. Today, over 70 percent are American made. So we know manufacturing creates all kinds of jobs, making 20 percent more, on average, than service jobs.

Since the beginning of the recession, though, we still see profits at large financial institutions and other service firms increase, but our Nation's unemployment rate is still hovering around 9 percent. So when profits go up for those financial services firms—and I appreciate JPMorgan Chase in Columbus, OH. I met with their top person in Ohio just this week—just moving from Cleveland to Columbus. I know the important work they do in my State. I know they provide thousands and thousands and thousands of jobs. That is all a good thing.

But I also know in an economy which is not paying attention to manufacturing, we do not get the multiplier effect, we do not get the higher wages, we do not get the employment growth that we might get otherwise.

That is why, yesterday, Senator ROCKEFELLER and I convened a meeting, where Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator JACK REED, Senators SCHUMER and KLOBUCHAR and FEINSTEIN and others attended. We talked about a real national manufacturing strategy. That means closing the skills gap. We have a lot of jobs in places such as Iowa and North Carolina, Ohio, where they go unfilled because we do not have well enough connected worker training with those jobs, with the needs. We need to pursue better tax and trade policies. We need to pay special attention to manufacturing.

Yesterday, the Senate sent to the House legislation we passed unanimously that said: When the government buys American flags, rather than 50 percent—a requirement that 50 percent of them be made in the United States—the requirement now is that 100 percent be made in the United States.

Why do we not put more focus on ''Made in the USA''? It will matter for us. It matters for our national pride on flags, to be sure, but it matters for our communities, it matters our companies, and it matters for our workers.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I meant to be here earlier when Senator

ROCKEFELLER was on the floor speaking about the situation with the Federal Aviation Administration. However, I was unavoidably detained while chairing a hearing on the HELP Committee that just adjourned a few minutes ago. I wanted to be here to discuss with Senator ROCKEFELLER the sad situation we are facing right now with the shutdown of the Federal Aviation Administration.

We are now in the sixth day of the defunding of the Federal Aviation Administration. What that means is that right now we have some 4,000 FAA workers who are furloughed, and tens of thousands of people out of work in airport construction jobs—infrastructure. These are people who are not working for the government; they are working for private contractors who have a contract with FAA for runway construction, putting in lights, safety measures, things like that. So tens of thousands of people are out of work in the private sector because of the cutoff of FAA reimbursements to these businesses around the country.

It is costing the Federal Government about $25 million in tax revenue a day—$25 million a day in lost revenue. That money would be plowed back into the economy to pay for aviation operations and for the people who are working out there on construction jobs building runways, lighting systems, and things like that.

At a time when we have so many people who are unemployed in our country—and the underemployment rate is really somewhere between 16 and 18 percent—with over 23 million people in America out of work, what do the Republicans do? They hold up funding for the Federal Aviation Administration, which puts 4,000 more FAA people on furlough and tens of thousands of people working on construction jobs around the country out of work. Why would the Republican Members of this Congress do such a thing? Because they want to overturn a National Mediation Board decision that was handed down a little over a year ago to align the election procedures under the National Railway Labor Act with the provisions that have always been in place under the National Labor Relations Act.

Let me explain that. Under the National Labor Relations Act, which has been in existence since the late 1930s, if you have an election to see whether workers want to organize a union, you count the yeas and you count the nays of those who vote. If the yeas are more than the nays, the workers form a union. If the nays are more than the yeas, they don't form a union. Under the Railway Labor Act, an odd thing took place. Under that, it said that if you have an election for a union, you count the yeas, you count the nays, and then all those people who didn't vote, you put them in the ''nay'' column. Interesting. If you don't vote, you are an automatic no.

What the National Mediation Board did a year ago was realign this using rulemaking procedures. They said that from now on you would only count the yeas and the nays. You would not assign to one side or the other those who didn't vote. To most of us, that just seems to make plain old common sense. After all, any election for your local school board—and we know the turnout is pretty low; school board elections usually turn out maybe 20 percent of the electorate, maybe less than that. Yet I submit there is probably no more important election in America today than school board elections. I will not get into that right now. What if we said: In all these school board elections, take the yeas, and then all the people who didn't vote, they are a no.

What if we did that in Senate races? That strikes home to people around here. Say a Senator is running for reelection, and if you are lucky, you get a 60-percent turnout of voters. That means the people who don't vote are considered a ''no'' vote on the incumbent. Is that what we want to see? If you don't vote, that is a ''no'' vote on your reelection. Most people would think that is inherently unfair. It is inherently unfair.

The same is true in elections on whether workers want to form a union. There are a lot of reasons people don't vote in an election. Maybe they are sick and they can't go vote. Maybe they can't make up their mind one way or the other. Maybe they said: Well, I see this side, and I see that side, and I cannot make up my mind, so I am just not going to vote. Some people just say: I don't care which side wins; I am disinterested in this election. Thankfully, in America, we don't have somebody forcing somebody to vote. So it makes common sense that if you don't vote, you should not be counted on one side or the other.

The National Mediation Board put this rule in place. They went through all the hearings, the comment period, and all the stuff necessary to pass the rule. Then it was brought up in the Senate within the last year under a procedure called the Congressional Review Act, wherein there is an expedited procedure for the Senate to take up and vote on a regulation as to whether we want to overturn it. It is an expedited procedure, an up-or-down vote. That was brought up here, and, as the chairman of the committee that has jurisdiction over labor, I debated it with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It was a fairly good debate, I thought, and we voted. The Senate voted not to overturn that regulation. Well, you would think that would be the end of it. No, you would be wrong.

What does that have to do with the FAA? Because the Republicans in the House and some in the Senate are saying they are not going to let this FAA reauthorization bill get through unless and until we overturn the decision—this rule of the National Mediation Board which basically says that if you don't vote in the election, you are not counted on one side or the other. They are holding the FAA hostage—4,000 workers furloughed, tens of thousands in airport construction out of work, $25 million a day being lost in revenue that would be taken in so we could put these people back to work. It is all because they want to make it harder for workers to form a union.

Think about it this way. We are going to have a Presidential election next year. Let's say all the people who don't vote would be tallied as a ''no'' vote for the incumbent President, assuming he runs for reelection. Some of my Republican friends would probably like that, and I understand that. Do you think the American people would think that is fair, that if you don't vote, you are counted as a ''no'' vote?

A Federal district court—they took this to court—also rejected a legal challenge to these new rules, finding that the National Mediation Board was acting well within its legal authority in modernizing the election.

We see this time and time again. It is happening now in this Congress. Whenever we try to make things more fair or to use a legitimate procedure to address something that I think most people would think would be unfair; that is, counting somebody who didn't vote as a ''no'' vote—when we do that, Republicans always try to find an end run to try to undo that.

We are down to about 10 percent of our labor force that is now unionized. My friends on the other side will not be happy until there are no more unions in America. They will not be happy until unionization is less than 1 percent, and then only a company-sponsored union, not an independent union.

Right now, Republicans are voting to change the law in the middle of a trial as a special favor to the Boeing company. Boeing was accused of retaliating against its workers for going on strike.

As I have pointed out in numerous talks on the Senate floor, there is a judicial process that has been used by both labor and management for more than 70 years to settle disputes. That process has been to go to the NLRB—and management has done it, as well as labor—to find out if a certain thing was wrong or if a union has overstepped its bounds or if management has overstepped its bounds. The NLRB tries to mediate and get the two sides to agree, but if they can't, a process is set in motion whereby the General Counsel—who, by the way, was a career person, not a political appointee, as some have said—then begins an investigation to see whether the facts as presented warrant the next step, which is bringing the case to an administrative law judge.

That is what happened in this Boeing case. I have heard all this nonsense about how they are trying to take jobs out of South Carolina, trying to destroy right-to-work States. That is nonsense. Right now, the case is before an administrative law judge to see whether Boeing actually retaliated

against its employees for their exercising a legal right to organize and bargain collectively as a union.

Did Boeing retaliate against them for doing that? I don't know. My Republican friends seem to think they know. But it should go through the process before the administrative law judge, and that finding can be appealed by either side—management or labor—and it goes to the NLRB, and then they make a decision, which could be appealed to the Federal appeals court or circuit court. That decision can be appealed to the Supreme Court. Yet the Republicans want to interfere in that process and make it a political decision as to whether this case should go forward. Just as they are wrong to try to change the rules in the middle of a case going forward to benefit Boeing, what is happening now with the FAA is also wrong. They are trying to interfere in the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration to change a rule from the National Mediation Board.

The other day, one of my colleagues was talking about when are we going to stop doing favors for the union bosses or big unions or something like that. I never thought the National Mediation Board rule was a favor to a union. I always looked upon it as a fair decision, regulation, to make it in line with the National Labor Relations Act. Why should we have two separate kinds of election procedures for forming a union in this country? Take it to the American people. It is common sense. I think that most people would say that someone who doesn't vote shouldn't be counted as a ''no'' vote? As I said, we don't do that in the National Labor Relations Act. We have had this sort of anomaly for years. We finally tried to get it straightened out, and that is what is costing us these jobs and $25 million a day.

There is another issue they have brought up, and that is the essential air service at a number of small airports. We can debate that. We can talk about essential air service to small airports. The bill would eliminate it. That is about $16 million a year—$16 million a year—that it would save. Clearly, that is not what the Republicans care about. Every week—every week—they hold up the FAA reauthorization, it is costing the Federal Government some $150 million in uncollected taxes to support our airports. So in order to save $16 million a year, they are willing to cost the government $150 million a week. Boy, that is some kind of economics on the part of my Republican friends. So strictly from a budget perspective, the House's obstructionism is not just absurd, it is grossly counterproductive.

Again, this is uncalled for, what they are doing, to hold up the FAA reauthorization. As I said, we are now going into the sixth day, and it is going to have an effect on air travel. It is going to have a profound effect on air travel the longer this plays out. So I ask the House Republican leadership to get off of this obstructionism—get off of this—and let us deal forthrightly on the bill before us—which is the FAA reauthorization—and quit trying to overturn this rule of the National Mediation Board.

On essential air service, I think there are probably some compromises that can be made. There are some adjustments and modifications that can be made. I think that is probably so. We ought to work in good will in doing that on the longer term bill. But it is not right to hold up the FAA reauthorization right now on either the essential air service objections or their trying to overturn the decision of the National Mediation Board.

Again, I want to thank Senator ROCKEFELLER for his leadership on this issue and for his vigorous opposition to the House Republicans' effort both to eliminate totally essential air service and to try to do a backdoor, end run around the National Mediation Board's rule on providing for fair elections for those who seek to belong and to form a union in the airline or railway industry.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, let me begin by applauding Senator HARKIN, my colleague from Iowa, for his comments relative to the FAA and the need to put the people who are out of work back to work and to get the FAA reauthorization done. It has been way too long.

We have a number of people who staff the tower that deals with air traffic coming into the United States north of Boston. That tower is in New Hampshire. We have people out of work. We need to get them back to work and we need to see this legislation done and moving forward.

DEBT DEFAULT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I came to the floor this afternoon because the United States Government is now less than 1 week away from defaulting on its obligations for the first time in our history. As we have heard from economists and business leaders across the country, a default could result in hundreds of thousands of lost jobs and in higher interest rates for every American, yet we are still debating whether we should avoid default. It is a very dangerous game, and we are risking permanent harm to the American economy.

I want to examine one consequence of default for a minute. All three credit rating agencies—S&P, Moody's, and Fitch—have said a default would automatically result in a lower credit rating for the U.S. Government. I think we all understand the principle of credit rating. It is like the credit scores on record for most of us in our personal lives. The better we have been about paying our debts in the past, the better our credit score. When we go to buy a house or a car, when we ask for a loan, the bank looks at that credit score and decides how much interest to charge us. The worse we have been at paying our debts in the past, the lower our score and the more money we pay in interest.

The credit rating agencies are keeping a credit score on the U.S. Government. So far, it has been perfect. The United States has never failed to pay its debts. That is why we have the lowest interest rates in the world, and loaning money to the U.S. Government is considered the world's safest investment. With a default, that would all change. And here is the key: It would change in just minutes, and that change would last for generations. If we default, the credit rating agencies will lower our credit rating immediately.

I recently had a conversation with Martin Regalia, the chief economist of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In that conversation he said the market reaction to default would take ''nanoseconds.'' Once we have defaulted, we can never unring that bell. Our special status as the world's safest investment may never return. We will have increased our interest rates for decades to come and maybe even longer. JPMorgan Chase said this week that a lower credit rating could cost our government $100 billion a year in interest.

This is the worst kind of wasteful spending because that money wouldn't be going to investments in our economy or to secure a better future for our children. It would go to nothing. It would do nothing. It would be money down the drain.

We have a path forward. It is the plan that has recently been proposed by Senator REID. There are a lot of things about this plan I don't like. I am concerned because I don't think it takes a balanced approach toward deficit reduction that I have long called for, and I am disappointed that it lacks the $4 trillion in deficit reduction we need. But I am ready to support it. And because all the cuts in this bill are cuts that Republicans have already supported, they should be prepared to support this plan too.

The Reid plan would cut at least $2.2 trillion of our debt while allowing us to avoid default through the end of next year. These two elements are crucial to avoiding the lower credit rating we have been hearing raised as a concern. We need to provide the markets with some long-term certainty that will avoid default, and some proof we can deal seriously with our long-term deficits and debt.

A short-term, 6-month increase, as proposed in the House, would kick the can down the road. It won't prevent a lower credit rating. We need to end this constant threat of default which is paralyzing our government and our economy. The Reid plan achieves this through a combination of cuts to our

domestic spending, reduced spending on the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and through targeted cuts to mandatory spending. It doesn't raise taxes, and it doesn't touch Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security.

Again, this is not a perfect plan. I have been on the floor many times in favor of a balanced package that includes cuts to spending—domestic, defense, and mandatory—but also includes increased revenues. The Reid plan doesn't achieve those goals, but I do have hope that we will get there eventually.

This is not a proposal I would have written, but I am 1 of 100 Members of the Senate and 1 of 535 Members of Congress, so I don't get everything I want. None of us here in Congress get everything we want. That is the nature of compromise. That is the nature of democracy. That is why the Framers of the Constitution created checks and balances in government. That is why they created two Chambers in Congress and three branches of government. When you are a leader in government, you don't have the luxury of drawing a line in the sand and walking away. You have to be prepared to stay at the table and to give up something.

I have just laid out what I and I believe many of my colleagues are willing to give up in this proposal—our demand for a comprehensive balanced plan to reduce the deficit. In exchange, I am willing to accept a plan that includes more cuts than any other plan on the table. These are cuts that 40 of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have already supported. This is a plan that I think neither side is going to love but both sides should be able to accept. It is a plan that gets the job done.

We here in the Senate and in Congress have to get the job done, so I urge that we come to the table, we adopt a compromise, and we put this debt ceiling vote behind us.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we are not in a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct.

Mr. REID. It is a rare occasion.

ECONOMIC STABILITY

Mr. REID. Madam President, today the House of Representatives will vote on Speaker BOEHNER's short-term plan to raise the debt ceiling. As soon as the House completes its vote tonight, or this afternoon, the Senate will move to take up the message they send to us. It will be defeated. They know that, and the American people now should understand that clearly.

No Democrat will vote for a short-term bandaid approach that will put our economy at risk and put the Nation back in the untenable situation we are in today in just a few short months from now. Economists have said a short-term arrangement holds many of the same risks as a technical default. Democrats are not willing to put our economy on the line for something such as that. It is something we cannot do for the good of the country. Our economy and the financial markets desperately need stability. Speaker BOEHNER's bill does not provide either. It does not provide stability, and it certainly doesn't help our economy in any way.

I believe it is time for the tea party Republicans to stop resisting compromise. They must join Democrats and Republicans of good will to put the economy ahead of politics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I wish to underscore what the leader has said.

The bottom line is very simple. Speaker BOEHNER is busy twisting arms right now to try to get his bill passed through the House, but it is a futile gesture because that bill is not going to pass the Senate. We have made that clear in the letter that 53 of us signed yesterday, and nothing has changed. The idea that we will take BOEHNER's bill and pass it or take BOEHNER's bill and tweak it and pass it is not what is going to happen. So we would urge Speaker BOEHNER and all of our Republican colleagues to sit down and negotiate.

Throwing a hot potato over to us that will not pass just delays things a day, and we are simply 4 days away from one of the worst financial catastrophes that could face this country; namely, for the first time in our 230-year history, a refusal to pay the debt. That means the time for these kinds of political games and political posturing is over.

Speaker BOEHNER is having a rough time getting the votes over there, but my guess is he will. But it will not make a darned bit of difference. It will not make a darned bit of difference because it is not going to pass this house, the Senate. It will not pass because a short-term extension risks the same things that no extension risks: a downgrade, a lack of confidence in the markets, and gridlock. We have seen gridlock up to now; 3, 4, 5, 6 months from now the same gridlock will occur. We cannot play with this kind of risky fire.

So our plea to the Speaker is stop continuing to throw pieces of red meat after red meat after red meat, piece after piece after piece of red meat to that rightwing lion in your caucus. Start taming the lion. That is what you have to do because otherwise that lion will devour you and devour the economy of our country.

The kind of narrow ideological approach that we have seen in the House will not get us anywhere. The shame of it all is that not every Member of the House, and I don't believe the Speaker, has that ideology, the sort of my-way-or-no-way ideology, the no-compromise ideology, and it is time to break free. It is time to do what is good for the country.

A short-term solution will not work. The leader has just made clear that as soon as the House passes its bill, it will be defeated in the Senate. Let's not waste 5, 6, 7, 8 more hours. Let's start negotiating something that will save this country from potential financial catastrophe now.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator from New York for his very lucid remarks and for his great leadership in trying to get through this mess.

I say to my friend, a lot of people in the country are looking and thinking that this is some kind of food fight; that somehow everybody is to blame for this here in Washington.

I ask my friend, the Senator from New York, isn't it true that there are some 50 members of the Republican caucus in the House who have said forthrightly that they will not vote to raise the debt ceiling under any circumstance? One of those, of course, being Representative BACHMANN, who is seeking the Presidential nomination on their ticket, said she would not vote to raise it under any circumstance.

Does the Senator know of any one Democrat, either in the House or the Senate, who has said they would not vote to raise the debt ceiling under any circumstance? I ask the Senator, is there one? I have not been able to find one.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleague from Iowa for the question. I concur in his findings. I haven't found one either.

Democrats know we have different views on this side of the aisle, and many of us would write deficit-reduction bills differently than some others of us would. But we realize that to let the debt ceiling lapse would be a disaster to not raise it. So I have not heard of a single Democrat who has said the debt ceiling ought to lapse, and I have heard scores of Republicans, elected, official Republicans and thousands of others and groups in that rightwing firmament pushing their members to let this debt ceiling lapse.

My guess is—and God forbid it happens; and we are doing everything we can to prevent it from happening—they will retract that language or they will find ways to explain what they meant because their analysis that it doesn't matter or it will not do much harm is, unfortunately, dead wrong.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will yield for another question. Again, there is a lot of misunderstanding—and I sympathize with this—among the general populous that somehow raising the debt ceiling means that somehow we can go and borrow more money in the future and go further in debt.

Isn't it true that raising the debt ceiling just simply means that we are going to pay for what so many of us, Republicans and Democrats, have

voted in the past to appropriate money for? I ask my friend, it is like using your credit card to go out and buy something, but now you say, I don't want to pay the bill? I think that kind of puts it in terms that the average American can understand. If you have used your credit card, and you have run up a debt, you have to pay the bills; otherwise, your credit is going to go down, and you are going to lose your credit card, and you are not going to be able to do anything else.

Isn't that sort of what we are confronting? In the past, Democrats and Republicans—we all share the blame, perhaps, for having deficits. We can go into the causes of that. I don't mean to do that here. But the fact is, the United States of America has an obligation to pay its bills. The Republicans say, no, they don't want to pay the bills. Doesn't that sort of strike the average American as saying: Wait a minute. No, we have to honor our debts. We have always honored our debts in this country since the Revolutionary War. Is that not the fact?

Mr. SCHUMER. That is absolutely the fact. My colleague from Iowa is exactly correct.

The bottom line is, yes. What we are talking about with the debt ceiling is debts we have already incurred. No American family has the luxury, once they sign up for a mortgage, to tell the bank: Well, I am not going to pay you unless you do A, B, and C. No American family has the luxury of telling the credit card company: Hey, unless you buy me a year's supply of groceries, I am not going to pay my credit card debt.

Once you incur the debt, you have an obligation to pay. That is one of the foundations of American life. It has been that foundation since Alexander Hamilton argued with Thomas Jefferson, and it has served our country well.

The awful example that it would set if America, this great land, this Federal Government said: Well, I am not going to pay the debt, I am not going to pay the debt unless A, B, C, D is done—what kind of example does that send to American families, to American young people? It is the opposite, frankly, of the conservative philosophy—part of which I agree with in this regard—that you pay your bills, that you pay your debts. If you don't, there is a consequence.

So it is just amazing. This is the first time, I believe—check the history books—in American history where a large group in either House of this Congress has made it a campaign not to pay the debt unless they get their way on certain other issues, whatever they be. If every one of us did that, this country would be paralyzed. We wouldn't be able to do a thing. It is leading down a road that nobody should want to travel.

Mr. HARKIN. I would like to ask one more question and then I would yield.

Isn't it true that we—I would say the Senator from New York has been a leader in this and so many others here. We want to, first of all, pay our bills, but then we want to get our deficit under control and reduce our debt. To that end, on the Democratic side, I would say we have tried to propose a balanced approach, I ask my friend from New York, who has been a leader in this area of both cutting spending and also raising revenue so that we are kind of all in this together.

We are asking everyone. We are not willing just to cut the deficit on the backs of the poor or people who are out of work, the elderly on Medicare. We are saying everybody has to take a little bit. But we are also going to ask some sacrifice from those who have much in our society; that we want to raise some revenue from those who have benefited in the last 10, 15 years so much and have gotten so much wealth in our society. We are asking for them also to share in this.

We have proposed that, have we not, I ask the Senator? And has it not been true that the Republican side has been unwilling to ask the richest people in our country to help us reduce the deficit? They will not agree to any revenues. I ask my friend from New York, is that not the case?

Mr. SCHUMER. Again, my colleague from Iowa is on the money.

There needs to be balance. The President has stressed this. I think everyone on our side has stressed this. We do have a serious deficit problem and a serious debt problem. We have to deal with it. I think there is agreement in this Chamber, and I will give some credit to those on the other side of the aisle who made this their signature issue in influencing policy. But if we are going to have to do that and do belt tightening, shouldn't it be across the board?

Here is the fact of the matter: If you are a middle-class person, it is hard to pay for college. It is hard to pay for prescription drugs. It is hard to take that paycheck and make sure it deals with all the needs you and your spouse and your children have. Over the years, we have established ways that the government helps with student loans or with prescription drug programs or other kinds of help. It so happens that the wealthy among us, God bless them, don't need a student loan. They have plenty of money to pay for their children's college. They don't need a prescription drug plan. Even with the high expense of these prescription drugs, they can afford it. God bless them.

The way the wealthy benefit from the Tax Code, because they have a lot of money, is there are tax expenditures, tax breaks they get. They think they are important. I understand that. But they are no more important than helping young people go to college or helping our elderly, average folks pay for their prescription drugs. If you are going to be across the board and you are going to say no revenues, you are going to have an unbalanced and unfair approach.

Let me say this: Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have tried to scare people. This has not happened just this year but for many years. They say: Democrats want to raise your taxes. That is not the case if you are an average middle-class American. In fact, the President has made it a watch word, and we have religiously concurred and followed, that no one who makes below $250,000 a year should get any tax increase. That is 97 percent of all Americans.

So when we say we want revenues, we are talking about two things: We are talking about tax breaks, tax loopholes for the very wealthy, whether they be individuals or corporations, and we are talking about tax breaks for the wealthiest among us who, under the previous administration, got much greater breaks than anybody else. That is all we are talking about.

So I would ask my colleagues, I would ask the American people to understand that. Don't be scared when somebody gets up and says they want to raise taxes, that it means your taxes. It doesn't unless, God bless you, you have a whole lot of money or you are a corporation with a very nice little break that may not be as necessary as, say, helping middle-class students go to college or helping the elderly get lifesaving prescription drugs. So there has to be balance.

Now, I know my good colleague from Iowa, who has spent his lifetime creating government programs that help people, it pains him when he hears there has to be spending cuts in those programs. But I have never heard him say: If there are any spending cuts, I am not going to vote for deficit reduction. But the mirror image on this side says: I will not vote for any bill if it even has one plug nickel of revenues. That is not fair. That is not right. That is not balanced. It is totally against what just about every American believes, including a majority of Republicans. So that is why we are making this fight.

I will say one other thing in reference to my colleague's question. It is unfair when the commentators and the people say: Well, on the one hand, the Democrats aren't compromising and, on the other hand, the Republicans aren't compromising. I understand that we should always not just look at our own position and try to understand somebody else's position. That is the way it works around here; otherwise, we would have a dictator, a benevolent dictator. We do not. But when we are willing to give on spending cuts, serious spending cuts we do not like, and the other side says they are not willing to give a nickel on revenues, it is not each side is failing to give. It is not that each side is compromising a value. It is not that each side has walked about the same distance to come up with a compromise. In this case—it is not true every time—my Republican friends have been unwilling to compromise one jot and we have been willing to do things very painful to us.

I say to my friends who comment and write about this: Be fair. Let the public know who is willing to move away from their hard-line position for the sake of compromise, for the sake of raising the debt ceiling, for the sake of getting our large debt and deficit down, and who has refused to budge. I think the answer is pretty obvious.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Colorado.

THE FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. BENNET. I thank the Senator from Alaska for allowing me to jump ahead in the queue. I will have a word to say about the issues raised by the Senators from Iowa and New York at the end, but I am rising to talk about an issue that is actually separate. I have been out on the floor week after week talking about the debt limit and debt reduction negotiations, but today I want to talk about another absurd and needless Washington-inflicted, what I can only think of as a mistake, and that is the partial shutdown of the FAA. This shutdown—while buried in the headlines—is affecting Colorado jobs and the economy across the United States. Unable to walk and chew gum at the same time, Congress's inability to resolve this impasse has caused the furloughing of thousands of workers nationwide and put at risk several very important summer construction projects at our airports in Colorado.

Earlier this year, the Senate worked together to pass a long-term FAA reauthorization bill. This important bill, which I supported, will modernize our Nation's air transportation system and reduce frustrating and costly delays. The American people would be astonished to learn how antiquated our system is right now. But the House and Senate conference committee have been unable to finalize the bill.

Last Friday, Congress failed to pass a short-term authorization measure to buy negotiators more time. Now certain FAA functions have been shut down. This shutdown makes absolutely no sense to the people in Colorado who rely on this industry for their livelihoods, their businesses, and travel.

I know the same is true in Alaska. It is more than that. Colorado has a short summer construction season—probably not as short as Alaska's, but nevertheless short—and many airports set aside the summer months to complete much-needed improvement projects, so this shutdown has come at the worst time for them.

In Loveland-Fort Collins Airport in Colorado, they are very near cancelling a planned runway improvement project. Loveland-Fort Collins is a one-runway airport. Officials had already canceled summer flights to accommodate a $7 million runway rebuilding project. Now they could be forced to shelve the project, which was bringing around 150 jobs to the area.

At Pueblo Memorial Airport—by the way, keep in mind this is about Washington's dysfunction. There are not big policy debates here. It is Washington turning its back on the rest of the country once again. At Pueblo Memorial Airport, officials have said they may be forced to delay a $12 million runway rebuilding project.

At the Durango Airport, officials are concerned that an ongoing $3 million apron rehabilitation project—which currently employs 30 Coloradans—will receive a stop-work order next week if Congress refuses to act.

At the Denver International Airport, one of the crown jewels in this country, officials are concerned that the shutdown will affect scheduled concrete and asphalt work on a runway and maintenance on passenger loading bridges.

These delays could affect the overall safety of Colorado airports and they are affecting jobs right now.

Nationwide, an estimated 3,500 FAA workers began to be furloughed this past Saturday; 27 of these workers are in Colorado. They were either sent home or forced to work without pay.

To his credit, Chairman ROCKEFELLER recently introduced legislation that would allow the FAA to continue to pay those workers during the shutdown. I have cosponsored the legislation. I hope the Senate considers doing it today, but we need to do more than that. We have been asked to do more than the bare minimum by our constituents. We have gotten to the point around here where just keeping the lights on somehow is a success. That is a pretty low bar. It is a low bar to Heather Hilgers of Englewood, CO. She is an engineer. Airports hire her to complete construction projects so they can meet FAA safety standards. She wrote to my office:

> Next week, if there is no one to reimburse the contractor, the job has to stop. The stall is affecting engineering contracts. The visible impact would be the construction contractors' jobs.

Andrew Vogt of Denver, CO, is also an engineer. He wrote:

> It's a frustrating experience that this whole industry has gone through. We are hoping a long-term solution can be achieved in short order.
>
> As a professional engineer, certified construction manager for airport improvement projects, there is literally no work to do this year. . . . Put me back to work.

Jeff Campbell, also of Engelwood, CO—these are not government employees, by the way. We are talking about private-sector employees whose jobs and expectations and salaries and plans for their families are being put on hold by the games that are being played here in Washington.

Jeff Campbell, also of Engelwood, CO, is an aviation engineer who is involved with five projects that are being affected by the shutdown. One is the failing runway at Fort Collins-Loveland. He said 150 people, expecting to begin work next week, are about to be put on hold and the project will have to be rebid for the third time.

A lot of people in Congress talk about putting people back to work. They talk about fiscal responsibility. But this delay is costing thousands of jobs and an estimated $30 million a day in lost revenue. If this shutdown continues, these losses could dwarf the entire yearly budget of the EAS Program, which some claim is holding up the bill. Congress must not allow the debate over our debt limit or deficit to prevent action on a short-term FAA extension. Such inaction only proves once again to the American people how broken this place is.

It would be a terrible shame for Members of Congress to resolve this debt debate, adjourn, and board their planes home for recess without resolving this issue. What a slap in the face to people all across this country. On behalf of our constituents who make a much more forceful case than I ever could, I implore my colleagues and Members of the House to resolve this impasse and reauthorize FAA now.

THE DEBT LIMIT

With the indulgence of the Senator from Alaska, I want to take the opportunity to say a word or two about this debt limit discussion we are having right now. We face enormous challenges in our country right now. Our economy is almost producing what it was producing before we went into this terrible recession, but we have 14 million people who are unemployed. The great productive American economy has figured out how to produce what it was producing before with fewer people. But we have not figured out how to put people back to work. My own view is that we need to look hard at our Tax Code, our regulatory code, and other things to make sure we are inspiring innovation and job growth here in the United States and we are not just shipping it overseas and saying it is too bad for everybody who is here.

We are at the end of a decade when median family income has declined for the first time in our country's history. It never happened before. The cost of health care has gone up. The cost of higher education has gone up. It is harder and harder for the middle class in this country to survive. If you are a child living in poverty in the United States, your chances of getting a college education are 9 in 100 in the 21st century in the greatest country in the world.

There are countries all over this globe that sense weakness, that are trying to out-compete us, trying to out-educate us, trying to out-invest in their infrastructure while we play foolish political games. They are not waiting for permission from us to out-compete us.

One of the single greatest assets this country has had since almost its founding has been our bulletproof credit rating. It has been the fortress that is our full faith and credit of the United States. Financial transactions all over the globe, spanning decades, centuries, have been financed based on the

strength of our credit, the full faith and credit of the United States, and generation after generation of politicians has done everything they could to protect it, as any mayor in my State, as any superintendent of schools in my State, would do anything to make sure they protected the credit rating of their city or of their school district.

Now we face, for the first time in our country's history, a threat of downgrade, a threat that our interest rates would spike. That is not a political observation; that is coming from the credit rating agencies. They are not politicians. What the math tells us is that every 1-percent increase in our cost of borrowing adds $1.3 trillion to our debt over the next 10 years, making the problems we face today even harder to solve.

The President knows I have supported for a long time a comprehensive approach, one that would actually make a meaningful difference to our debt and to our deficit, and I will continue to fight for it, as will, I know, the Senator from Alaska. But it is time for Washington to move past these political games and reassure our capital markets that we are not going to be the first generation of Senators to blow up our credit rating over politics, to reduce the full faith and credit of the United States to rubble—for politics. I don't want to be somebody who, 30 years from now or 40 years from now where somebody comes and says: Hey, we detect you were once in the Senate, you were 1 of 100 people here when we compromised one of the greatest assets this country has.

I implore the leadership of both parties, both here and in the House, to work this out. Then let's get on with the tough discussion we have to have about our debt and deficit.

Mr. President, I thank again the Senator from Alaska for allowing me to speak ahead of him, and also for his leadership throughout this entire debate. He, like a number of us, has been working hard with Members across the aisle to try to get a bipartisan solution that is balanced and that makes sense heading toward the future. I thank him for his leadership.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from Colorado is always so passionate on the floor when it comes to the issues pertinent not only to his State and his country. He has laid out such a logical case on the debt of this Nation and why we need to deal with it. I will address the debt also.

But I came down here, like the Senator from Colorado, to talk about the FAA reauthorization bill. I was not planning to come down. I was in my office. As Senators, we have lots of meetings, events, activities and photo ops—meet and greets, they call them. People come in and say hello and chit-chat take a few photographs with you. They are residents from your State.

I was sitting there and having a great conversation with young people, four of them from Girls and Boys Nation here from the American Legion Auxiliary: Clara Farley, from Kodiak, Joseph Mueller from Healy, Derick Hanna from Palmer, and Marissa Torgerson from Anchorage. Then there was another young woman who was there, a young leadership student, Jocelyn Cayce from Juneau.

You know, to have a ''photo op'' is what they call them. We shake hands and take some photos. It was interesting having this conversation. The first question they asked me was what was going to happen with the debt of this Nation. Before I elaborate on my thoughts and what I told them, I, first would like to talk about the FAA extension because they are both related. The FAA bill and what is going on with the debt is all related. It is related because of the House majority's inability to function and their inability to do their work.

The FAA is a great example. I know the Senator from Colorado mentioned that the conference committee has not brought out a bill. What is amazing about this is the Senate appointed their conferees in April. For those who are watching, the way this works is the House passes a bill and the Senate passes a bill. They are not always exactly the same, so they go to a joint conference committee made up of Members from the House and Members from the Senate—Democrats and Republicans—and they work out a compromise. The Senate appointed their Members to the conference committee in April. The House has not appointed anybody.

The battle we are in is because of one person. There is one person who has decided that 4,000 people should be furloughed—about 80 in Alaska—to stop projects that are critical to the safety of air transportation. I can tell you there is no other State that depends on air transportation like Alaska, with 82 percent of our communities not able to be accessed by road, they are predominantly accessed by air. For one person in the House to decide he wants to play politics with aviation safety because he doesn't like something—oddly enough, the items he wanted to eliminate are from States that are represented by Democrats and chairmen of committees. It is unbelievable.

I did not come here 2½ half years ago to play those games. I came here to do the work the people of Alaska sent me to do. Part of that work was to make sure the Federal Aviation Administration actually has a reauthorization they can operate under because they haven't had it since 2007. I was elected in 2008. There have been 20 short term extensions of the FAA's authority while the House and Senate try to pass legislation and work out the differences. The Senate did pass a bill. We did our work. We did it, and we did it with a lot of debate.

I sit on the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee with jurisdiction over the FAA. Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator HUTCHISON, Democrat and Republican, worked in a bipartisan manner with all the members. The Senate passed our FAA bill. The House passed theirs, and now we are waiting for the House to appoint conferees. We are waiting for the House to do something. Not one person. That is not how this system should work. They need to appoint conferees so we can sit down and resolve these final minor issues. Instead the chairman in the House decides he knows best.

Here is what happens: Yes, 4,000 FAA employees get furloughed all across this country. These are people who have mortgage payments to make and kids planning to go to college this fall, or maybe they are the only breadwinner in their homes—but 4,000 people are furloughed.

There are 79 FAA employees in Alaska who have been furloughed. Compound that with the next piece of the equation. Part of the FAA reauthorization bill is to invest in our aviation infrastructure. I think I will hit 100,000-plus miles this year, maybe more, 125,000 miles flying back and forth from Washington to my home State, visiting communities all across my State. I pay a small fee like everyone who flies does. We pay for our airline tickets and a portion goes to the FAA, who then invests this money into making our runways and our air traffic facilities safer. It is the people who fly who pay for our aviation system, and their money goes to the FAA to pay for the improvements that we use to make sure we fly safely. It is not complicated. Yet what is happening because the FAA doesn't have the authority to collect this fee, is the airlines and passengers are getting a tax holiday. That fee is important. I will get back to that fee and what has happened with that money.

First, without that money, we cannot do airport construction projects. It is all part of the system. In Alaska it is a pretty important piece.

In Bethel, a project now has a stop-work order issued by the FAA because they cannot complete the project without an extension. As my friend from Colorado mentioned, Colorado has a short construction season, and we have a very short construction season in Bethel, Alaska. We are trying to build a project that improves the approach lights to make it safer for people to land at the Bethel Airport. That project has been stopped. There is no other access to Bethel except by air. Bethel is 400 miles from Anchorage, the largest city in the State, by air. We cannot drive to Bethel. That project has stopped because the House hasn't passed a clean FAA extension.

Another project makes seismic improvements to the air traffic control tower in Anchorage. People say it is just a tower, what does it matter? The

tower is old. It needs improvements. It is not only important for Alaska and the people who would work on the project, it is important for this country. We are the third busiest air cargo airport—in the sense of cargo throughput—in the world. We move products that are produced in this country and around the world through Anchorage. If you are shipping something to Europe or Asia and you are west of the Mississippi, the odds are you are coming through Anchorage's international airport.

Almost 700 wide-body jets fly through Anchorage every single week carrying cargo. It is the third busiest airport in terms of cargo throughput in the world. It is an economic engine. It is a job creator. I remember almost 25 years ago when the idea came from a couple of companies, FedEx and UPS. They said: We will look at Anchorage as our international hub because of its location. Today it is a robust facility and many other airlines cargo carriers use our airport facilities. It is huge.

Instead of the House doing their job and appointing conferees to resolve this issue, one person in the House decided he wanted to play politics over the life-safety of our air traffic system, the Federal aviation system, and now that project is not happening. Not only are the 79 FAA employees furloughed in Alaska, but projects in Bethel and Anchorage are not moving forward. So that means the private contractors—it is not government employees who make these improvements and build lighting systems or remodel the tower. It is private contractors who employ people who then pay mortgages and buy cars and spend money in the economy and help our economy move forward. This is clearly a job-killing action. That is what it is. They will say some other reasons, but that is what it is doing. It is killing jobs, and it is hurting America.

Again, it costs more because when the construction season in Bethel is over in the next month or month and a half, we don't get to come back in November and say we are going to finish this project. We can't. The weather conditions don't allow it.

What will happen is, next year the costs will go up because the private contractor will have to remobilize—I hear a lot from folks on the other side over there in the House talk about the private sector. I am from the private sector. I don't know how many of those guys worked in the private sector, but I have. That is where I made my living, and that is how my wife makes her living, from the private sector. They spout off about how they want to support the private sector. Well, pass the FAA reauthorization legislation that the private sector supports and wants moved forward for the creation of more jobs and the opportunity to make our air safer.

Again, it is astounding to me how dysfunctional the House majority is and how they are unable to do their work. They complained a lot earlier this year that the Senate doesn't do their job, and we are not doing our work. We are doing our work. We passed the Military Construction-VA bill. We passed the FAA bill. We passed several things. They go over there and they die. They go over there, and they have one person who decides they know best.

A lot of those guys ran in 2010 on the effort to open government, 72 hours to review bills, which is great. I have not seen it. They had some Rules Committee meeting earlier last night or whatever late night they did it to set the rules on what they are going to vote on in less than 12 or 13 hours. I am sure that has been notified to a lot of people. It is amazing they ran on the fact that they want to open government, the system is broken, and then it is so dysfunctional over there.

The FAA bill, as I mentioned, these airlines collect fees that then go to the FAA to make sure all this happens. It is part of the fee we pay to travel. Now the FAA is not authorized to collect it, but what happened? Several of these airlines jacked up their fees to collect the money for their own. There is $200 million a week coming from consumers into the pockets of these airlines for their profit, not to improve the safety of the airports, which is what the money is supposed to be designed for. I will say Alaska Airlines—and I am proud to say Alaska Airlines, Hawaiian Airlines, and Spirit Airlines are three examples of companies that did not do that. They did not jack up the price to the consumer for their own bottom line. Also, remembering that those fees are for the purpose of improving airports and not improving the corporate profits or the CEO's million-dollar-plus checks they get at the end of the year for the work they do.

The problem is—something like this happened many years ago—we are not going to be able to get those resources back to make sure these airports are safer.

I, of course, implore the airlines to do one of two things: Lower those fares they jacked up or put that money aside and work with Congress to make sure that money goes into the fund to ensure that we improve these airports. I challenge every one of those airlines that have done that.

As a consumer who is watching this issue, you should be appalled that $200 million a week that you thought was going to improve the airports you fly through, it is not. It is going into the pockets for profit for some of these companies. Again, I point out Alaska Airlines, Hawaiian Airlines, Spirit Airlines are a few of the only major airlines that are not doing that. I commend them for that. I commend them for doing the right thing by the consumer.

I was originally coming down and going to talk—as I got inspired by the students sitting there—about the budget, but then I wanted to talk about the FAA. I want to get back to the budget.

As I mentioned, these young people came to my office and asked the first question: What are we going to do about the debt? Great. It is the question of the day. What are we going to do? We can debate how we got here. Everyone got us here: Democrats, Republicans, current, past, everybody. We have a problem. We have a challenge. I know the Presiding Officer is new. You came here to solve problems, create solutions, not just play the politics and push it off for another day, but actually do some things. That is why people sent me here, and I know that is why they sent you here: to do the job the American people expect us to do—I know Alaskans expect me to do.

There is no question in my mind why we are here today. It is because, again, the House majority, I will point out, cannot do their job. They are unable to do their job. They are not dealing with reality.

Do I want to add more debt to the Nation? No. No one does. As my colleague from Colorado earlier said—and I know the Presiding Officer—we have been working on ideas. One thing that is unique about the Senate is there is an effort here—it may not be as visible as the press would like to portray because they would like to see the battles, that is better press. There is a lot of bipartisan discussion going on. The Gang of 6, you can argue if that is good or bad, but the point is three Republicans, three Democrats sat down for months. In the Budget Committee, we sat down for months. We came up with proposals. We are talking to Republicans. Republicans are talking to Democrats. We are looking for solutions. We are trying to weed through this. The Senate is trying to do this. We are trying to solve this problem and create a solution that moves us forward. But there are several in the House majority over there who believe to drive off a cliff is good policy. I don't know, I don't think that is good policy. I would rather drive on the road, going somewhere. That is what we are trying to do over the next few days.

As I think of the differences—and people say: Well, why don't you just take that deal or this deal? Here is the difference. They are fundamental. They are not complicated. The deal the leader, Speaker BOEHNER, has in the House is about $900 billion in reductions. It is short term. It has a joint committee to look to the long term. What is the Reid proposal? The Reid proposal, as it is now scored by CBO—the Congressional Budget Office, for those who are watching and wondering what all these things mean—is $2.2-plus trillion in reductions, almost 2½ times more than the House version, and it is long term. Here is why that is important. I am not voting for anything short term. Let me make that very clear to the Presiding Officer and others who might be watching. If we want to disrupt and continue to disrupt this economy, keep doing these shenanigans and keep doing these

2-, 3-, 4-month deals, that is disastrous to this economy.

I have heard and talked to business leader after business leader, from associations, to individuals, to people back in my home State, and they say over and over: Don't do short term. Whatever you decide, give us certainty—certainty.

The unique thing about the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House: Only we would describe long term as 16, 18 months because that is all we can do around here. But short term, as one can imagine, is 3, 4 months. That would be more disruptive to this economy than anything we can imagine because all we do as we shift it—and I can describe this because I understand this business. I have been in it. My wife is in it. Here is what happens. We will have this same debate in November, probably. Here is what happens in November. This is the biggest time for people who are buying. For retailers, this is the most important time—actually, back to school a little bit, but November through December is when people make their expenditures and are buying things, consuming, and spending money in our economy. But people always like to blame Democrats: It is all about government. I come from the private sector. As I said earlier, that is where I made my living. It is an important part of our economy.

So here we are going to debate, create more uncertainty at the most important time, when consumers are going to try to judge what to do. What do they do? Do they spend a little bit extra for a gift for their friend? Do they go on that trip they were planning? Do they make that extra expenditure? Yet we will have the same debate. So long term is important—again, 16, 18 months, but that is better than the short-term plan.

No businessperson has come to me—and I challenge any businessperson: Pick up the phone. Call me. Let me know. Tell me you want a short term, and I will be happy to come down here to the floor and say that. I will mention your company name. I will tell people: This company is interested in short term. I would be happy to do that. I am not going to get those calls because they know that is not the way to run a business, that is not the way to run a household, and that sure as heck should not be the way we run our government.

So there is a clear difference. For all of those people who—I get a lot of pro and con on this issue, calling my office, sending me e-mails—for all of those people who say: Hey, just vote for the Boehner thing, I will tell them why I will not. I want people to understand clearly my position. It is not about, he is a Republican, I am a Democrat. That is irrelevant. It is short term. It is fewer spending reductions. It keeps us in turmoil. It doesn't move us forward. It is all about shenanigans and gameplaying and politics. That is what he is presenting.

Now, maybe the Reid proposal isn't perfect. I know there are Republicans who have some ideas here in the Senate who want to modify it. Great. But it is long term, it has more significant reductions, and it moves us down a path in the right direction. It is not perfect, but I can tell my colleagues that the idea they have over there will not work for this economy.

I have probably spoken too long, but those kids from Juneau and Healy and Anchorage and Kodiak had a great question. When kids are asking that question and they say to me—and I give them the same exact presentation. I say: Here are the differences. I give them the papers and say: Here, you look at it. And they say to me: Why aren't we doing a long term, because these kids are now at an age where they are thinking about their future. They are not thinking about the next weekend; they are thinking about their future. They have a position we could learn a lot from around this place, I will tell my colleagues they made it very clear to me: Whatever you do, make it long term, because they are thinking about their future and where they want to be. It is an incredible commentary when we have kids who have more wherewithal in the sense of their knowledge of what should be done in the body we sit in today. It should wake us up.

The last thing I will note is this. I think about what my colleague from Colorado said about the value of our position in this world when it comes to ensuring that people understand America will stand behind everything we do—the debt we do, the positions we take. As a matter of fact, it was so important, it was written into the Constitution that we should never question the ability to pay our bills.

For those on the other side who like to spout off, and they pull out of their pocket the little portable Constitution—all of us get those; we all have those—and they cite the Constitution, sometimes they forget sections of it. I hope we don't forget this section. We should never be questioned in regard to our debt. We pay our bills. We stand behind what we do. That is what makes our country different from any country in this world.

So I challenge them to get their job done, maybe on the FAA bill, maybe on this issue involving the debt, but the House needs to get their act together—the majority. Let me make that clear. The majority over there needs to get their job done, quit killing things over there, from jobs to legislation, and focus on the work people sent them here—especially the group of 2010—but who sent me here and sent the Presiding Officer here—we were sent here to do a job.

It is outrageous to me that we cannot move forward when it is so simple in the sense of a plan that gets us on a path that is long term and has better spending reductions. Maybe it is too logical. Maybe that is the problem around here: If it is too simple, too logical, it doesn't work. It has to be complicated with a lot of gamesmanship is the only way it works. I want to prove that wrong.

I thank the Chair for allowing me the time to say a few words. Hopefully, the people who are watching us and listening will hear the real debate and cut through all the moment-in-time politicizing. Maybe, hopefully, they will hear those five kids whom I heard and will hear their concerns and what their position is.

So, again, I thank the Chair for the time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

TRIBUTE TO BERT BLYLEVEN

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to former Minnesota Twins pitcher Bert Blyleven, who this week received his sport's highest honor when he was inducted into the Major League Baseball Hall of Fame.

To Bert, I offer hearty and well-deserved congratulations.

To the rest of the baseball world, I ask the question: What took so long? In the 14 years since he first became eligible for the Hall of Fame, we in Minnesota all assumed that, with his rare talent and Hall of Fame numbers, Bert was a shoo-in, and for many of those 14 years he was considered the best player never to have been inducted. I am proud to say as a Minnesotan and a lifelong Twins fan that this year Bert Blyleven was officially voted into the Hall of Fame.

People in Minnesota all know Bert belongs on the distinguished list of Minnesota Twins already in the Hall of Fame, including Harmon Killebrew, Rod Carew, and Kirby Puckett, as well as two other baseball greats who grew up in St. Paul, MN, and later played for the Twins and were inducted into the Hall of Fame: Paul Molitor and Dave Winfield. Each of them had Hall of Fame careers, and now Bert has finally joined them.

Bert pitched 22 seasons in the Major Leagues, 11 of them for the Twins, but he also took his talents to Texas, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and California. During his career, he won 287 games, he struck out an amazing 3,701 batters, and is fifth on the alltime career strikeout list, with more career strikeouts than pitching greats Tom Seaver, Walter Johnson, Bob Gibson, Greg Maddux, Cy Young, or even his boyhood idol, Sandy Koufax. He pitched 60 shutouts and led the league in shutouts three times. He had a career earned run average of just 3.31. He pitched 242 complete games, something that would be unheard of today. He played on two world championship teams: in Minnesota, with the 1987 Twins and in Pittsburgh. For Twins fans, we all know Bert was a major part of that

1987 Twins world championship team which we all revere for finally bringing a world championship to our State. And we won again in 1991.

Bert mentioned in his acceptance speech on Sunday that he is the first Hall of Famer born in Holland. He moved to California as a child and became interested in baseball by watching Sandy Koufax pitch for the Dodgers. His father Joe, also a baseball fan, built him a pitcher's mound in the backyard, where he developed one of the best curveballs in baseball history. I would like to think if my dad had built me—no, I don't think so.

Bert finished his playing career in 1992. In 1996, he rejoined the Twins in the broadcast booth, where for many years he and Dick Bremer have become familiar voices to Twins fans all over the upper Midwest. I personally love nothing more than watching a Twins game on TV and listening to Dick and Bert, who, in my humble opinion, are an authoritative and amazingly entertaining broadcast team.

During broadcasts, Bert has created a phenomenon using his telestrator to circle Twins fans who, whether they are in the Target Field or on the road, are holding up signs that catch Bert's interest, and then he will circle them. There is no higher honor for a Twins fan than to be circled by Bert, and every game is packed with fans holding signs that simply say ''Circle Me, Bert.''

It was great to see that Bert was joined at Sunday's induction ceremony by his wife Gayle, their children, Bert's siblings, and his mother Jenny. During his speech, Bert spoke about his father Joe, who died in 2004 of Parkinson's disease, saying, ''I know he is up there right now looking down.''

In memory of his father, Bert and his wife Gayle started the ''Circle Me, Bert'' Web site to raise research money for the National Parkinson Foundation Minnesota. That says volumes about Bert Blyleven. Bert is known in Minnesota for his dedication to other charities and to the community there.

So, once again, Bert, as a lifelong Twins fan, thank you and congratulations. After 14 years of waiting, you are hereby ''circled'' by the Major League Baseball Hall of Fame, where generations of fans from Minnesota and around the country and around the world will know of your career and of your amazing contributions to the game of baseball and to the community of Minnesota.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor and maybe also put in a word for Tony Oliva and also suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator may speak for up to 15 minutes.

NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I think it is obvious to the world around us that the atmosphere here is hardly one of comfort or satisfaction. The public does not see the agony of the debate that is taking place, as we watch how dysfunctional the discussion about the national debt has been.

We feel the threat to America's world financial leadership that is lurking around here, and it is not very satisfying to those people whose homes are close to foreclosure or the people who need to be assured that health care is going to be there for them or that their child who can learn can get an education without mortgaging their future or cannot even get a mortgage on that.

So we look around and we watch and we listen and we see that the Republicans in the House and the Republicans in the Senate are in a search for political gain regardless of the cost to our society and our Nation.

I do not make this statement casually. But after months of watching and listening to the targeted goal of politics over the pain that could follow a default, no other conclusion may be drawn. We want to consider the evidence. By way of example, Vice President BIDEN convened a bipartisan working group to find solutions to get the national debt problem over with, get it resolved, and let us go on to our normal and needed debate and business. After that, Republicans walked out. Walked out.

Next, President Obama offered Republicans what he called a ''grand deal'' that would reduce the deficit by $4 trillion. Republicans ran away. Now our majority leader, HARRY REID, has proposed a plan that includes more than $2 trillion in spending cuts, $1 in cuts for every dollar the debt limit is increased—and not even insisting on a dollar of revenues, which has been suggested several times.

But there is no way of getting through the obstinacy on the other side. Republicans turn their back time after time. Democrats in this Senate and in the White House have offered the Republicans compromise after compromise. But they do not see their target. Their target is to do damage to the Obama administration so that it hurts sufficiently to discount the progress that has been made for our society under President Obama.

Time and time again the Republicans have changed their demands to find reasons to say no. Are we asking the Republicans to do something radical, something that has never been done before? That is certainly not the case. Over the past half century, the debt ceiling has been raised 75 times, almost two-thirds of those occasions under Republican Presidents. In fact, the debt ceiling was increased 18 times under President Reagan, and 7 times under President George W. Bush.

Our country has never defaulted. So the question that must be raised is: What is different about today? Why, at a time when we already face a real jobs crisis in this country, would Republicans plan for another economic crisis? Why would they do that? Will destroying the economy help Republicans win seats next year when people across our country are already expressing their dissatisfaction with the deadlock they see being displayed?

We heard the minority leader say his No. 1 priority is stopping the President from winning another term. What a goal that is. He is our President, elected by the people of the country. He has a term of 4 years and will be up for reelection. We hope and we pray that he continues to be the President of our country. What good does it do to target the system?

Make known what it is they stand for. So far we have seen that they stand for nothing that is helpful to the average American. So what we need is a chance to have an honest discussion. Insecurity reigns as people grow more and more conscious about their inability to afford the basics of life, jobs, health care, education. They see prices being raised around them as their purchasing power shrinks. Look at the price of gasoline. You see a perfect example of what is happening. We had one Republican Presidential candidate who was asked: ''Does it strike you that as the unemployment rate goes up your chances of winning office also go up?''

Do you know what her answer was? She said, ''I hope so.'' Hope so. What an outrageous thing to say from the halls of government, the high halls of government. I hope so. I hope that unemployment goes up, says she, so she might have a chance to win office. How cruel that statement is.

Make no mistake, if the United States Treasury runs out of cash next week, the principal burden will fall on middle-class families. But the effects on our total economy will be devastating as well. We may not be able to send out Social Security checks to seniors, benefit checks to veterans, the people who serve the country. Let's stop paying them? Or paychecks to the men and women who now bear our country's uniform in Afghanistan and Iraq. Sorry, we cannot pay you. Is that what we are going to say?

Interest rates could rise almost immediately, greatly increasing the cost of mortgages, car loans, student loans, credit cards, you name it. If middle-class Americans think their 401(k) plan suffered during the Wall Street crisis a few years ago, imagine what will happen to the markets if the U.S. Government cannot pay its bills, or redeem bonds that are ordinarily turned in for cash.

A default will lead to increased job losses at a time when we are still emerging from a recession and 14 million people are now out of work. And those are the relatively short-term impacts. A default crisis will damage our reputation, our credit standing around the world. It will call into question America's credibility, stability, financial leadership. It will make our bonds and our currency less attractive to investors, and we may never recover the exalted status of our financial instrument.

But in response to this looming crisis, our friends, the Republicans, are digging their trenches deeper and offering little but circuitous routes to avoid a more serious plan to resolve this situation. Their latest trick is to propose a short-term debt limit. That increase will leave us in the exact same position 6 months from now so they will have another opportunity to make political mischief.

Imagine. Imagine. All types of tricks, all kinds of devices to try and cut short something that can be dealt with and left behind. Let's continue trying to solve the serious problems that our country has.

The Boehner plan poses the same grave risk to our economy as default. CNN reported that the Boehner plan would probably still lead to a downgrade of the United States credit rating. Christian Cooper, head of U.S. dollar derivatives trading at Jefferies and Company, said—he is an authority:

> From the markets' point of view, a two-stage plan is a non-starter. . . . There is significant risk of a downgrade with a deal that ties further cuts to another vote only a few months down the road.

It is time for the Republicans to remember that all of our citizens are entitled to be heard, not just the wealthy ones, not just the millionaires, the billionaires, the tea partiers and the powerful, because they have positions that get attention when they make phone calls here.

Inherent in our responsibilities is our obligation to preserve our strength as a democratic society. It is time to get serious. No more sleight of hand. Honest discourse is essential. The other day we were reminded—I describe my own reaction. Shock. They had a picture of lovely looking young people walking away from daddy's airplane that they had—whether it is a charter or owned I do not know—to go to camp. I did well in business. I ran a big company. I got there because I got the GI bill to help me. The GI bill helped me start a company with two other fellows that now has 45,000 employees—45,000 jobs—because I was able to get an education under the GI bill. It was fantastic. So when I see what is being prized as a front-page picture in the New York Times of this child, looked like a lovely child walking to camp from daddy's airplane—and to me, I do not object to that. If they make their money the legal, responsible way, they can spend it any way they want. But why in the devil would they not want to contribute something to the underpinnings of this country? I do not understand it. Why is there resistance from those who have made so much that they can have yachts and airplanes and this and that? It is said sometimes here class warfare is what we are witnessing. Class warfare.

The warfare comes from the top down, because average citizens, those who work for a living, those whose jobs right now are often insecure, those who watch their 401(k), their precious savings maybe dwindling as a result of a negative change in the marketplace—saying to young people and their families, sons and daughters who have the capacity to learn: I wish that I could afford—says dad or mom—to send you to the right kind of a school that your ability suggests you can handle, but we cannot afford it—we do a disservice to that family. We do a disservice to country when those things happen. So I do not understand why those who have so much, made not by their own ingenuity exclusively but made by the fact that we have a foundation in this society of people who want to go to work every day and do the right thing. That is what holds up this facility of ours. I am not talking about the building, I am talking about the facility this country has.

You cannot build a house from the ceiling down, from the chimney down, and you cannot build a society from the top down. You need the underpinnings. You need those people who bring their skills daily to work and hold out hope for their children to succeed. That is what we need. We need a regeneration of the spirit in this country of ours.

But it is not going to happen when the Republicans' dominant view is: No, let's get Obama. That is what we have to do. Foul play. It is almost like desertion. I wore the country's uniform proudly, and that is what we are talking about, loyalty to country. It says we need everybody to participate. We are not going to get it with the foul schemes that are being proposed.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS.) The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I am about to yield the floor to my distinguished senior Senator JACK REED. I ask unanimous consent at the conclusion of his remarks I be granted recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR SUNDLUN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, Senator WHITEHOUSE and I have come to the floor today to pay tribute to Governor Bruce Sundlun. He passed away last Thursday. He was an extraordinary gentleman.

I think it is particularly appropriate that my colleague is here along with me because he was the director of policy for Governor Sundlun, and many of the achievements in the Sundlun administration were directly attributed to Senator WHITEHOUSE's extraordinary efforts.

Today, I am here, first, as a Rhode Islander to say on behalf of the people of my State how much we appreciate the leadership, vision, and determination of Governor Bruce Sundlun. He was elected in the middle of the worst financial crisis in the history of our State since the Great Depression—a collapse of the private credit union system. He got through that crisis as only he could. Then he went on to reconstruct our airport, to reform our workers' compensation system, and to make lasting contributions to the people of Rhode Island.

So I come to salute an extraordinary Governor. I also come as a colleague in government. When Governor Sundlun was elected to the statehouse in 1990, I was elected to my first term in the Congress. I was there to observe his extraordinary intellect, determination, skill, and his relentless commitment to doing his best to help the people of Rhode Island. I saw it firsthand.

Truly, without Bruce's leadership, we would not have weathered the financial crisis of 1991 in Rhode Island. His extraordinary grasp of the financial details, his unwavering determination to do the right thing, not the popular thing, and his ability to withstand withering criticism from all quarters resulted not only in the restitution of the savings of thousands of Rhode Islanders, but essentially the repayment of the moneys that had to be borrowed to take care of the crisis. It was extraordinary work. Frankly, I think everybody in Rhode Island rapidly conceded that only Bruce Sundlun could have done it.

I also come here, like Bruce, as a veteran of our Armed Forces, but unlike Bruce, who was a combat veteran. Bruce joined the U.S. Army and qualified as a pilot in the Air Corps in World War II. He was brave. He was tough. He led his crew with great distinction on numerous bombing raids over occupied Europe. In one of those raids, he was shot down. Of course, he had the presence of mind to keep the aircraft as steady as he could to let crewmen escape.

Finally, at the last moment, he himself parachuted to Earth. He was behind enemy lines without any weapons except his determination, his courage, and his determination, again, not only to survive but to return to the fight.

Through an amazing series of breathtaking episodes that read like a novel, Bruce would go from village to village and seek out the priests in the French village, or Belgian village. He would

say in fluent French that he was an American flier and needed their help. He always received their help. He would be given assistance and would be hid for a while. He told me with his great sardonic smile—that he would find unusual ways to get around. He would go into the village at market time when the ladies of the village parked their bicycles, and he would take one of them and pedal as fast as he could to the next village where he could find another bike. So he covered the route through occupied Europe, finally making his way into Switzerland. That was a remarkable bit of courage.

After the war Bruce continued to distinguish himself in business, and in so many ways. But one thing is that he left a legacy not just to the people of Rhode Island, not just a public record, but he was part of the ''greatest generation'' that left an indelible image on the soldiers, sailors, aviators, and marines who serve today, a fidelity to duty, of courage, and of determination to serve and sacrifice on behalf of your comrades and your country. That image continues to sustain our forces in the field and this great Nation.

To Governor Sundlun, to his family, as a Rhode Islander, I thank you. As a colleague in government, I thank you. As someone who was inspired by your service to this country, I thank you. May you rest in peace.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to follow Rhode Island's distinguished senior Senator with remarks about our friend and our former Governor, Bruce Sundlun. As Governor, he served with some of our colleagues who are in the Senate today, including BEN NELSON, who was Governor of Nebraska, and TOM CARPER who was Governor of Delaware. They served with Bruce, and he was one of those irrepressible characters they remember very distinctly to this day.

Bruce Sundlun had a remarkable Rhode Island life. He was the son of a jewelry store owner, who was the son of an immigrant watchmaker. It turns out that he had real athletic talent. He was a track star, breaking record after record around Rhode Island. It was as a competitor in that era that he first felt the sting of discrimination over being Jewish, and that gave him a lasting characteristic to stick up for the underdog.

As I mentioned at his funeral service, he was the opposite of a fair-weather friend. He became a better friend the stormier the weather got around you.

He went on, with his great generation, to defend our country and fight for freedom around the globe in World War II. He was a pilot of a B–17, the Damn Yankee, at a time when the life expectancy for bomber crews over Europe was not very long. Unfortunately, his aircraft was shot down and crashed in Belgium. He was able to survive the crash, although, as the pilot, he was the last living person out. When he went back to Belgium years later, people who remembered that day remembered being astonished at the parachute that appeared out of nowhere just above the ground, just before he hit, just in time to save him. But he was injured and hid in the manner of the purloined letter. He hid in plain sight as troops swept the area looking for the survivors of the bomber crash. He laid out in the middle of the field in a deep place in the plowed furrow where you could only see him if you got down at the end of the furrow and looked.

As the Nazi's were poking through the hay bales and prowling through the sheds and looking under whatever they could find, there he lay more or less in plain sight. But still, he was shot down on December 1, 1943. You can imagine how cold it was lying in that field in Belgium while the search went on around him for hours. For the rest of his life, he hated the cold. There was no weather that was too warm for him.

I remember when First Lady Hillary Clinton came to speak in Rhode Island when he was Governor, he was wearing this enormous black sheepskin coat—very thick and warm—as he prepared to step outside of the statehouse and go out on the stone deck looking out over downtown on a cold winter afternoon. Mrs. Clinton started needling him and saying how Jack Kennedy didn't need a coat and it was not really very fashionable and people would question how tough he was if he went out with this big coat on.

So he ended up taking off the coat. He went outside into the bitter cold, made the introduction of the First Lady, turned to welcome her to the podium, and out she came with a smile from ear to ear wearing his coat. He loved that kind of exchange with people. I think he immensely loved the Clintons. He was one of the first Governors—if not the first—to endorse President Clinton, and the Clintons never forgot it.

Bruce did not get to Switzerland until May 5, 1944. He spent 156 days as an American Jewish bomber pilot behind Nazi lines in Belgium and France. No greater testament to this man's resourcefulness and drive could be imagined than succeeding for that long in that circumstance.

When he came back from the war, he went to Harvard Law School and became an attorney at the Department of Justice. He was an assistant to a Rhode Islander who became Attorney General, J. Howard McGrath. He began a successful career in the law. It was also at a time when President Kennedy came to office representing that ''greatest generation''—then a new generation—and he trusted Bruce Sundlun to run his inaugural parade, which was the kind of logistics feat that Governor Sundlun loved.

The fact that it snowed like crazy the night before didn't phase him a bit. The entire parade went off on schedule and without incident, as planned, in very inclement weather because Bruce prepared so well in advance.

He was appointed to the board of COMSAT by President Kennedy. He was the longest serving director of COMSAT, a public-private partnership that helped open the skies to the space age. His business career was remarkable. He took a foundering airline, called Executive Jet, and turned it into the largest private and charter airline in the country. He took a department store in downtown urban Providence, at a time when New England cities were in decline, at a time when cities across the country were losing ground to the suburbs that were sprouting up around them—he took this dying business, I guess you would say, and he saw in that downtown department store a media empire. He went off and began buying radio stations and TV stations and created this remarkable company, the Outlet Corporation, as a media empire. He also turned it into a refuge from time to time.

In the blizzard of 1978, the State of Rhode Island was clobbered by snow. People were trapped downtown for hours and hours, in some cases days. He saw to it that the Outlet Company stayed open, that the cafeteria kept serving, and that the department store that sold clothing gave clothing to whoever needed it. The part of the store that sold bedding was spread all over the store so people could sleep on the bedding. He responded to a crisis better than anybody I know. It brought out his best characteristics, which were certainly necessary when he was elected Governor, because on the very first day of his administration, he was obliged to close more than 30 different lending institutions across Rhode Island, serving more than 300,000 of Rhode Island's 1 million population.

He went from being sworn in, to the receiving line where he greeted all his happy supporters and all the welcoming officials and the well-wishers who came from Rhode Island, and rolled immediately from that into a press conference in which he announced they had to close these institutions because the deposit insurance provider ended up having been crooked and had failed and they could not operate without deposit insurance. So they had to be closed. That was a heck of a way to start a governorship.

He also found out that he had inherited the biggest budget deficit the State had ever seen, and we could never find a State with a bigger percentage deficit than he inherited. The compensation system melted down, and every worker's compensation insurer said: I am leaving the State.

A lesser person might have failed under all that pressure. Not only did Bruce meet all of those exigencies of the moment, he also worked very hard to set a better ethical tone and restructured our State government so that it would be lasting because most of those things went wrong because of failures

in ethics in the Rhode Island State Government.

That was a pretty remarkable added accomplishment on top of solving all those underlying problems. He had confidence in Rhode Island and in America, and we were in a terrible recession. So he went to work and got things done. He built a new airport terminal, he got a new mall started that would be built, he built a new hotel that allowed for the convention center to go forward and so he built a new convention center. He changed the skyline of Providence. He moved one of our universities to a downtown campus. He understood that in times of economic distress, activity was good and positive activity that brought jobs was better still.

In his personal characteristics, he was a remarkable individual. He was relentless, determined, and decisive when issues were presented to him. With his staff, he was demanding and abrupt and terse. I asked him once why he didn't bother to say hello. When a person got a phone call from him, he just started talking at them, and when the conversation was over, he hung up without saying goodbye or any pleasantries. I said: Don't you think it would go a little further if you said hello and goodbye in your telephone conversations? He said: How much time do you think I would waste in my entire life? Add up all the times you have wasted saying hello and goodbye. Doesn't do anything that is productive. He had that kind of attitude. But he was bold and he was willing to take big leaps. I guess, back to his early days as a broad jumper, he was willing to take big, big leaps.

As a staff person, he was extraordinary to work for. I have told the story of opening day. A few of us were in on that news, but it had to be very closely held because it would have created a run on all those banks if word had leaked. So even many of his staff people had no idea this was going on until he announced it. So that was kind of a shocker and made for an interesting time to be a staff person.

On another occasion, he had a couple of raccoons on his property and they were bothering a den of baby foxes. He didn't want the baby foxes to be killed by the raccoons, so he took out a shotgun, went down to the end of his property and shot the two raccoons. He then climbed in the car with his State trooper and headed off to work and, of course, he described the exciting episode of his morning and the trooper said to him: Governor, don't you realize it is against the law to fire off a weapon in the city of Newport? In his customarily brusque and decisive way, he said: Well, take me to the courthouse.

A trial was going on in the Newport County Courthouse, but into the trial walks the Governor and he interrupts the trial and tells the judge: I would like to plead guilty. The judge, thankfully, said: I am not going to accept your plea, I am doing something else right now. Plus, you don't have the benefit of counsel. To which he tartly responded: I am as good a lawyer as there is in Rhode Island. The judge responded: Well, a lawyer who is representing himself has a fool for a client, and on your client's behalf, I tell you I will not accept that plea.

So there is the Governor's staff. The phone rings and the message is: Your boss is in court trying to plead guilty to a criminal offense. One can imagine how that lights up a staff's day. So down we went to help take care of that.

Another day saw the arrival of his daughter. When he was elected Governor, Sundlun had three sons—Tracy, Stuart, and Peter. It turned out there was also a daughter, and at age 16—in midterm—Kara arrived and was recognized as Bruce's daughter from a relationship he had years before. She was taken into the family and is now—and was to the end of his days—as beloved as any of his sons.

But that was an exciting day for staff members, when suddenly the boss turns up with a brandnew 16-year-old daughter nobody knew about before.

He had five wives, in addition to those four children. He led a rich, full, exciting, passionate life, and I miss him very much. He died on Thursday. He died very peacefully, with his family around him. He was 91 years old. I think he probably put about 151 years of living into those 91 years, and he left a family who loved him, a State he had served incredibly well, and staff members who had their lives changed by their exposure to this remarkable, hard-driving, affectionate, bold man.

We are in Washington, as I close, and we are in a situation in which one party is holding the economic future of the country hostage in order to force changes the American public doesn't want, wouldn't vote for, and wouldn't accept if they were consulted on them. But by virtue of having, in effect, a gun to the head of the economy, they want to force these things, such as killing off the Medicare Program.

Americans are wildly opposed to that in huge numbers, and when they found out that was in the House Republican budget, they rejected it by 4-to-1 margins. The response to that was to bring back something called cut, cap, and balance, which had hidden beneath the slogan an even worse cut to Medicare. They didn't learn their lesson the public didn't want this, so they insisted on doing even worse and doing it by holding the economy hostage.

That is the kind of thing Governor Sundlun would not accept. He was, first and foremost, a patriot. As hard as he worked and as much as he challenged everyone around him, he always had the purpose of making America better, making America stronger, making Rhode Island better, making Rhode Island stronger, and building toward the future. He had incredible confidence. The notion of holding an economy hostage and threatening the well-being of people to force down their throats something they would not want would be completely alien to his patriotic character, and it makes me miss him a lot as we are trapped in this day.

The other party appears to be, in large part, acquiescing to this. Governor Sundlun's streak of willfulness and determination to do the right thing, I think, is missed on the other side of the aisle as much as his patriotism and desire to put the well-being of people first is missed on the first. So he was a man whose life and accomplishments made a great difference in Rhode Island and have great relevance and resonance as we stand here today.

As I said, I miss him very much. He was very important to me, and I wish we had his forceful, patriotic, buoyant, and determined spirit with us today.

Mr. President, I mentioned in my remarks the speech I gave on behalf of Governor Sundlun, which was delivered at his funeral service. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD those remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY FOR GOVERNOR BRUCE SUNDLUN AS DELIVERED BY U.S. SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, SUNDAY, JULY 24, 2011

What a man. What a life.

Bruce Sundlun's accomplishments—as a record-breaking athlete, as a resourceful war hero, as a superb lawyer, as a successful business entrepreneur, and as political leader of our state—would each on their own be significant. You could probably write a book about each. Together, packed all into one energetic life, it makes Bruce Sundlun one of the most accomplished and remarkable men in our state's history.

And that's not even counting five marriages, four children, three unsuccessful runs for governor, two dead raccoons, and one long escape on the loose, behind enemy lines.

There's really just no way to fit it all in.

Let me step into my role as a Sundlun staffer, and ask you to think just of his brief four years as governor. Hit (on Day One of his administration) by an unprecedented bank failure affecting 300,000 Rhode Islanders, and by the worst budget deficit in state history, and by an implosion of the state's entire worker's compensation system, and with the urgent need to restore ethics in government, Bruce was the man for that moment, and swung into his customary decisive action.

The budget was promptly and fairly balanced and the whole budget process improved.

Inventive solutions to repay the depositors and clean up the RISDIC mess were found and implemented, and those at fault were made to pay—over a hundred million dollars.

His worker's compensation reform moved the state from an embarrassment to a model, moving what was then the business community's worst problem completely off the problem list for now going on 20 years.

As a problem solver, he had no peer.

And that alone would be pretty extraordinary. But there was that ethics gap. So Bruce wrote Executive Order 91-One, the ethics executive order that succeeding governors renewed virtually unchanged. He reformed our Ethics Commission. He changed the way we appoint judges, to reduce the politics. He changed the way we fund elections, with a public finance plan and donor limits.

Through an intense storm of legal and political opposition, he opened up the pension records; putting an end forever to backroom special pension bills. He got our State Police nationally accredited.

He even cleaned up the Capitol literally!

All that was extraordinary—but still not enough.

In the worst economic times the state had seen since the Depression, with a shrinking budget, he decided to extend universal health care to children—and started the program that became Rite Care. Against immense opposition, he built our new airport terminal. He embarked on the Westin Hotel, the Convention Center, and the Providence Place Mall. He finished the Jamestown Bridge and built the Expressway. And even that's not the end of it.

It was an amazing burst of activity. I will bet that almost every Rhode Islander, almost every day, is somehow touched by something Governor Sundlun did.

And through it all, he drove his staff crazy. He was irrepressible, impatient, imperial, unscriptable, combative, frustrating, willful, constantly threw caution to the winds, impossible to keep up with—he drove us nuts.

And we loved him.

We loved him because he was bold and brave, and was warm-hearted and trusting and generous, and because he was willing to throw caution to the winds to do what was right. We loved him because he never once had us make excuses or try to shift the blame.

That was not his style. ''Never complain; never explain.''

We all remember his Bruce-isms:

''Always touch base with those concerned before taking action.''

''How fast would you get it done if the Russians were in South Attleboro?''

''When you've won, stop talking, close your briefcase and leave.''

''Message to Garcia.''

''Who, what, where, when; don't bother me with why.''

The phone calls, at all hours, that began with no ''hello'' and ended with dial tone.

The road shows known to his staff as ''Dome on the Roam,'' or more precisely, ''Bruce on the Loose.''

And sometimes just that big foxy grin.

We saw that his qualities of friendship and loyalty had an almost physical force; that he had your back even if you made mistakes (no one ever was thrown under the bus); and that he was a better friend the more the chips were down.

Politics is full of fair weather friends; Bruce Sundlun was your stormy weather friend. Politics is full of people who take tiny cautious steps with their finger up constantly testing the winds; Bruce stepped boldly down the path he thought was right, even if that meant stepping right in it.

People wonder what lives on after they die. Well, Bruce, we do. And every one of us has been changed: made better, and stronger, harder-working and more resourceful, by your vibrant elemental force in our lives.

We've gone on to be judges and lawyers, to run state and federal agencies, to become Senators and councilmen and Lieutenant Governors, banking leaders and senior partners in national accounting firms, but none of us ever will be more proud of anything than the simple title: ''I was a Sundlun staffer.''

Soozie and Marjorie, Tracey and Stuart and Peter and Kara: Thank you. Thank you for sharing your husband and father with our state. For those who loved and were changed by him, I thank you. For those who knew and were touched by him, I thank you. And for those who never knew him directly, but whose lives are better today because of what he did, I thank you.

As I close, I want to take you back to a scene from that wonderful movie I saw as a kid, ''To Kill A Mockingbird.'' As you'll recall, Atticus Finch takes on the courageous but unpopular defense of a black man wrongfully accused of rape. At the end of the trial, Atticus's daughter Scout—proper name Jean Louise—is up in the gallery of the courtroom, with the black townspeople, who aren't allowed down on the regular courtroom floor. The courtroom floor empties, but they remain, and slowly stand. As Atticus packs his papers together, closes his bag, and walks out, an elderly man leans down to the little girl and says, ''Stand up, Miss Jean Louise. Your father's passing.''

At the end of this service, as Bruce is taken to his gravesite after 91 years of a life well and fully lived, we will all stand up. And rightly so. A governor will be passing.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, there are currently two bills headed for a vote to raise the debt ceiling and to reduce spending. One of those two bills from the House, Speaker BOEHNER's, cuts about $1 trillion in spending and raises the debt ceiling by $1 trillion until the end of the year, approximately. That is about how long it would take to run up another $1 trillion in debt. The other bill from Senate Majority Leader REID cuts about $1 trillion and raises the debt ceiling about $3 trillion—or past the 2012 election. This is because the President said emphatically just a few days ago at a press conference:

> The only bottom line I have is that we have to extend this debt ceiling through the next election, into 2013.

So it is really quite simple. Speaker BOEHNER's bill lives up to the principle that I thought we had all agreed to: that every $1 in debt ceiling increase should be tied to a $1 reduction in spending. The spenders get an advantage since the spending reductions occur over 10 years, whereas the debt ceiling would increase immediately. But that is the principle on which we have been operating.

Senator REID's bill is a hoax. It uses Washington gimmicks designed to make it look three times as large as it is. In reality, it hikes the debt ceiling $3 for every $1 in spending cuts over 10 years. The House bill is 1 to 1, the Senate bill is 3 to 1. We have demonstrated this exhaustively in a Budget Committee analysis that I don't think people would dispute. And the House approach—one of the primary ways this is accomplished is to count the reduction in spending over the war in Iraq and Afghanistan that is projected to occur and has already been projected to occur and count that as a spending cut. Speaker BOEHNER didn't do that. His would look $1 trillion better also if he used those numbers.

The House approach is honest, it is straightforward, and it achieves $1 in cuts for every $1 in debt ceiling increase. It allows us to return to the table in a few months to assess our progress, see what is happening in the economy, and begin working toward the greater cuts that are needed.

Senator REID's bill relies on accounting tricks, takes the debt limit off the table until after the election, and exchanges a record $3 trillion in debt hike for only one-third as much in debt cuts.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle signed a letter vowing to defeat the Boehner plan. I find this a little shocking, frankly, and surprising. Is it the position of the Senate Democratic majority that $1 trillion in cuts over 10 years is all we need to achieve between now and 2013? Is it their view that $1 in cuts for every $1 in debt limit increase is too steep or is it a political effort to protect the President by pushing the debt limit ceiling past the next election, creating the highest increase in debt ceiling, I think, in history, except for perhaps the one that the super Democratic majority in the Senate slipped through during the passage of the health care bill? Is it this election issue that Democrats would turn down an agreement on and put us at risk of financial disruption of our economy?

So let's step back for a moment and look at the wider context. Washington is often consumed by political fights and blame games. It can be hard to differentiate between facts and talking points. But I would like to provide as honest an assessment as I can as to why we find ourselves in this unfortunate situation at the eleventh hour.

We have a process, a statutory and legal process to arrive at a budget deal every single year. It is written into the law of the United States. The President is required to submit a budget, by law, each year, and each Chamber is required to pass one separately and then agree on one together.

If the year had begun with a serious budget proposal from the President, we wouldn't be in this mess today. But he submitted a budget that would double our debt in 10 years, while he claimed it would not add to the debt and he claimed it would cause us to live within our means. Indeed, he had a substantial tax increase, very real tax increases of significant amounts, but his spending increased even more than that. So the net total of the President's budget was to make the debt trajectory we are on not better but worse, even with the tax increase. Indeed, his budget next year that he submitted proposed increases for the Education Department, the Energy Department, the State Department, and the

Transportation Department—those double-digit increases at a time when we are running the biggest deficit the Nation has ever sustained.

Senate Democrats have refused to pass, meanwhile, in this body—pass or bring up a budget for 820 days, 2 years. The majority leader said it would be foolish to pass a budget. Foolish to not pass a budget?

So these are facts. Our colleagues who run the Senate here have defied the law and sound policy all year long, and now we are paying the price—a last-minute, take-it-or-leave-it, panic vote. Nobody yet knows what is going to be in the legislation finally because of the rejection of any bill that seems to be out there at this time.

If the White House or Senate Democrats had taken the budget process seriously last year and if they had presented a single credible plan to cut spending, we wouldn't be here at this eleventh hour. Indeed, our Democratic colleagues have insisted on secret meetings that shielded them from making any of their budget plans public, that shielded them from any real votes on spending and debt, and it appears those meetings have failed.

Democrats have campaigned and sought control and a majority in the Senate, and they chose, in this time of fiscal crisis, not to engage in the budget process in a serious way. In fact, they are apparently so determined to avoid the public budget process that the Reid bill even includes language designed to circumvent the process for 2 more years.

So you will forgive me if I am a little concerned by all these attacks on the tea party. They didn't start this fire; they sounded the alarm. Before the last election, when Democrats controlled both Chambers of Congress by substantial majorities, every conversation was about increasing spending, more, more, more. Congress passed a stimulus bill—the largest single onetime expenditure ever passed by any Congress or any nation in history, every penny of that borrowed. We were already hugely in debt. We are now borrowing 40 cents of every dollar. It passed. The Congress also passed the President's massive new health care entitlement. It passed the President's request for extraordinary increases in discretionary spending. Nondefense discretionary spending has gone up 24 percent at a time of record deficits in the last 2 years. We have added $4 trillion to our gross debt since the President took office. Just in the time since the Senate Democrats last passed a budget, we have spent more than $7 trillion without a budget. These are the facts.

But after the 2010 election and the emergence of the tea party and commonsense American people who knew better about what is going on in Washington, we have finally begun to look at Washington's spending problems. Now, instead of just raising the debt ceiling with no spending cuts, as the White House initially and repeatedly demanded, we are talking about how to cut some spending.

People in the tea party and those who share their concerns should not be the ones vilified. They are good, decent, patriotic Americans whose only crime is rightly fearing for the future of their Nation. Are they wrong to be concerned when this Congress spends money willy-nilly every day, 40 cents of it borrowed? They know this is not right, and that is the kind of message they have sent to us. We need to listen to the heart of America speaking.

The last point I would like to make is about the issue of compromise. There have been suggestions that the Republicans have simply been unwilling to budge from their position. But the Boehner proposal represents only a small portion of the cuts the Republicans have advocated and that they believe should be achieved. This is truly a critical point and one the White House will not acknowledge. The House budget that they passed, a long-term 10-year budget that would change the debt trajectory of America and put us on a sound financial course in a responsible way, cuts $6 trillion in comparison to the President's request. The Toomey budget the Senate voted on cuts about $8 trillion. The House passed a plan, which I cosponsored, that not only cuts and caps spending but that requires the passage of a constitutional balanced budget amendment. In fact, all 47 Republican Senators have cosponsored a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

The $1 trillion in cuts Speaker BOEHNER is asking for would be, indeed, a modest first step, an effort to compromise and reach a number that had a realistic chance of passing this body. But under his plan we will return to the table after that $1 trillion increase in the debt ceiling has been used. This is far from the level of savings I wish to see, or the Republican House wishes to see. One trillion dollars is a bitter pill for a lot of those Members who know it is not enough. The economists and others and bondholders are telling us we need at least $4 trillion. That just reduces the crisis nature we are in. That would not come close to putting us on a path to a balanced budget over 10 years. Reducing deficits by $4 trillion over 10 years when our deficits are going to increase by $9 trillion to $13 trillion over 10 years obviously does not solve our debt crisis. But $1 trillion is even much smaller. That was a figure that was believed that this Senate might accept, so the House Members, in order to avoid a debt crisis and a financial crisis over the debt ceiling, are apparently working hard and maybe they will send it over here, I don't know. They are working hard to try to do that. I think that is a reasonable compromise and a fair approach to this Congress.

We are going to spend around $45 trillion over the next 10 years. That will add as much as $13 trillion to the gross debt. It is clear we have a lot more work to do. We are going to be fighting for cuts in spending bills, omnibus bills, continuing resolutions, and in every other place we can to impose fiscal discipline on this country. We must control spending. We must control and conquer the debt.

The President said he wants a balanced approach to the deficit—a balanced approach. But a balance is not a tax hike that bails out the big spenders who surged our spending with stimulus bills and surging 24-percent increases in discretionary spending. He is going to bail them out by raising taxes. We should never have run up that kind of spending. But balance is not a tax hike of that kind. Creating real balance, the right balance, means shifting power away from Washington, placing it in the safe hands of the American people. That is what the voters said last year when they gave a shellacking to the big spenders and that is what we should do now, and that is what I will be working for and I believe a lot of other people in the Congress on both sides of the aisle will be working for.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIORITIZING DEBT

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, last January—probably late in the month I think it was—it occurred to me that as we proceeded in the direction of approaching the statutory limit of our borrowing as a government, the discussion was becoming a little bit counterproductive in some respects. One, in particular, was this constant threat we would default on the loans we had taken out as a government, the bonds that were held by millions of Americans, and that a default would have cataclysmic repercussions. It occurred to me that this is an unproductive discussion, in part, because no such default was ever going to happen. Certainly, it didn't need to happen. In the event we didn't raise the debt limit upon reaching it or prior to that, we would have enough ongoing tax revenue to cover the debt service by many multiples.

So I introduced legislation that would clarify this. It would take this risk off the table and try to provide some clarity to markets and to senior citizens who are savers and who have invested their savings in Treasurys and to have a constructive and honest debate about what the implications are of reaching the debt limit without raising it. So I introduced a bill that would instruct the Treasury Secretary to prioritize debt service in the event we

didn't raise the debt limit upon reaching it.

Unfortunately, the idea was dismissed by the administration. It was derided. It was castigated. It was described as reckless and irresponsible and unworkable. This idea of prioritizing the payments we would make if we didn't raise the debt ceiling was dismissed out of hand.

Now we have two reports that have come out this week. One cites the fact that senior Treasury officials have been calling around to big banks assuring them that in the event we don't raise the debt ceiling, which we will hit within just a few days, Treasury is assuring the banks there will be no default; they have this covered, and they have taken care of this. The scheduled interest and principal payments on our bonds will occur on schedule.

It is nice that the administration is informing the banks of this. I think it would be nicer still if they would inform the American public and everybody who has such an important stake in ensuring that the U.S. Government not default on its debt. So that was the first report.

The second report came out just late last night—and it has been confirmed today—which is that the Treasury has, in fact, been working on a plan of the very nature they have been deriding and denying for many months now; that they, in fact, have been developing and are continuing to refine a plan to prioritize the payments that will be made in the event the debt limit is not raised by August 2.

I am glad they have finally come to this conclusion. I wish they had approached Congress and worked with us constructively many months ago when I first suggested we ought to have a plan B, but I would say it is better late than never. But now I think we ought to get this plan, such as it is, exposed to the sunshine of public discourse. We ought to understand what this process will be and Congress ought to have a role in it.

That is why I introduced an updated version of this bill last week. I have 33 Senate cosponsors on the bill. The purpose of the bill is not to be a substitute for raising the debt limit. I understand if we don't raise the debt limit close to August 2, the results will be very disruptive. We can minimize that disruption if we have a game plan, and we ought to work this out. The bill I introduced with a number of colleagues is a bill that identifies three very high priorities, that we ought to make sure we make these payments, whether or not we raise the debt ceiling. We know we will have enough money to do so, and I think we have an obligation to do that.

The three categories embodied in our bill are, first, interest on our debt. By making sure we make those payments we avoid a catastrophic default and we avoid the financial consequences which could be very dire. So that ought to be one of the top priorities. The second, equally important, is making sure we send out all the Social Security checks in full and on time to everybody who has one coming. Senior citizens all across America, including my parents, depend on Social Security checks, and they have earned those benefits by virtue of the contributions they made into that system, in many cases, for many decades.

The third and final item I think ought to be prioritized in the event we don't raise the debt ceiling by August 2 is salaries paid to Active-Duty military. I think the men and women who are risking their lives for all of us deserve to have the peace of mind of knowing that their families back home will not have to wait until Congress gets its act together for them to get their paycheck in arrears. It ought to be done on time.

So these three items, if we add them all and look at the amount they would cost during the month of August and we compare that to the tax revenue that is going to come in the door in August, these three expenses are less than half the amount of tax revenue that is going to come in. Clearly, and obviously, this is easily manageable—or easily affordable, I should say.

Technically, the Treasury and the Fed have some work to do, no doubt, to make sure this is all done smoothly. That is precisely why they should have engaged with us a long time ago, so we could have had a constructive period of time to work out whatever details are necessary so we could have as smooth a functioning process as possible—one that would have the benefit of a transparent debate.

I acknowledge there might be other items that ought to be added to the list, and we ought to have a debate on the floor to consider those items. What we would end up with is a process that the American people would understand, they would know, they could anticipate, and it would be far more constructive. It is getting late in the day, but maybe it is not too late. I hope this body will take up my bill and it will have that debate, we will have some kind of resolution, and we will provide some guidance. I think it is part of our constitutional obligation to have control over spending that occurs in our government, and this should be no exception.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. If my colleagues have constructive suggestions of how we can make it better, I welcome them, as I welcome working with the Treasury and the administration, to make sure that we, in the unfortunate event—if it should occur—that we don't raise the debt ceiling by August 2, do everything we can to minimize the disruption that will follow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in 1939, we passed a law and the law created the debt ceiling. Before that law was passed, whenever the Government of the United States of America wanted to borrow money, it had to come to Congress. Congress had to approve it and the President would sign it. We decided then to change it. Instead, we said Congress will approve a certain amount of money that the President can borrow and we will change it as needed. In other words, we don't have to approve every single bond issue, every single borrowing of the Federal Government. In 1939, that is what we did.

Since then, on 89 different occasions, Presidents of the United States have come to Congress and said the money Congress spent I have to borrow to cover. We don't have enough in the Treasury. Eighty-nine different times Presidents have come and asked for the authority to borrow money to cover expenses Congress approved. Fifty-five times Republican Presidents; 34 times Democratic Presidents. Not once—not once—did we ever default. Oh, there was a period, I think in 1979, where there were a few days of technical default, but there was never any conscious decision by Congress not to fund this debt ceiling and extend it.

It is ironic that Members of the Senate have come to the floor and said: I will never vote to extend the debt ceiling as long as I serve in the Senate. They are the same Members of the Senate who have been voting for and sending to this President requests to spend money. An example: the war in Afghanistan. Some of the most conservative Senators on the other side of the aisle not only want us to wage this war but to stay there and keep spending money. Do we know what it costs? It costs $10 billion a month for us to protect our troops in Afghanistan. For every $1 we spend—every $1 we spend—whether it is on the war, on food stamps, on missiles, on highways—but for every $1 we spend, we borrow 40 cents. We should not be borrowing all this money, but we do because Congress says there are certainly things we have to do as a nation.

Many of the same Senators who have said to the President of the United States: Do not withdraw the troops from Afghanistan, keep them there even longer, are now coming to the floor and saying to the President: But we are not going to join in asking for the authority you need to provide that money for those troops.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has come here the second day and given his take on what would happen if Congress fails to extend the debt ceiling on August 2–5 days away, August 2. What would happen?

First, understand, this is a self-inflicted wound. We have created this crisis. Madam President, 89 times we have extended the debt ceiling without incident. Presidents of both parties have asked for this over and over.

Who holds the record for extending the debt ceiling the most during his 8-year Presidency? Ronald Reagan. Eighteen times—18 times—more than twice a year, he asked Congress to extend the debt ceiling because under his 8-year watch the debt of the United States tripled.

Who holds the record for second place on the list of increasing the national debt? President George W. Bush, who, I believe, came to us seven or nine times asking to extend the debt ceiling.

It has been done by Presidents of both parties.

Now there is this controversy that is raging between the House and the Senate about whether we extend the debt ceiling. It is a vote we have done customarily without this confrontation in the past. Now we face it. But we have created this crisis. It is a self-inflicted wound, and to blame anybody else for it is just plain wrong. History tells us Congress not only has the authority but, I believe, has the responsibility to extend the debt ceiling. It is hypocritical to pass bills on the floor of the Senate—to call for the President to wage a war or build a building—and then not give this President the authority to borrow the money to do it. That is what I am hearing from the other side.

The Senator from Pennsylvania comes and says: We can live with this default. We have to figure out how to manage this default. I think he said at one point it could be managed easily. Wrong, completely wrong.

Let me tell you what happens if we default on the national debt for the first time in history. First, what does it do to the reputation of the United States of America? We have a credit report too. I do not know if you can get a free credit report for the government, but we have one. We have a AAA rating. Pretty good, right? The best in the world, the strongest economy in the world. It means when we borrow money, we borrow it at the lowest interest rate because people trust the United States of America to keep its word.

If we borrow money and say we are going to pay it back, we have always done it. We have never defaulted. We are pretty trustworthy as a debtor, and creditors understand that and charge us the lowest interest rates.

If this goes through as promised by the tea party people, and we default on our national debt, for the first time in history, what do you think it is going to do to our credit status? I can tell you what it is going to do. It is going to diminish our credit reputation in the eyes of lenders. What happens when lenders think it is riskier to loan money? They raise interest rates. In other words, the money we borrow to sustain our government will cost us more. How much more? For every 1 percent increase in interest paid by our government on our debt, it costs us $130 billion a year added to the debt. That is not $130 billion worth of money for education or $130 billion worth of money to protect us from terrorism. That is $130 billion to international bankers and countries that loan us money from this self-inflicted wound.

What else would happen? Sadly, when interest rates on our Federal Government go up, interest rates go up across our economy. It affects every family, every individual, every business in America. It affects how much you pay on your credit card bill, how much you pay for an automobile loan, a home loan, a student loan. All of these are affected. It is as bad, if not worse, than a tax because it hits everybody.

It could not come at a worse time. When our economy is struggling to create jobs, with millions out of work, to think that this unnecessary, manufactured political crisis, self-inflicted wound is going to hurt our economy in its recovery is just plain wrong.

Let me go to the specific point made by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Stay tuned and listen to what he just said. He said to us he has asked our government to tell us how they would manage a default—who would you pay, who would you fail to pay—and the government has not been forthcoming, the President, with a plan on who will be paid and not paid.

Well, we will get that plan, and we will not like it one bit. Here is why. If we do not extend our debt ceiling, in the month of August here are the raw numbers we have to work with. We will have $172 billion on hand in our Treasury to spend in August, and we will have obligations of $306 billion.

So what do you do when you have 55 percent of what you need? You make choices. The Senator from Pennsylvania said: Here are my three choices. First, we pay interest on other debts we have so we do not default on everything. That is sensible. Secondly, he said, we pay Social Security because these folks—many of them—have no other source of income. That is sensible too. Then he said we ought to pay our troops in combat and the military. I vote for that too. These men and women are risking their lives and they should be our highest priority. He says we can talk about the rest.

What is the rest? I will tell you what the rest includes. It includes every Medicare payment to every hospital and doctor in America. It includes every payment to a disabled veteran in America. It includes the decision as to whether we are going to fund Federal employees. If they are not your favorite class of people—I happen to think a lot of them, but many people do not—keep in mind some of the things they do that we will have to decide whether we should continue doing.

I was at the Greenville Federal Correctional Facility 2 weeks ago. The men and women risking their lives holding people in prison, thousands of them across the United States—pay them or not? They were not on the list. They were not on the list of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

We just had a meeting where we talked about our weather satellites collecting information about weather around the world, warning people when severe weather patterns are developing. Should we pay NOAA to maintain those satellites in orbit?

As you go through this list—whether you are talking about the FBI fighting terrorism, whether you are talking about the men and women representing the United States at embassies around the world, whether you are talking about law enforcement, whether you are talking about the intelligence agencies of the United States that watch on a minute-by-minute basis the activities of terrorists who would kill us—they were not on the list from the Senator from Pennsylvania. He did not put those on the list.

If we get down to a choice, and if it becomes that terrible a choice, understand this President—no President—wants to face that. They do not have to. It is time for us to get this resolved.

When I call radio shows back in Illinois—and I will bet the Presiding Officer gets the same thing back in Missouri—people are fed up with what they see going on in Washington. They cannot believe grownups in the House and Senate, paid to do this job, are failing; that they are dragging this out.

I will tell you what I got yesterday: an e-mail from a businessman in Chicago. He is a friend. He has a lot of businesses. He has a lot of people working for him. He had a closing yesterday on a deal worth more than $100 million to renovate a major building in Chicago. It would have been a lot of jobs. It would have been great for our city. The closing was canceled. The parties at the table said: Until Congress gets this figured out, we are not going to close the deal.

He sent me an e-mail and said: For God's sake, when is this going to come to an end?

I am hearing that all over from people who are just fed up.

The Chicago Tribune printed an article today entitled: ''Across state, businesses fret over debt ceiling showdown.'' They went through a long list of individuals who talked about what this stalemate might mean.

As the article states, Ed Wehmer, with Wintrust Financial Corporation, ''worries that a prolonged stalemate could lead to a double-dip recession,'' even more unemployment.

> ''The possibility of not getting a Social Security or other government check will make people skittish,'' Wehmer said. That could weaken consumer spending and hamper economic growth. Higher interest rates, he said, would hit an already stressed real estate market.

A banker in Lake Forest said: ''Could you imagine if we ran our business like that,'' referring to what is going on in Washington. ''These are the people who make the regulations we have to live with.''

> The Illinois Hospital Association figures that its members will have to absorb $8 billion in federal payment reductions over 10

years as a result of the 2010 health care overhaul act. Now, [they are] bracing for another blow.

''We're concerned that any additional cuts to hospitals, whether through Medicare or Medicaid, will have a dramatic impact on hospitals and health care providers . . . ''

The Illinois Finance Authority—all of these groups look at this situation and say: This makes our economy even worse. It is a self-inflicted, politically manufactured problem. It is a crisis which does not have to exist. Should we ignore our debt? Of course not.

Madam President, you know I have worked on this issue for a year and a half now with more specificity than ever in my career. I was on the deficit commission the President appointed. Then I stuck around afterwards as six Senators—the Group of 6, we called ourselves; it was not a very inspired name, but that is what we came up with: three Democrats and three Republicans—and we sat down for 6 months and hammered out an agreement among us to reduce our Federal deficit by $4 trillion over the next 10 years, with a balanced approach that puts everything on the table—everything—revenue, entitlements, spending—everything.

We came to an agreement. We presented our agreement to the Senators just 2 weeks ago. Forty-nine Senators showed up at that meeting, Democrats and Republicans. It was amazing. Then we followed up and said: Are you ready to put your name on the bottom line? Will you support moving forward with this bipartisan way to deal with the deficit in a responsible way that does not endanger our economy and make us face bankruptcy as a nation?

We now have 36 Senators, Democrats and Republicans, who have signed up. That is a pretty good number. It shows that this is not an idea that we came up with that does not have legs. Sure, we are going to have to change it. We understand that. But look what happened. Democrats and Republicans sat down—no cameras, no reporters—and worked out a reasonable way to deal with the deficit and our Nation's debt.

What is better? Lurching from this crisis to another crisis 4 months from now, as Speaker BOEHNER suggests, or dealing with this in an honest, bipartisan way today?

Madam President, I can tell you what the American people want us to do—at least I think I know what they want us to do. They do not want us to endanger this economic recovery. They do not want us to kill jobs. They do not want us to hurt businesses. They want us to help this economy recover and create jobs. They want us to extend this debt ceiling so we do not see interest rates going up across America at exactly the wrong time. They certainly do not want to see us put in a position where we have to decide between paying Social Security recipients and our soldiers who are in combat. That is what the administration would face if this crisis that has been manufactured on Capitol Hill continues.

What they expect us to do is to earn our pay as Members of the House and Senate, to work hard to come up with a reasonable approach, and to be willing to give a little. It is the only way you reach a compromise. Compromise is the nature of this political process. Those who condemn it—and there are some who do, who say: Never give up, stick to your principles, never change—we are not going to get a solution. We have to be willing to work together to give and get this done.

Here is what I predict is going to happen soon.

I predict Speaker BOEHNER is going to call his bill on the floor of the House. We have told him in advance it is a nonstarter here. If it passes the House, it will come here, and it will likely be voted down. We will then propose an alternative.

Majority Leader HARRY REID has an alternative which basically extends the debt ceiling beyond next year so our economy has time to recover. It cuts spending by over $2 trillion so we address our deficit. It does it with a list of spending cuts that every Republican has voted for so it is not controversial in substance. I think that is the best approach.

He creates a joint committee to deal with the long-term deficit. I have been involved in those, and I think we should. I think it is a good, balanced approach that solves our problem and gets us through this crisis. We are likely to vote on it either tomorrow or the next day. But we are down to 5 days. We are running out of time. We have to get this done.

I want to tell you, any Senator who comes to the floor and says defaulting on our debt and reaching the first point in our history where the credit reputation of the United States is in doubt is OK, it is a good political tactic, they do not understand the gravity of that decision and the impact it will have on businesses and families for generations to come.

This notion that we can pick and choose the checks we are going to send out in August when we are going to have 55 or 60 percent of what we need is going to put us in an impossible position. Deciding among all of the valuable, important functions of government which ones will not be funded—that is an impossible position for this President to be in. We cannot do that to him. We cannot do that to our government. We cannot do this to our country.

I hope that after the House votes today or tonight, whenever it may be, that we take up the measure quickly. Let's move this forward. Let's get this done. Let's avoid this crisis. Let's meet the responsibility we were elected to address.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I understand that we are in morning business and Senators are allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

A HOUSE DIVIDED

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, our greatest Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, in his drive to end slavery, said ''a house divided against itself cannot stand.'' With these few words, Lincoln is calling to us through the echoing halls of history. He is calling for us to put aside our differences and to become unified into one people, one Nation, one common purpose.

Mr. Lincoln recognized that the issue of slavery was tearing this great Nation apart and that it could not survive half slave and half free. Slavery was the great unfinished business of our Founders. The institution of slavery was so ingrained in the infant country's past and future that even Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison and Franklin could not disentangle it. I am not trying to equate carrying too much debt with slavery, please understand that, but the truth remains. A house divided against itself cannot stand.

This house, this Nation, this Republic, is divided against itself. Our Founders called their effort at establishing a new Nation ''a great experiment''—and it has been. Nothing like it had ever been tried and America has been the unequaled success in all of world history. Truly, we are the envy of the world. We began as 13 weak and barely united States but quickly became the strongest country in the Western Hemisphere. About 70 years after we adopted the Constitution, we survived a deadly Civil War. All the while we grew in stature and in favor with other nations. Our economic power grew rapidly. American influence grew as we became the agent of democracy and capitalism for the entire world. Although our military power was slow to develop, we fought on the winning side in two world wars and we grew into an economic, military and cultural super power.

We are a Nation of immigrants, of many faiths, of many races and our national call to union is E Pluribus Unum. Out of many, one. Out of many States is forged one Nation. Out of many races is forged one people. Out of many, one. The Founding Fathers had to balance the agrarian interests of the South and West with the industrial and shipping interests of the North and East. They balanced small States and big States. They balanced regions dominated by the frontier with regions dominated by the old world. They balanced Catholicism and Protestantism and Judaism. They balanced English

culture with German culture with French culture. Out of many, one. Had previous generations of leaders not achieved oneness, we would not be, could not be, the great Nation we are today. The Senate was added to the Constitution as a compromise. Washington, DC, was placed on the banks of the Potomac as a compromise. States were added to the union as the result of compromise. In this sense, America's ability to find compromise has always been our pathway to greatness. Our Founders established this more perfect union with the clear-eyed knowledge that came from experience that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

Division leads to failure. To make our democracy work, we all must work together. We must acknowledge that we have differences of opinion and differing points of view, but we must commit to unity. The floor of the U.S. Senate is the marketplace for ideas and it is a window into democracy that is a living testimony to the greatness and diversity of our Nation. The floor of the U.S. Senate should not be a graveyard for ideas or innovation or promise. Campaigns should stop at the threshold of this chamber. What happens in this chamber is much greater than any single Senator's political fortunes, and it is much more important than a political party's fate at the next general election. We have a sacred responsibility to the people through the Constitution, and if we orient ourselves to the next presidential election, we are failing in our duty. The U.S. Senate, at its core, by its nature, is where decisions get made. We have our ideological battles here, that is certain, but this is where consensus should be achieved. The Senate should fuel the engine that propels us to a better future, not stall that engine.

All Americans should fully participate in our government. We should register to vote and serve on the jury. We must volunteer in the schools and pay our taxes. We must teach our children about our country, their country, and prepare them for their time to lead. We must tell them that our system of government is the best that man ever devised and that it works. It works very well if we allow it to work.

This moment in history is a day where we can show our children, as well as our Founding Fathers, that this is no longer a house divided. We can show the world that our parents instilled in us the value of E Pluribus Unum. America's best days lay ahead if we are mutually committed to that future. It is, however, not possible unless we set aside our differences and work together for that common goal. My fellow Senators, please heed the words of Abraham Lincoln and understand that there is truth of what he said, ''A house divided against itself cannot stand.''

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, let me speak for a few minutes about the disappointment I have and I am sure many other colleagues have with the situation we find ourselves in with respect to the partial shutdown of the Federal Aviation Administration.

My colleague from Colorado, Senator BENNET, was on the Senate floor this afternoon and spoke eloquently about how this partial shutdown is affecting his State of Colorado. I wanted to talk briefly about the similar concerns I have for my State of New Mexico.

Frankly, some in this Congress, in my view, have lost sight of what they were elected to do in Washington. Aviation is a critical piece of our transportation infrastructure, a critical piece of our economy. Yet, for nearly a week now, the Congress has failed to extend the necessary authorizations to keep the Federal Aviation Administration doing the work that needs to be done.

It has been over 5 months since the Senate passed its reauthorization bill for aviation programs. That vote was overwhelming; it was 87 to 8. So this was not a partisan bill; this was a bill supported strongly by both Democrats and Republicans.

The bill included a number of programs important to my State of New Mexico and to the entire Nation, including the Airport Improvement Program that provides grants for the construction of runways, taxiways, which help to make airports safer. These projects also create hundreds of jobs in the construction industry in my State and tens of thousands of jobs in the construction industry nationwide.

One of the most important features of the Senate's bill relates to our air traffic control system. Our current system is universally recognized as being antiquated, inefficient, and increasingly it is recognized as being unsafe. The bill we passed out of the Senate dramatically accelerates the FAA's efforts to convert the air traffic control system to one based on satellites and global positioning systems, similar to the GPS many of us have in our cars. When implemented, NextGen—the name given to this improvement of the air traffic control system—will improve safety, will increase efficiency of operations, will reduce delays, and will save fuel and help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Thanks to the good work Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Ranking Member HUTCHISON in the Commerce Committee did, the Senate passed a good bill to reauthorize aviation programs. That was in February. Then in April, the House passed its own version nearly on a party-line vote. The House majority, unfortunately, chose to include partisan and divisive provisions in that legislation that were not appropriate in an aviation bill.

Let me give a little description of what those partisan and divisive provisions I am referring to are. There was an editorial in the New York Times this morning that summed it up well. It says:

> Last year, the National Mediation Board changed a rule to make it easier for airline and railroad workers to unionize. Until then, workers who did not vote in union representation elections were counted as ''no'' votes; after the change [this is the change by the National Mediation Board—its own rules] they are counted as abstentions. Pushed by the airline lobby, House Republicans passed a long-term FAA reauthorization bill that would have undone the rule change. The Senate's reauthorization bill, passed in February, maintained the rule.

In spite of this difference in the two bills, the Senate did appoint conferees, did begin working to resolve differences—as we should have—and working out the required compromise is never easy. Unfortunately, now the House has decided that in order to gain leverage over the Senate to accept the House anti-union provisions, there would not be any additional clean extensions of existing law.

We have had 20 extensions of existing law to just keep the Federal Aviation Administration operating while the House and Senate negotiate the final resolution of this larger bill. Unfortunately, the situation now is that the Congress's failure to extend the authorization one more time has shut down important aviation programs across the country, and 4,000 FAA employees have been furloughed and forced to go without pay. Across the Nation, important airport improvement projects are now on hold.

In New Mexico, $26 million in funding for over two dozen projects has been stopped. These include a new firetruck for the airport in Roswell, runway projects in Raton and Santa Rosa, and snow removal equipment in Clayton and Vaughn. In Santa Fe, work on a vital new radar system has been stopped. In Albuquerque, progress has stopped on a $10 million project to replace the airport parking apron.

What is particularly troubling to me is that the authority to collect the ticket tax has also been suspended. Why should this matter? This is the money that goes into the airport trust fund and allows us to continue to make improvements and maintain our airport infrastructure around the country. This is funding that is used to pay for safety and infrastructure projects at airports in my State and everywhere in the country. As I understand it, it amounts to about $30 million a day being lost from that trust fund. At a time when we are being told the country is falling behind in its investments in basic infrastructure, this loss of funding is clearly going to have major impacts on airport projects down the road.

People also need to realize that the fact that the FAA is no longer able to collect the ticket tax does not mean people don't have to pay the full price they would be paying if the tax were being charged. The airlines, with very few exceptions, have announced they

are going to continue to charge the full price for tickets and pocket the extra money themselves, instead of turning it over for infrastructure projects at our airports.

So here we are. It is simply, in my view, unacceptable for the Congress not to restore to the FAA the authority to collect airline ticket taxes and to resume normal operations.

Senator ROCKEFELLER has introduced a clean extension of the aviation programs. Whatever differences there are between the two bodies in provisions in the short-term extension are trivial compared to this $30 million a day the Nation is losing in funding for our Nation's airport projects.

We all here in the Senate, in the Congress, and in the country, are focused on the need to extend the debt limit, and that is the most urgent need we face, but in addition to that we need to restore to the FAA the authority to resume its normal operations and to resume payments into the airport trust fund. To leave for an August break without having fixed the problem of the lack of FAA authorization as well would be seriously irresponsible.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from this morning's New York Times entitled ''This Is Called 'Small' Government.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 27, 2011]

THIS IS CALLED 'SMALL' GOVERNMENT

What has happened to the Federal Aviation Administration in the last few days should remind everyone of the costs of the Republicans' obstructionism and their slash-and-burn budget games.

Taxes on airline tickets expired on Friday when the F.A.A. lost its operating authority, including the authority to collect taxes. Passengers are rightly furious at the nation's airlines, many of which are pocketing the difference. But the masterminds of this fiasco are the House Republicans who let this happen.

The F.A.A. has also had to furlough some 4,000 workers. Needed airport construction projects—to maintain runways, build new traffic control towers and upgrade other facilities—have been halted across the country. The only good news is that the air traffic control system is still working because traffic controllers are paid from the Aviation Trust Fund, which still has a positive balance.

All of this happened after House Republicans inserted a new provision into a routine bill to temporarily extend the F.A.A.'s operational authority. The provision would end $16.5 million in federal subsidies to 13 airports in rural communities. The bill passed the House. But Senate Democrats balked, arguing that the right place for changing policy is in the regular F.A.A. reauthorization bill—noting that the temporary extension has passed 20 times since 2007 without any additional provisions.

''If we can't put an end to these extravagant subsidies, then we will never be able to rein in spending where really hard decisions are necessary,'' said Tom Petri, the chairman of the House aviation subcommittee, upon submitting the bill. Talk about pound foolish. When the F.A.A. lost operational authority, it lost its ability to collect $200 million in taxes a week. These taxes would have paid for the airport subsidies in about 14 hours. There is more going on here. As we have seen in many Republican-led states, an attack on ''excessive'' government spending is also often a bid to break labor unions.

Last year, the National Mediation Board changed a rule to make it easier for airline and railroad workers to unionize. Until then, workers who did not vote in union representation elections were counted as ''no'' votes; after the change, they are counted as abstentions. Pushed by the airline lobby, House Republicans passed a long-term F.A.A. reauthorization in April that would have undone the rule change. The Senate's reauthorization bill, passed in February, maintained the rule.

Earlier this month, John Mica, the chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, told an aviation conference that adding the airport subsidy provision to the temporary bill to keep the F.A.A. running is ''just a tool'' to force the Senate to give in on the union issue.

Next time voters hear Republicans talking about taking a principled stand against government spending, they should keep this sorry and cynical tale in mind.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I follow my colleague who mentioned our need to prevent default. The need we have—the reason we are here and why there will be a vote in the House and the Senate tonight—has to do with the need of our Nation to prevent default, and also, of course, the need to cut spending. Our problem is that we spend too much. Americans all around the country are calling in to Members of the House and Senate and saying: Hey, let's get things under control and let's cut the spending.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, I am happy to see with the proposals being brought forth, are beginning to understand what my constituents in Wyoming have known from the very beginning: Americans are not taxed too little, Washington spends too much. But the President seems to be more concerned about the next election than about the next generation of Americans.

I was astonished last week when the President was addressing the Nation and he talked about what his bottom line was in this whole debate. He said:

> The only bottom line I have is that we have to extend this debt ceiling through the next election, into 2013.

This was the President of the United States saying this:

> The only bottom line I have is that we have to extend this debt ceiling through the next election, into 2013.

Since 1962, the debt ceiling has been raised 74 times. On average, the debt ceiling is usually for about 8 months. But now the folks on the other side, and the President, are calling for the largest debt ceiling increase in history and it is designed to last a lot longer than 8 months—almost for a year and a half, as the President wants it to go into 2013; and specifically, as he said, through the next election.

The President's Treasury Secretary has essentially said the same thing. He said:

> We have to lift this threat of default from the economy for, you know, for the next 18 months. We have to take that threat off the table through the election.

Well, if the President and the Treasury Secretary get their way, they will be able to ignore the single biggest threat to our national security until after the next election. As the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has said: The greatest threat to our national security is the debt.

The President could have gotten what he wanted last week—which is an increase in the debt ceiling beyond the election—when the House passed its cut, cap, and balance legislation. I was one of the original cosponsors of that in the Senate. I was in favor of it, supported it, and continue to support that. Instead, the President issued a veto threat. He told Democrats in the Senate to kill it. After all, they are still the majority party.

The Senate Democrats, I believe tonight, will have the power to save our country's finances once again. They can do that by passing the Boehner plan—pass it through this body and send it to the President's desk for him to sign. Instead, the majority leader has said no Democrat—not one—will support this plan. It has what the President wants. It raises the debt ceiling. It lets us, as a nation, avoid default. But it doesn't take us beyond the election.

It is interesting. It would seem support by the Democrats for this plan would clearly signal their desire to continue working to rein in Washington's wasteful spending, to get our fiscal house in order. But that doesn't seem to be the signal the President wants to send. The Boehner plan is the only plan currently on the table that can get through the House of Representatives and protect us from default.

Republicans have put forward plan after plan. Democrats and the White House have done nothing but criticize from the sidelines. The White House Press Secretary has even said:

> Leadership is not proposing a plan for the sake of having it voted up or down and likely voted down.

That is what he said. He said the Democrats have even sent a letter asking for a long-term debt increase. But how can we have a long-term debt increase if they have no plan to get there? The White House Secretary claimed recently the President's plan is well-known. He said:

> There is no plan that has been offered, certainly in the last several months, about which more detail is known.

I say: Where are the details? I want to know how I could get this well-known plan and share it with my constituents back home in Wyoming. How

did the CBO score this plan that, according to the President's Press Secretary, is a plan about which so much detail is known? Where is it? What is the CBO score? Where is the text of it? How can we read it and bring it here and discuss or debate it?

These things don't exist—neither a CBO score nor a text—because the White House has continually refused to release a plan, even with pleas coming from Congress and from the media. I can understand why the President might be reluctant, since the time he last brought a budget to this body it was defeated 97 to 0. Not one Democrat voted in support of what the President had proposed—not one. No one supported the President's budget plan.

There is a Reid plan being proposed. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Reid plan cuts about $2.2 trillion from our budget over the next 10 years. But if you dig a little deeper, you find these so-called cuts are accounting gimmicks. The House Budget Committee looked at the Reid plan and their assessment was not very flattering. Let me quote from that assessment:

> Reid's plan relies on the inaccurate assumption that surge-level spending in Iraq and Afghanistan is scheduled to continue over the next decade.

No one in America, and I would hope no one in the White House, believes that surge level spending in Iraq and Afghanistan is scheduled to continue over the next decade. But the plan endorsed by the President relies on such an inaccurate assumption. Why is he trying to mislead the American people? The Democrats are claiming to save money by cutting spending that was never, ever going to be spent in the first place. This is the strongest possible proof the White House is not realistically dealing with the situation and is not, in my opinion, serious about realistically and reliably cutting the debt.

In fact, even if you assume the Reid plan would work, it wouldn't cut spending fast enough to keep up with the spending the President is doing. The President wants to borrow at least $2.4 trillion to get him through the election—to get him into 2013. But the last draft of the floor plan we are going to be asked to discuss cuts $2.2 trillion over 10 years while raising the debt ceiling by $2.7 trillion. It would take over a decade to pay back what this President wants to borrow over the next year and a half. So we would still be borrowing at a much higher rate than we are cutting. That is not responsible leadership. Responsible leadership would be to recognize the solution to our country's financial woes, and that solution is to avoid default, while consistently cutting spending and balancing our books the way that families do. That solution would require us to keep working until we get it right. That is the theory at the heart of Speaker BOEHNER's plan.

The President talks about wanting a balanced approach. That means different things to different people. When the President is talking about wanting more taxes, I think what Americans want is actually a balanced budget. Speaker BOEHNER will bring us one step closer to that balance by forcing a vote on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I look forward to voting for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

We live under a constitution in the State of Wyoming, and from the very beginning we have balanced our budget. As a result, we have excess money and scholarships available to all students to study at our universities and community colleges, because year after year we live within our means.

The President talked a bit about public opinion being important in this debate. Yet he is opposed to a balanced budget constitutional amendment. In a recent Sachs/Mason-Dixon poll, 65 percent of Americans say they support a balanced budget constitutional amendment. So where is the respect for that public opinion? The Boehner plan works because its authors have listened to the American people.

The White House refuses to seriously confront the problems facing our Nation, and Democrats are trying to shut down the only plan that can pass the House and save us from default. I am alarmed at their denial about how to solve these problems. The President must not veto America into default. It is time we pass a real plan that cuts spending and avoids default. We don't need to wait until midnight on August 1 or August 2. We can do it, and we should do it today.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 7 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that time; and further, that I be recognized at 7 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia.

TOUGH FISCAL CHOICES

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the tough fiscal choices this body, this government, and our President now face. But before I say anything else, I wish to start off with a profound apology. I want to apologize to every West Virginian and all Americans for the terrible process they have been made to endure and witness. With 5 days before the August 2 deadline to raise the debt ceiling, this government faces yet another crisis of its own making. Yet it is not we who pay the price for our failures to govern, it is the American people. To the tens of millions of American families who work hard to take care of their families, I can only imagine the anger and disgust they have at witnessing a broken government and a President and Members of Congress who can't seem to even agree sometimes on what day it is, let alone on how to solve the Nation's debt crisis.

The American people deserve better.

Some will say Washington is broken and that is the best we can do, but I do not believe that for one moment. Washington may be broken, but it will not break me, and you should not let it break you either. I came to fix things, not to make things worse. I came to solve problems, not to ignore them, and I came to worry about the next generation, not my next election.

I, for one, am willing to make the tough and painful decisions that will improve the lives of every West Virginian and all Americans for generations to come, regardless of what it means for my party or for the next election, and I know I am not alone.

After our beloved Senator Byrd passed away, I chose to run for the Senate for one simple reason: I saw the great challenges our Nation faced: exploding debts and deficits, our Nation's energy dependence, costly wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and a painful jobs and economic crisis, and I wanted to help make things better by bringing a little common sense to Washington. I knew we had to focus on rebuilding America and doing so meant making hard, politically difficult choices.

Some of my colleagues often remind me that fixing problems as complex as our debt crisis isn't easy. But with all due respect, it seems we make it harder than it needs to be. My friends, it doesn't need to be this way.

I did not come to Washington with the illusion that I could reinvent the wheel, but I did come to help balance the wheels and make the car run a little smoother.

Months ago, when I said I would not vote to raise the debt ceiling without a long-term fix, I thought this Congress and our President would be able to tackle the issue head-on and have it done by now. As I made clear on that day, the choices we make to address our debt now will determine whether the vital programs we all deeply care about, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, our veterans programs, education for our children, Head Start, are there for those in need and for the decades to come. However, instead of coming together months ago to focus and deal with the gravity of our debt, we delayed, and we continue to delegate.

While I will never question someone's motivations or their heart, we all have a right to question the strategies of our leaders and colleagues, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, because these strategies have once again led us to a crisis and the brink of a disaster. At a minimum, this entire process has, once again, fed a growing public cynicism that is corrosive to the very fabric of our government, and we all bear the responsibility for that.

I truly believe we can do better. I know this to be true because we proved it in West Virginia.

When I first became Governor of the great State of West Virginia, our State faced similar grave fiscal concerns. After facing dismal credit ratings for far too long and a dark fiscal future, some thought our State's best days were behind us. But after confronting our fiscal challenges head-on in West Virginia, even during the deepest recession in our lifetimes, we are one of the few States in the Nation that has had its credit rating upgraded the last 3 years in a row, and we had surpluses for 6 years in a row during the toughest times. We did this in West Virginia by cutting spending but not cutting the vital programs or services we hold so dear. We did this not by raising tax rates but by ensuring that everyone paid their fair share in our State. We did this by tackling waste, fraud, and abuse so as to ensure that we took care of those most in need, not those bent on greed. By doing this, we helped to restore confidence to the economy of our State, and that is a factor we can't overestimate.

West Virginia may be a small State, but these are commonsense solutions I strongly believe can apply right here.

I did not blame these fiscal challenges we had in our State on the mistakes made by past Governors or legislators, whether they were Democrats or Republicans. I reached out to all members of our legislature, whether they were on the front row or the so-called back row, and I met with them and anyone who had an idea on how we best could solve our fiscal problems. It required sacrifice, it required patience, and it required trust and respect. Can anyone honestly say that with all that has taken place here? In fact, if we turn on cable news right now, we will see exactly where this broken process stands. We as Democrats sometimes are rushing out to attack our colleagues, the Republicans, and the Republicans are rushing out to attack us, the Democrats.

We are better than this, and for the sake of this Nation's future we must do better. I owe it to all West Virginians and we all owe it to this great Nation to do much better than we have. From time to time, we should remind ourselves we took an oath to do just that.

As idealistic as it may sound, I implore this great body, each Member, the leaders of both bodies, the President, the two parties, and especially the political committees, to put away their political knives and swords and let us do something that has become rare in Washington: Put aside the political attacks for a few months and actually work together, openly, honestly, with respect for our profound differences, and build a trust that will fix the big problems we face as a nation.

The stakes are too high to do anything else. Our Nation faces not only a threat of default but of a downgrade. The credit rating agencies, such as Standard & Poor's, have made it clear that the United States needs to cut nearly $4 trillion over the next decade or they will lose the confidence in our long-term ability to pay our bills.

Yet in my estimation, neither of the two plans that are currently proposed by both Republican and Democratic leadership comes close to preventing our Nation from being downgraded or actually solving the debt crisis we face. Each falls far short, whether it is in time or dollars.

The truth is, both of the plans being discussed and that the Senate may consider, one offered by the leader of the Republican Party, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, and the other offered by the leader of our Chamber and my party, Senator REID, do not solve the Nation's long-term fiscal problems as presented.

Make no mistake, I have the utmost respect for both of these fine public servants. Both find themselves in difficult positions, and I know they are trying their best to do what is right. I understand the desire to prevent our Nation's default. But what we have before us are effectively a short-term fix and a shorter term fix. Either one might prevent a default, which is a good thing, but neither may prevent a credit downgrade, which is a terrible thing.

To me, it doesn't matter if it is a Republican proposal or a Democratic proposal, but including $1.2 trillion in savings from the wars we should not be fighting as savings doesn't make sense. Saying we will save money that we haven't even budgeted or spent is akin to saying that because your family bought a $20,000 car instead of a $50,000 car, you saved $30,000. It is even worse when we consider we couldn't afford to buy any car in the first place. Most of the American people understand that, and I know in West Virginia they do.

As for Speaker BOEHNER's plan, his was supposed to save $1.2 trillion, but the Congressional Budget Office just took a look and determined it would save only $917 billion. So instead of fixing our problem, it kicks the can down the road to 2012, which will be an election year. If we think this process is ugly now, we ain't seen anything yet.

As these two proposals currently stand, I could not, in good conscience, support either one of them unless they include a pathway for a long-term debt fix. While it is true our Nation will suffer if we only enact a short-term deal, we will suffer much more if we fail to fix our greater fiscal problems.

We must solve our Nation's problems now, not in 2012 and certainly not in 2013. This is not just my opinion. As many rating agencies have warned and economists have predicted, every year that goes by, the options on how to fix our looming debt crisis will become worse and worse.

If we are being honest, neither of these proposals, as they stand today, can prevent a credit rating agency's downgrade, an event that would be as catastrophic or maybe even worse than default because I, personally, know a government's climb back from a low credit rating is extremely long and painful.

To be clear, a downgrade in our credit worthiness could lead to selloff of stocks, Treasury securities, and U.S. dollars. Gold prices could rise even higher, and interest rates could increase across the board, which would not only have a devastating impact on consumers, small businesses, and local governments but would make the price of financing our Nation's debt even more costly. At a minimum, the shock to our Nation's confidence from our first-ever downgrade could prove more costly than we could even fathom.

We can't let this happen. For the sake of our Nation's future, we must come to a compromise that acknowledges that a long-term debt fix is needed and our spending is out of control and that raising tax rates, whether it is the rich, the middle class, and most especially even the poor, will not cure our spending problems.

But we must also come to a compromise that acknowledges that tax reform is not the same as raising taxes and that there is something morally wrong when a large corporation, such as G.E., pays zero in Federal taxes while small businesses or a middle-class family pays more.

We must also come to a compromise that finally acknowledges we simply can't fight three wars for years to come while we cut services here at home and we choose to keep taxes low. I have said this before, but it is so important. If I have to choose between rebuilding America and rebuilding Afghanistan, I choose America.

So with the clock ticking toward default, what can we do?

As part of any deal to raise the debt ceiling, I would respectfully encourage leaders in the Senate and the House and our President to find common ground by committing to a guaranteed vote on a long-term fix; otherwise, as I said months ago, I simply cannot support a short-term deal that is just a little better than the shorter term deal.

With all due respect to my colleagues, I will not look West Virginians in the eye and say: Don't worry, all is good; I saved myself for the 2012 election, but you are on your own.

A vote on such a long-term debt fix, I would hope, could come within the next 90 days or a reasonable period of time so as to prevent what I fear the most, a downgrade of our Nation's credit rating. I believe such a vote on a long-term fix is possible because many good people have already worked hard to put together the framework and pieces of what such a long-term fix could look like.

Already we have seen two promising, commonsense proposals from bipartisan groups: the Bowles-Simpson debt commission, which presented its report nearly 9 months ago, and a similar framework that was presented last week by the bipartisan Gang of 6.

In fact, the day the Gang of 6 announced their proposed framework was one of my better and prouder days as a Senator. For the first time since I have been in the Senate, I saw Democratic and Republican Senators, almost equally divided, come together to put politics aside and agree to the principles of a commonsense solution that recognizes the urgency of fixing our long-term problems.

No plan is perfect; no plan will be. No plan will please all, and no plan can. But within these two plans I believe lies the path our Nation can take if we are to get our fiscal house in order. Of course, some will have other ideas, whether from the right or whether from the left, and we should listen to them all. But I would ask each of us and all the groups that undoubtedly will be mobilized to stop any fix, to think hard about what will happen to our great Nation if we fail and do nothing. What will happen to the programs we cherish, such as Social Security and Medicare, for all those people who depend on that for their only means of livelihood? What will happen to our Nation's defense and to our tax rates? What will happen to the people who are truly in need? What will happen to our seniors, our veterans, and our children if we choose to do little or nothing at all?

Finally, as the negotiations for this long-term fix proceed, I would hope we could all remember that if we are to negotiate in good faith, we must have faith in each other. We cannot turn a fair compromise into the enemy, and we can't tear each other apart with attacks if we are to come together to solve our Nation's great problems. We can respectfully disagree as long as we never forget to respect each other.

As difficult as the next few days and weeks and months will be, I believe we, the President and this esteemed Congress, have the opportunity to make this one of our finest hours. We have within our hands an opportunity where we can prove to the naysayers and the doubters that the government of the people is as great as the people which it serves.

I, for one, am willing to do whatever I possibly can, whatever is asked of me; I will work hard every day, across the aisle, until we have a long-term solution to our debt crisis.

I know no Senator or Member of Congress can do this alone. But together, putting politics aside, we can do this. For the sake of this great Nation, our children, the State I love, West Virginia, and this wonderful country of ours, the United States of America, I truly hope we do.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT INSPECTOR GENERAL AUDITS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, at least two times in the last couple of months I have come to the floor to tell my colleagues about some work I am doing on investigation of waste, fraud, and abuse in the Defense Department and primarily to focus them on the work of the Inspector General's Office in regard to how they do audits. So I come to the floor today to renew my call for better audit reports.

As a Senator dedicated to watchdogging the taxpayers' money, audits are a primary instrument in my toolbox. They are like a hammer and a wrench. They are the tools of the trade. But like other Members of Congress conducting oversight, I can't do audits. We don't have staff for that, so we must rely on the inspectors general of the various departments to do the independent audits of the work of those departments. So today I speak about the Defense Department inspector general.

The audit should be the inspector general's primary weapon for rooting out fraud, waste, and theft. Audits should be the tip of their spear, and that spear should have a very sharp point. The mere possibility of audit should have the fraudsters—people who commit fraud—quaking in their boots, but that is not the way it is, at least not at the Defense Department.

The audit weapon belonging to the Defense Department's inspector general is not as effective as it should be. This problem is not entirely the inspector general's own doing. The broken Defense Department accounting system is also to blame. It is incapable of generating accurate and complete finance and accounting data. When the books are in shambles, as they are, then there are no audit trails to follow, and following the money is how we get to the bottom of things when it comes to waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement. Of course, that makes the auditor's job doubly difficult. So the auditors need to adjust the audit strategy to meet the challenge that there is not a very good financial management system within the Defense Department.

As a watchdog, degraded audit capabilities give me serious heartburn. It puts the taxpayers' money in harm's way. When we have unreliable accounting data coupled with ineffective auditing, theft and waste can thrive undetected. Those concerns are the driving force behind my ongoing audit oversight review.

Starting in January of 2009, I began receiving anonymous letters from whistleblowers. They alleged gross mismanagement in the audit office. In response, my staff initiated an in-depth oversight review. It focused on audit reporting by that Inspector General's Office.

On September 7, 2010, I issued my first report. It evaluated 113 audit reports issued in fiscal year 2009. That study determined that those audits, which cost the taxpayers about $100 million, were not on target. I offered 12 recommendations for getting the audit process back on track.

Inspector General Heddell responded to my report in a very positive and constructive way. He promised to ''transform the audit organization.'' The newly appointed deputy for auditing, Mr. Dan Blair, produced a roadmap pointing the way forward. He, too, promised reform and transformation and the creation of a ''world-class oversight organization.'' All of this, of course, was music to my ears. All signals were very encouraging. But the big question before us now is this: When will the promised reforms begin to pop up on the radar screen? And that radar screen is our further reading of additional audits as they come out this fiscal year and into the future. When will we see sustained improvement in audit quality?

To establish a solid baseline for assessing the highly touted transformation plan, my staff took another snapshot of recent audits. My latest oversight review is best characterized as a report card, and it was issued on June 1 of this year. Each of the 113 unclassified reports published in fiscal year 2010 was reviewed, evaluated, and graded. After each report was graded, all the scores for each report on each rating category were added up and averaged. This created a composite score for each of the 113 reports.

Although 15 top-quality audits are highlighted in the report card, the overall score for all 113 was D-minus. That is low, I know. Maybe the score should have been a little higher. Obviously, the grading system isn't perfect. It may need some fine-tuning, and we are working on that. But I still believe it provides a rough measure of audit quality.

Clearly, none of the 2010 reports reflected any reforms that Inspector General Heddell put in place in December of 2010 because all those reports were published 3 months before the reforms went into place before October 1, 2010. That was a good 3 months before those reforms were approved.

Shortly after my report card was issued, Inspector General Heddell pounced on it. He objected to the low score. He complained that it did not adequately reflect $4.2 billion in what he calls ''achieved monetary benefits'' identified in the 2010 audits.

To address Mr. Heddell's concerns, I had my staff ask the audit office to prepare an information paper on the reported savings. That document was provided to me on June 20. I call it a ''crosswalk.'' It takes me to the exact page in each report where savings are discussed and identified. This document lists $4.2 billion in ''identified potential monetary benefits'' and $4.2 billion in ''collections.'' These alleged savings were uncovered in 19 reports, including one classified report we didn't look at.

After reviewing the crosswalk, I concluded that Inspector General Heddell

had a legitimate gripe about the report card. The report card should have included a section on savings. The first time around, we did not give sufficient credit for those accomplishments. As a practical matter, we gave those reports only partial credit for pinpointing waste. I say partial credit because six of those reports were given top scores in my report card, so they did get some credit—just not enough credit.

In order to fully assess Mr. Heddell's complaints, I directed my staff to reassess the scoring process for all 18 unclassified audits. In rescoring the reports, we asked ourselves key questions such as, Was the audit objective aligned with the inspector general's core mission? Did contract audits connect all the dots in the cycle of transactions? Did they match contract requirements with payments? Did the audits answer the key oversight question, which is, Did the government receive what it ordered at an agreed-upon price and schedule? Did the audit verify the exact dollar amount of alleged fraud and waste using primary source payment records? I do not have time to go into this, but the use of primary source payment records is very important if we are going to follow the money, and following the money is where we determine whether there is fraud, waste, and abuse.

Other key questions we asked were: Were the recommendations tough and appropriate? Did they recommend accountability for waste and mismanagement? Did they propose workable remedies for recovering improper payments? How quickly were the audits completed?

The answers to these questions take us right to the heart and the soul of an audit—any audit, in any department. They are a good yardstick for measuring audit quality.

This is my bottom line: Were the audits hard-hitting, down-in-the-trenches audits that produced results or were they softball audits with no redeeming value?

After completing the review, my staff upped the overall score of those 18 reports from a D-plus to a solid C.

Excellence in several reporting categories pushed the scores up as follows: All reports were highly relevant and were aligned with the core mission. They detected and reported $4 billion in waste. Most reports offered reasonable recommendations for recovering unauthorized payments.

Poor performance in other categories pulled scores down as follows: Most reports did not verify exact dollar amounts of waste using primary source payment records. I wish to emphasize again the necessity of using primary source pay records. Follow the money. Most dollar amounts for alleged savings were taken from untested Army budget documents. Most did not offer meaningful recommendations for holding responsible officials accountable for waste and mismanagement. Of course, in government, if people are not held responsible for what they do and accountable for what they do, then, of course, we do not see change in culture. So accountability and responsibility and holding people responsible is very important if we are going to bring changes. Then, lastly, I would say, most reports were old and stale, having taken far too long to complete.

I wish to point this out by saying, the single biggest factor that keeps dragging the scores down into the pits is timeliness or lack of it and, in most cases, the lack of it. The Audit Office continues to publish old, stale reports. Of these 18 reports we reviewed and on which I am reporting to you, they took an average of 17 months to complete. Eight took a total of 168 months to complete, and none of these numbers includes the 4 to 6 months it takes to get an audit started. So we are looking at a minimum of 2 years to complete top-quality audits.

Under my scoring system, audits completed in 6 months or less earn a grade A, those completed in 12 months earn a C, and those that take more than 15 months get an F.

These 18 reports, of course, as we can see from my comments, were over the top. So they earned a grade of F for taking so long to finish.

I have said this before, and I wish to say it again. The power of top-quality audit work is greatly diminished by stale information. Out-of-date audits have little impact—with the passage of time, records disappear, particularly financial records—because following the money is a very important part of good auditing. People retire and move on. Money cannot be recovered and no one can be held accountable, and without people being held accountable, we do not change the culture of organizations.

The new Deputy for Auditing, Mr. Blair, is part of the problem. He has not set any goals for audit completion times. I hope he will do that. Reasonable goals need to be established.

I would like to summarize. In my summarization, I would point out that I wish to talk about the $4 billion that was potential waste and was saved. These 18 reports clearly put the spotlight on $4 billion of potential waste. The auditors detected it. They reported it. They did exactly what they are supposed to do. That is a major accomplishment worthy of recognition and praise. So they ferreted out waste. They presumably saved the money.

But what happened to the $4 billion? Busting $4 billion in waste did not produce $4 billion in savings. The savings touted by Inspector General Heddell were lost, in a sense.

Then there is a technical lingo around government: The money got reprogrammed. In plain English, that means it got put to better use but not necessarily saved. As seen through the eyes of this skeptical watchdog, all the loose change got scooped up and shoveled out the backdoor and into the jaws of the Pentagon spending machine on some other program. That machine is known to have an insatiable appetite for money.

The disappearance of the savings is part semantics. The word ''waste'' is not in the audit lexicon. Sprinkling waste with perfume and calling it savings does not make it savings. Perhaps if the auditors started calling it what it is—waste—it might be easier to reach the Promised Land, but they never got there. Mr. President, 99.9 percent of the $4 billion got spent. Only in government could we spend all the money and still claim savings.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT LIMIT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, later today, we will get a chance—another chance, I should say—to vote to raise the debt limit.

My understanding is, the House of Representatives has delayed the time at which they are going to vote on their plan, the so-called Boehner plan. But at some point I suspect that vote will move forward and we will end up receiving that legislation from the House of Representatives, and we will have an opportunity to act on that as well.

It will be the second bill we will vote on in the Senate that would raise the debt limit. The first one was the cut, cap, and balance plan that was first approved by the House before being sent to the Senate over 1 week ago.

This was a three-pronged approach that would have required a downpayment on our deficits by immediately cutting spending. It would have put us on a path to reform entitlements and cut spending over the medium term by putting a cap on spending as a percentage of our economy. Finally, it would have made sure we do not keep adding to our debt by approving a debt limit increase after a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution was passed by Congress.

This was the Republicans' first choice as to how to deal with this crisis. Unfortunately, Senate Democrats killed this commonsense bill which had the support, according to a CNN poll, of 66 percent of Americans. So we did not have an opportunity to debate it, offer amendments or get an up-and-down vote on that legislation. In the interest of solving the problem before us, it was recognized that probably we would have to find another approach.

There have been a lot of observations made by the media and others that somehow the Republicans need to compromise more in this situation. My

only question would be: Compromise with whom? With themselves? Because they are the only ones out there who have put forward a plan. And, in fact, this current proposal that will come from the House of Representatives actually is a compromise. The spending reductions in that proposal are two-thirds of those that were proposed in the House budget that was passed by the House of Representatives earlier this year. So it still addresses the fundamental problem, and Speaker BOEHNER came up with a new plan that would cut spending by $915 billion and create a process to reduce the deficit by $1.8 trillion on top of that.

This is not a perfect plan. As I said, it is certainly not our first choice, but it is a plan that cuts spending more than it increases the debt limit, and it does it without raising taxes on job creators. In a little while the Boehner plan will hopefully join the cut, cap, and balance plan as the only plan which has passed a body of Congress.

Senate Democrats do not have a plan to cut spending more than they raise the debt limit. Senate Democrats do not have a plan that can pass a single House of Congress. Of course, this is more than the White House can say, because the White House does not have a plan, period. So when the Boehner plan comes up for a vote here in the Senate, hopefully sometime later this evening, I would encourage my colleagues from across the aisle to support this measure.

They have been speaking constantly about the need to raise the debt limit, and here is their chance to do so. All they have to do is vote for this bill and send it to the President for his signature and we can put this issue to rest for the time being. Then it puts a pathway in place for us to get, as I said before, to a debate about entitlement reform several months down the road.

I understand there are some concerns among my colleagues on the other side about how long it will be before we would need to increase the debt limit again. But if you look at the past 20 years or so, 72 percent of the time our debt limit increases have been for less than a year. So this increase is hardly out of the normal time range. If you think about it, almost 75 percent of the time—almost three-fourths of the time—we have raised the debt limit, we have done it for less than a year.

What we are talking about here would be something that would take us into next year, at which point we would have to have another vote on the debt limit as we come to a conclusion about the entitlement reform component or element of this particular legislation.

So this increase, as I said, is not out of the normal time range. Markets are not going to care about for how long we increase the debt limit. They simply care that we do not breach the debt limit and, more importantly, over the long term we lay out a long-term plan to cut the debt.

Many of us have spoken on the floor of the Senate in the past and indicated that the real crisis, the real issue before our country right now is not the debt limit, it is the debt. It is the fact that we are borrowing literally 40 cents out of every dollar that we spend here in Washington, DC, and we continue to pile up and accumulate massive amounts of debt that get passed on to future generations and put in great peril the economy of our country and our ability to create jobs. So a longer term increase is not needed to calm the markets.

But what this bill does not do is raise the debt limit past the elections. I think that is where the real rub comes in. Because the President has made it very clear, as have some of my colleagues, that this is one of their major concerns. They want to have a debt limit increase that gets us past the 2012 election. That is a political concern, it is not an economic concern.

But today it has arisen that these concerns are more than political, they are personal. You see, the White House is concerned that this would require Congress to approve another debt limit increase sometime in January, which they complain would ruin their Christmas vacation plans. I certainly do not want to ruin the President or anyone else's Christmas vacation plans, but I think it is a bit more important that we prevent our country from adding $9.5 trillion to the debt held by the public, as the President's budget would do. I think it is a bit more important that we prevent our country from being forced to implement severe austerity programs, such as they have had to do in Europe because of their inability to constrain spending. I think it is a bit more important that we reform entitlements so these important programs are around for our children and grandchildren.

Finally, I think it is a bit more important that we leave our country in better shape for our children than the one we received. This has been the American ethic. Each generation has sacrificed so that the next generation could have a better quality of life. Today we risk turning that tradition on its head. If we continue to run up debts and deficits such as those proposed, our children and grandchildren will have an astounding burden to pay off to our country's creditors. We do not have to leave them this burden.

We have proposed, as I said, the cut, cap, and balance plan, which would make great strides in reducing this debt burden. We will have, hopefully later today—if not today perhaps sometime tomorrow—in front of us the Boehner plan, which will make significant downpayments on these burdens.

What I would simply say is that we have consistently now put before this Senate different plans we have had a chance to vote on. We voted on the cut, cap, and balance plan. Unfortunately, it was a tabling motion, it was a procedural motion. It was not an up-and-down vote, because the leader did not want us to get on that legislation and have an opportunity to debate and amend it and ultimately vote on it. But we did have a vote on a tabling motion. Hopefully, we will get a vote on the Boehner plan which, as I said, hopefully will be in front of us in the not too distant future. But my point very simply is there has not been any effort put forward by our colleagues on the other side to, one, put forward a budget which we know now has been I think 820 days since the last time the Senate acted on a budget. You have to go back to April 29 of 2009. That was the last time the Senate voted on a budget.

It starts there. It starts there. That is where we set our priorities. That is where we determine how we are going to spend the people's tax dollars. So we have not had a budget. The House of Representatives passed a budget. They did it on schedule. They did it on time. As far as I know, there are no plans here to move a budget any time in the future.

Then we have the cut, cap, and balance plan that passed the House of Representatives, which was an attempt to deal with the debt limit increase, but do it in a way that forces us to focus on the real issue, which is spending reductions, spending reforms, puts in place a pathway to get a result on entitlement reform, forces a vote on a balanced budget amendment, which many of us think is a priority if we are going to get long-term spending under control, and then, hopefully later today, we are going to get a vote on the Boehner plan which will come over from the House of Representatives, which is yet another attempt to get the debt limit increased, but do it in a way that actually makes a dent in the long-term challenge facing this country, which again is not the debt limit, it is the debt.

That is the problem. That is fundamentally what we have to deal with. It is fundamentally a spending problem. Much has been made about a balanced approach. What does the other side mean when they say balanced? Usually it means we are going to take more of your money and spend it on more government. Many of us would support tax reform that would close tax loopholes, broaden the base, if you could lower the rates at the same time. I happen to believe that is important if we are going to get the economy growing again and creating jobs. I think you would see tremendous growth as a result of tax reform. But if you talk about raising taxes to pay for even more government, that is precisely the wrong approach. That is why we are in the mess we are in today, because we spend more than we take in. We have been doing it year over year. We have got to learn to live within our means and to quit spending money we do not have.

Many States have amendments in their constitutions that enable them

and force them and require them to do this every single year. It is time our Federal Government started operating in a way that makes fiscal sense. I think the American people understand very clearly what this is about. This is about spending. It is about getting Washington to live within its means, to quit borrowing 40 cents out of every dollar it spends, and to put this country on a path fiscally that will ensure we do not bankrupt the country for future generations, and that we get our economy back in a place where it can start growing and creating the jobs we need to get people in this country back to work.

I see the Senator from Utah. I expect he will have some remarks about this subject. There are many of us on this side, I know, who are anxious to vote and certainly are doing everything we can to facilitate this process where we deal with the crisis before us next week, but, importantly, do it in a way that addresses the fundamental issue here which is not the debt limit, it is the debt.

It is time Washington started living within its means, started to make sure we have got a pathway in place for not only cutting spending today but dealing with the long-term issue by putting a balanced budget amendment in our Constitution. I hope my colleagues will join us in this legislation that will come before us sometime we hope later today, and it will be yet another attempt to address this issue. I implore my colleagues here, I think we are going to get most of the Republicans to vote for this. I hope there will be some on the other side who will join us in this endeavor. It is too important to the future of this country not to.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado.) The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to finish my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before turning to the issue of the moment, I want to thank my dear friend for his good remarks here on the floor of the Senate. He is a great leader, a great human being, and he certainly outlined, I think in a fair way, some of the problems and some of the solutions we might have here on the floor.

But before turning to the issue of the moment, the need to restore the Nation's fiscal stability by reducing our deficits and debt, I want to return to a matter I discussed on the floor yesterday, and that is the FAA reauthorization bill.

I must respond to some of the comments made by two of my colleagues earlier today regarding one of the major sticking points in our efforts to pass the FAA reauthorization bill. Their arguments are, to put it quite simply, fallacious and cannot go unanswered.

As you might expect, these comments were regarding the provision in the House bill affecting the way votes are counted in union elections in the airline industry. My colleagues, the senior Senator from West Virginia and the junior Senator from Iowa, characterize the House's actions as some sort of radical endeavor, a change that lacks justification and common sense.

In fact, the Senator from West Virginia even argued that the House's provisions would ''undo 75 years of labor law.''

These were his exact words. Well, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the claim is so far from being accurate I simply have to assume that my good friend, Senator ROCKEFELLER, simply misspoke. I know this is the line the labor unions and the administration are peddling, but here is the truth: The House of Representatives or Senate Republicans are not trying to undo 75 years of labor law, it is the National Mediation Board—or NMB, I will call it—that has already done so in a highly partisan fashion.

It is the NMB, controlled by pro-union appointees of President Obama that in a partisan way unilaterally undid 75 years of labor law, and put their finger on the scale for the unions that bankroll Democratic political campaigns.

I know what I am talking about. I won the American Jurisprudence prize for labor law. I have led labor fights on the floor for our side for the last 35 years. House and Senate Republicans are only trying to restore long-lasting labor law following its highly partisan corruption by the National Mediation Board. This is not an opinion. This is fact.

Put the talking points and revisionist history aside, this is what you have: a highly partisan NMB changing 75 years of settled law, settled labor law, to benefit the Democrats' political allies. For 75 years, NMB-supervised elections required that a union receive the votes of a majority of the entire workforce before it can be certified. That has been the law. There is good reason for it. This was not just a mathematical trick to disadvantage unions, as my colleagues have argued. It is plain common sense.

Let's suppose, for example, that only 50 percent of a proposed bargaining unit votes in a union election, and the union wins by a very slim majority of the votes cast. In that case, a union representative would be certified with only the demonstrated support of one-fourth of the bargaining unit. That is what would happen if we follow the language the NMB fallaciously put into their ruling. One-quarter of a workforce could vote to certify a union and bind every other coworker to have to live with that decision. Apparently a commitment to Democratic and true majority rule only matters to the left when it suits them. What is going on in this country is outrageous, not just at the National Mediation Board but the NLRB as well. Democratic radicals, very brilliant labor lawyers, who do not give a darn about what the law is, are now starting to change the laws by regulatory fiat.

Apparently a commitment to democratic and true majority rule only matters when it suits certain people's politics.

The Senator from Iowa compared these votes to Senate and schoolboard elections, suggesting that only a majority of those voting is necessary to prevail. This is a misguided comparison. First, union elections are not a choice among competing representatives. They are, instead, held to determine whether the workers want to be represented at all. Even setting that aside, how many schoolboards are going to be empowered to make decisions that affect every hour of every day an employee goes to work? How many Senators are elected to serve a small, narrowly defined group of constituents? And, in the end, if your vote is not counted in a Senate or schoolboard election, you will get another chance to vote a few years down the line.

Employees voting in these union elections have no such options. That is why the law has been completely different from what my two friends and colleagues have said on the floor. Requiring the support of the majority of the whole unit before certifying a union representative only makes common sense. This is why the procedure at NMB used for these elections went unchanged for 75 years. Boards appointed by Democratic Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Johnson, Carter, and Clinton all agreed with that process that the House bill is only attempting to restore.

In fact, the NMB appointed by President Carter unanimously ruled it did not have authority to administratively change the form of the NMB's ballot used in representation elections, and that such a change, if appropriate, can only be made by Congress. That makes sense.

Yet today we have an administration bent on greasing the rails in favor of the unions, and a Democratic Senate all too willing to go along with it. They are so willing that they have opted to stall passage of the FAA reauthorization to prevent Congress from restoring a system that served the Nation and airline industry well for decades. This is another example of the administration showing its true colors. Rather than provide certainty to travelers, the transportation industry, and airports, they are holding up a long-term FAA reauthorization in order to benefit their union allies. It is wrong. This type of thing should not go on. Nor should the National Mediation Board be issuing what ought to be congressional decisions.

I wish we were not having this debate. I wish we could get this FAA reauthorization done. I want to get it done. I don't want anybody furloughed, but these are important issues. This isn't some itty-bitty nonessential issue. I am not going to yield on this issue. I will not let an out-of-control National Mediation Board and their patrons in Congress and the White House rig the rules so a small minority can jam unionization on unwilling employees.

I expect we will be debating this issue for some time. I am willing to have the debate in full view of the public. But, at the very least, I expect my colleagues to acknowledge the truth as to what has transpired at the National Mediation Board. It is not the House of Representatives that has taken a radical position; it is the Obama administration, and some of my colleagues on the other side should know better.

Let me add a couple of other things. I don't enjoy the fact that people are being furloughed. But it is not Republicans who are holding this bill up. It is those people demanding outrageous changes in the law by individuals who were never elected to make those changes. We ought to fire that whole doggone National Mediation Board—or at least the Democrats on the board, who don't seem to care about what the law is.

And it is the same with the NLRB. At least one of them, and maybe more, could not make it through this process and had to be recess appointed. They could care less about what the laws are, and they want to change them without proper congressional approval. It is outrageous. It is not something my friends on the other side should encourage. It just makes sense.

All those Democratic Presidents, until now, have honored that 75-year history of how votes should be taken in union elections. Unions win over 60 percent of their union elections. The system is not unfair. They lose some, sure. But to stack the rules so they can win every time is not right either. It certainly isn't democratic. It is wrong for those employees who didn't have the opportunity, or didn't vote. It is wrong. You can have 10 people vote in a 100-person union, and if 6 vote for it, under their rule, that would change the rule for all 94 of the others. That is what we are ignoring. So much for that. All I can say is I don't want to have anyone whining from the other side, because they are the ones who are holding up the FAA reauthorization. And they are doing it for the most crass of reasons.

THE DEBT CEILING

Turning to the matter that is consuming the Nation, I want to address the so-called August 2 deadline we hit next week.

In early April of this year, Treasury Secretary Geithner informed Congress that Treasury might run out of ways to stay at the debt limit and have enough cash to pay its bills around July 8. About a month and a half later, on May 16, the Treasury Secretary updated his guess to August 2.

This August 2 deadline, which the administration has insisted is when Treasury runs out of sufficient cash to pay bills, was estimated back in the middle of May. It is only reasonable to expect that Congress would be kept apprised of Treasury's cashflow status and estimates. If we indeed face an economic catastrophe on August 2, it is only reasonable to expect warnings from those in government responsible for issuing such updates and monitoring threats to our financial stability.

We have a group in government that is charged with that responsibility. It is called the Financial Stability Oversight Council, or FSOC, set up in the Dodd-Frank financial regulation law. The FSOC is chaired by the Treasury Secretary and composed of members such as the Federal Reserve Chairman and banking regulations czars. Indeed, the FSOC was sold by Democrats as a body that would be able to spot threats to our financial system and then warn and protect us all.

The President, Treasury officials, the President's Press Secretary, and others in the administration daily warn of catastrophe, crisis, and the potential for conditions even worse than we saw during the financial crisis. They seem to be channeling Dr. Peter Venkman, who, faced with another catastrophe, once predicted a disaster of biblical proportions—human sacrifice, dogs and cats living together, mass hysteria.

Yet through all these predictions, the FSOC has essentially remained silent. That body of unelected bureaucrats either doesn't see an impending threat to stability from the debt limit impasse, or from a ratings downgrade for the United States, or it is too busy writing a mountain of new regulations to make a warning.

I sent a letter, which I wish to have printed in the RECORD, to eight voting members of the FSOC yesterday, asking two basic sets of questions. I ask unanimous consent that that be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, DC, July 27, 2011.

Hon. TIMOTHY GEITHNER,
Secretary, Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC.
Hon. BEN BERNANKE,
Chairman, Board of Governors, The Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC.
Hon. GARY GENSLER,
Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Washington, DC.
Hon. MARY SCHAPIRO,
Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC.
MARTIN J. GRUENBERG,
Acting Chairperson, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, DC.
EDWARD DEMARCO,
Acting Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, Washington, DC.
Hon. DEBBIE MATZ,
Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, Alexandria, VA.
JOHN WALSH,
Acting Comptroller, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY GEITHNER, CHAIRMEN BERNANKE, GENSLER, MATZ, SHAPIRO, ACTING CHAIRPERSON GRUENBERG, ACTING DIRECTOR DEMARCO, AND ACTING COMPTROLLER WALSH: The President, on July 25, spoke to the American public about risks associated with failure to raise the statutory debt limit, saying that: ''We would risk sparking a deep economic crisis. . .'' The President warns of a deep crisis and risks to financial stability.

You, the voting members of the Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC), are charged by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act with the responsibility to identify risks and potential emerging threats to the financial stability of the United States.

Does the Council agree with the President's assessment that possible failure to raise the statutory debt limit by sometime in early August represents an emerging threat to the financial stability of the United States?

Does any voting Council member dissent from whatever is the majority view of the Council? If so, please explain precisely why.

Neither the Minutes of the FSOC July 13, 2011 meeting nor the Annual Report of the FSOC, which was approved on July 22, 2011, identify possible failure to raise the statutory debt limit by August 2 as an imminent risk to the financial stability of the United States worthy of a warning to the American people, and do not come close to recent statements by Treasury officials warning of ''catastrophe.''

In addition to inquiring about the Council's views on possible risks to financial stability, I write to ask the Council and its voting members about their current knowledge of recent Treasury cash inflows and outflows and projections of those cash flows, daily, through the month of August.

Treasury officials have warned that based on actual and projected revenues and expenditures, along with potential exhaustion of available ''extraordinary measures'' to avoid breach of the statutory debt limit, the United States will exhaust its borrowing authority under the limit and possibly run out of available cash to pay obligations of the federal government that are due.

Unfortunately, Congress and the American people do not have sufficient information about Treasury's actual and projected revenues, expenditures, and cash flows to make informed judgments. Many Americans and members of Congress are, unfortunately, relying on estimates and projections from either large Wall Street financial institutions

or non-governmental organizations often labeled ''think tanks.'' The lack of information is unsatisfactory.

In a May 2, 2011 letter to Congress, Treasury Secretary Geithner stated that as a result of stronger than anticipated tax receipts, Treasury then estimated that extraordinary measures to provide headroom under the statutory debt limit would be exhausted on August 2, 2011. Since that time, more data have become available. Some reports since that time have indicated that receipts may have been turning out higher than previously expected. Further, the Federal Reserve's July 2011 Monetary Policy Report to the Congress identifies that ''Federal receipts have risen rapidly lately—they are up about 10 percent in the first eight months of fiscal 2011 compared with the same period in fiscal 2010.''

I recognize that receipts and Treasury's cash inflows and outflows can be lumpy and are stochastic. However, the date at which extraordinary measures available to Treasury become exhausted, and cash inflows may prove insufficient to meet incoming obligations that are due, has almost surely changed from the August 2 date estimated by Treasury on May 2. Given incoming data since May 2, does August 2 remain the date with the highest statistical likelihood of being the point in time at which Treasury will run out of extraordinary measures to provide additional headroom under the debt limit and will face insufficient cash inflows relative to obligations that are coming due?

Please provide, by 5:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time on Thursday, July 28, detailed information known by the Council and by any voting member on:

Actual revenues and expenditures through July 27;

Projected or actual daily Treasury cash inflows and outflows for each day between July 28 and August 31, along with methods used to make projections;

Whether, given current projections of cash inflows and obligations coming due, Treasury would run out of cash and not have sufficient cash available to meet all obligations that become due on any date between August 2 and August 31 (projections here mean point estimates, with the acknowledgement that projections are inherently uncertain);

Any cash or liquid accounts available (presently or any time during August) to Treasury, such as Treasury's $5 billion liquid balance sitting idle in its Supplementary Financing Program Account at the Federal Reserve, established to allegedly assist the Federal Reserve with management of its balance sheet during the financial crisis (the Daily Statement of cash and debt operations of the United States Treasury for Monday, July 25, 2011 indicates that the $5 billion was available to Treasury on that date);

Current values of securities and other marketable assets available (presently or any time during August) to Treasury, including mortgage-backed-securities and other financial claims amassed by Treasury during the recent financial crisis, which could be liquidated and converted to cash (my request is for total values, not an assessment of the advisability of asset sales);

Contingency plans for generation of cash within Treasury in the event that the statutory debt limit is not raised by August 2, 2011;

Contingency plans of regulators of financial institutions, including any plans for regulatory forebearance, in the event of a ratings downgrade of United States Treasury debt securities;

Contingency plans of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York in the event of a ratings downgrade of United States Treasury debt securities, including plans related to ''breaking of the buck'' by a money market mutual fund, disruptions in the tri-party repo market, disruptions in payment systems or systemically important financial utilities, or creation of programs or facilities with broad-based eligibility under authorities provided by Section 1101 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act;

Any private assurances by any government officials to any financial institution or significant financial market participant that the United States Treasury will not fail to pay principal and interest on Treasury securities even if the statutory debt limit is not raised.

As Ranking Member of the Senate Finance Committee, with a responsibility for oversight of our sovereign debt and Treasury's cash management practices, I am deeply concerned about the lack of information about upcoming cash flows and reliance of Congress and the American people on non-governmental projections of those flows in decisionmaking. Time is of the essence, and I require, as I stated, the information that I have requested by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on Thursday, July 28. Please contact Jeff Wrase at 202–224–4515.

Sincerely,

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Ranking Member.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, one is whether they see any imminent threat to financial stability from the debt limit impasse, or from an impending downgrade to our Nation's credit rating. Of course, we face warnings of downgrades of our credit rating not merely because of the debt limit impasse; we have had dozens of such impasses in recent decades, with no effect on our credit rating. Yet we do face warnings of a ratings downgrade because of President Obama's acceleration of deficits and debt along our unsustainable fiscal path and unsustainable entitlement promises.

With spending as a share of the economy up to levels not seen since World War II, and a lack of willingness by the administration to break its deficit spending addiction, ratings agencies have been brought to the edge and warn of impending downgrades. Those downgrades would immediately harm job creation, the economy, the cost of credit for every American family and business, and, indeed, overall financial stability.

However, instead of a forthright discussion of this threat, the FSOC chose to instead bury an academic discussion of it in their annual report. Let me remind everyone how important Democrats said the FSOC would be as an early warning system, protecting us from the imminent threats to stability. It was supposed to be a watchdog, a cop on the beat combing global financial markets for imbalances and stability threats, and then giving warning to everyone.

The President, the Treasury Secretary, ratings agencies, Secretary of State, Fed Chairman Bernanke, admirals, investors, former administration officials across party lines—all have issued warnings of threats to financial stability from our fiscal crisis. Yet the FSOC buried whatever observation it has about our crisis in its annual report.

Another set of questions I asked the FSOC involves Treasury's cashflows through August and the date at which Treasury now believes it is most likely to run short of cash. I asked about contingency plans that Treasury, the Fed, and bank regulators have if there is a ratings downgrade. Reports of meetings of Treasury Secretary Geithner, Fed Chairman Bernanke, and New York Fed President Dudley suggest that contingency plans certainly are in the works.

Yet as the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, the administration has provided me with no information on what those plans might be, in spite of my responsibility for oversight of debt and cash operations at Treasury. I wish I could say I was surprised, but the fact is, the promise of the most open, deliberative, and rational administration in history has given way to a highly secretive and partisan operation that denies the people of this country the leadership they are owed.

Perhaps I am supposed to wait, as in the past, for news reports on Sunday afternoon before the opening of financial markets in Asia to find out what we would do if an economic catastrophe in fact unfolds.

It is an unsatisfactory and unacceptable state of affairs that the American people and Members of Congress do not have updated and sufficient information about Treasury's cashflows and liquid assets, or the contingency plans of our financial regulators. It is disturbing to me that in recent days Members of Congress in both Chambers have gone to their respective floors to discuss Treasury's cash and liquidity position using information supplied either by large Wall Street financial institutions, or by nongovernmental think tanks.

Press reports of the U.S. Treasury's financial condition have also been relying on these sources. Why? Why do Members of Congress not know details of Treasury's projected cashflows for August? Why are we relying on dated numbers Treasury gave us months ago? How can we decide whether August 2, a threshold date estimated by Treasury back in May, is even close to some sort of deadline date for dealing with the debt limit?

Maybe the date is July 29. I don't know, and neither the administration nor the FSOC has told us. Maybe the date is August 15. I don't know, and neither the administration nor the FSOC has told us. I don't know. The American people don't know. This is unacceptable.

Wall Street firms have recently put out their own projections and say that August 2 may not be relevant at all. Maybe it will be August 8 when Treasury runs into a cashflow problem. Maybe it will be August 13. Does Treasury still believe August 2 is the date when cashflow problems are most likely to arrive, given new information on

government receipts since early May? If not, we need to know, and we need to know how that assessment has been made. If so, then why is Treasury not telling us and showing us why?

My letter to FSOC members, which includes the Treasury Secretary, includes a request for updated information about Treasury cashflows and liquid assets. Given warnings from the administration that there is special urgency to act by August 2, time is of the essence, so I asked to receive responses from the FSOC members by 5 o'clock today, which is now an hour and a half ago. I have received no reply about Treasury cashflows and liquid assets. Nothing. Radio silence.

Television cameras can't be turned on in this town without capturing some administration official reminding Americans about the looming default, but they are unable to provide Congress with the numbers that would show when the default would happen, after all these months of recommending we should know, and after warnings months ago.

Let me say this again. I asked for, and have not received, critical information about the state of our Nation's short-term finances that I specifically requested from eight voting members of the FSOC, including the Secretary of the Treasury.

I have received no response at all regarding the cash and liquid assets Treasury has and expects to have available. But worse than the refusal by the Treasury Secretary and the FSOC members to inform us about the Nation's cash position is their refusal to keep the American people duly informed about the state of our finances. It is, quite simply, a shirking of their responsibility to the citizens of this country. Rather than providing transparency—which we were promised—the administration has chosen to scare Social Security recipients about their benefits in politicized debt-limit negotiations.

We are debating debt and deficit plans that involve trillions of dollars. Yet we only have guesses about how much cash the Federal Government expects to have in August from a nongovernment think tank and from Wall Street firms. This is unacceptable.

Mr. President, one of the most troubling aspects of this lack of disclosure is the way it is affecting our Nation's seniors. I listened to my constituents in Utah, and many of them who rely on Social Security are very worried, and they are, frankly, scared. The Obama administration has been hard at work frightening them about the prospects of default. More concerned about his election prospects than resolving this crisis, President Obama commented recently that he could not guarantee Treasury would be able to make Social Security payments in early August.

Really? This fearmongering is shameful—absolutely shameful. For the President to threaten not to send out Social Security checks is a stain on his Presidency. Those relying on Social Security benefits rightfully count on timely payments. They worked hard and paid taxes, and timely benefit payments are due to them. These payments can and should be assured, no question.

Why is the President using the politics of fear on our seniors? I think we all know the reason. Given the information that is available, it appears that roughly $50 billion of Social Security payments are due during August. Recent estimates from outside sources put flows in the Treasury of between $170 billion and over $200 billion in August from various tax receipts and other sources. That alone is more than enough to pay $50 billion in Social Security payments, with cash left over for the $30 billion due on our debt in August and more.

Perhaps the President is worried about the timing of cashflows in August. Yet even if all $50 billion of Social Security payments come due on August 3—and they won't—Treasury can easily get its hands on cash to pay those bills. According to the Daily Treasury Statement for July 26, Treasury has $5 billion sitting idle at the Federal Reserve. Treasury can call that up. They can call up the Fed right now and get that $5 billion in cash.

Treasury has roughly $90 billion in mortgage-backed securities that it bought in the financial crisis to bail out the housing markets. It sold $10.6 billion of those just last month. Treasury can go out and sell more next week if it is worried about not having cash to pay seniors. It could raise almost $80 billion.

There are many more options for Treasury to get cash, and if the administration had any concern for seniors it would have had its officials working hard since at least May to ensure enough cash is available in August. Treasury could easily have $50 billion of cash on August 3 to pay our seniors if it wants to do that.

Why, then, did the President choose to strike fear into all of our Nation's seniors? Why would the President say to our seniors that he could not guarantee there would be cash available to pay benefits in August when he can absolutely guarantee there would be cash available?

It seems clear the President has chosen to use fear and to scare seniors in order to boost his chances at reelection and to strengthen the hand of our friends on the other side who are insistent on raising taxes as a means of deficit reduction. If we raise taxes, I guarantee you the other side will spend every dime of it. It will not be used to pay down the deficit, and especially with a Presidential election in a couple of years.

Using Social Security and the financial security of our seniors as bargaining chips in a political poker game over the debt ceiling is, to put it bluntly, shameful. To do so to try to raise taxes at a time when unemployment is 9.2 percent and trending up—and that doesn't even include the underemployment rate, which is hovering around 17 percent when you count those who will not even look for jobs anymore, and others who will not work—well, it represents an odd way to express concern about jobs.

The only reason Social Security payments would not be made in August by the administration would be a conscious choice by the administration to stiff seniors and to blame Republicans. It would be a conscious political choice, not a choice forced by the debt limit or lack of cash.

Well, Mr. President, it is time for me to conclude, but I want to be clear. The American public has been shortchanged by the new Financial Stability Oversight Council that was created by the job-killing Dodd-Frank financial regulation act. That is one of the worst bills I have seen in all of my 35 years.

The FSOC, chaired by Treasury Secretary Geithner, has refused and ignored my request for basic information about government finances and government contingency plans in the face of dire warnings of threats to our Nation's financial stability.

I don't enjoy coming on the Senate floor and excoriating this administration and the President and FSOC. But this is shameful. The American people deserve transparency, and they deserve accountability. Yet the administration and its regulators chose instead to withhold information from the people and their elected representatives in Congress. The refusal by members of FSOC, including the Treasury Secretary, to provide simple basic information about government finances is unacceptable and requires investigation and action.

Mr. President, we have to get to where this government starts to work again. We shouldn't have to rely on Wall Street for these figures or rely on Wall Street to know what the administration's plan is. We shouldn't have to rely on anybody except those who are designated to provide this information. Unfortunately, they haven't done that.

I admit, I only gave them a few days, but they have been working on this for months. I don't know about their office, but I tell you one thing. We get things done on time. We are at rug-cutting time on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives. We know August 2 is the heralded date by this administration. Since they chose the date, I think they should justify what they are going to do and how they are going to do it; to make sure if we don't somehow increase the debt ceiling, which I am not going to do, we at least know what their plan is.

I hope the administration will get a little more active on some of these things that are so important on Capitol Hill—important to Democrats as well as Republicans. We need to have the facts. We need accountability, we need transparency, and I am calling on the administration to get on the ball.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the urgent need to act on the debt ceiling before the August 2 deadline. While I believe we have reached a defining moment as a country, which has not been wasted—we need to reduce our debt—we also can't afford to play Russian roulette with our economy by toying with the debt limit.

We have had months to work this out. Yet less than 6 days from a possible default that would plunge this country into a serious crisis, here we stand in opposite corners of the boxing ring. The markets are jittery, investors and businesses are deeply concerned, but, most importantly, the people of this country are fed up with this political stalemate. They do not want their interest rates to rise, the value of the dollar to fall, and they do not want to see their retirement savings decimated again because some in Washington believe if they refuse to compromise, the resulting crisis will score them political points.

Ever since the economic downturn, families across the country have sat down at their kitchen tables to make the tough choices about what they hold most dear and what they can learn to live without. We all know those conversations. They have to end with compromise.

A poll released Monday by the Pew Charitable Trusts found that 68 percent of Americans say lawmakers who share their views on this issue, on either side, say those lawmakers should compromise. So people who actually share a view with a particular lawmaker, 68 percent of them say lawmakers should compromise, even if it means striking a deal they disagree with.

Just 23 percent say lawmakers who share their views should stand by their principles even if it leads to default.

My colleagues and I don't need polls to tell us that. We have all had our offices flooding with calls and e-mails in the last few days from well-meaning constituents with advice and from those who are mad and asking us to work it out. Just this morning I received this e-mail from Dave and Cheryl of Northfield, MN. This is what it says:

Dear Amy,

The political positioning and wrangling over the Federal Budget and debt ceiling limit has gone on long enough! It's time for our elected leaders to step up and resolve the debt ceiling and budget crisis in a mature, adult fashion. We realize that this is easier said than done, but after experiencing the shutdown of the State of Minnesota, it is unconscionable to even have the possibility of the crisis that we will face as a nation if we don't raise our debt ceiling and begin reducing the deficit. We urge you and your colleagues to do all it takes to resolve this issue prior to the deadline. There has to be some compromise that can be identified. Each side will need to give to make this happen—let's focus on the art of compromise and get this wrapped up. It's time to show the world that we are still a truly great nation and can step up to resolve the challenges placed before us. The greater good of the nation has to be placed as a top priority. Hoping and praying for successful resolution to the outstanding issues.

That is Dave and Cheryl of Northfield, MN—just citizens who sent an e-mail today. I wish everyone in this Chamber and everyone over in the House would listen to this today. I think it sums it up very well.

Outside the Halls of Congress there isn't much disagreement over the urgency to act or the consequences of failing to do so. There also isn't a lot of disagreement over the importance to our economy of a long-term extension. Who seriously believes dragging this country through this again in 5 or 6 months will help our economy get back on track?

Economists and experts from across the political spectrum have warned that a short-term approach would likely lead to a downgrade of our credit rating, which would cost us billions of dollars more in interest payments on our existing debt and drive up our deficit. For families and businesses, it would mean a spike in interest rates, making everything from mortgages, car loans, and credit cards more expensive.

I think the most common refrain I hear from the business community in Minnesota when we talk about what it will take to spur investment and create jobs in this country is a need for certainty—certainty in the Tax Code, certainty in expenses, certainty in our government's budget. Let's provide some certainty.

After months of debate, it is clear what sort of plan is needed to garner the support necessary to get us across the finish line. We will all ultimately have to accept things with which we don't necessarily agree. It is time to get serious about advancing a deal that is both fair and achievable.

On August 2, the borrowing authority of the United States will be exhausted. No one benefits if we are unable to reach an agreement by this deadline. Every day that passes without a deal only increases uncertainty in the markets and puts the brakes on economic activity. Failure to bring the national debt under control also threatens America's future, but the danger of default threatens our economy today.

We have two options: We can either set a precedent of holding our debt hostage to political maneuvering, raising the cost of borrowing and increasing our deficit at the same time or we can show the world we are serious about working together to address our fiscal challenges to reduce the debt, reduce the cost of borrowing, and strengthen our financial outlook. I believe the choice is clear, and I believe a lot of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that.

The sooner we can agree on a long-term package, the better for our economy and the better for our country. It is time to put our political differences aside and work on an agenda that strengthens our economy, promotes fiscal responsibility, and increases global competitiveness because if we refuse to have an honest conversation, if we insist on using the debate as a vehicle for rhetoric only, we will not just be doing ourselves a disservice, not just be doing this institution a disservice, we will be cheating our children and grandchildren out of knowing the America in which we grew up. If we are committed to our country and not to unmoving ideologies, we will get this done.

Last month, I received a lesson in what commitment as a public servant means when I attended the funeral of Jack Murray, who was the former mayor of International Falls, MN, right on the Canadian border. It is a town where they often test cars to show that they can withstand the cold, but it is a hardscrabble, thriving town.

Mayor Murray was a decorated marine who served for 14 years as a member of the city council and for 14 more years as mayor. He figuratively and literally wore ''I love International Falls'' on his sleeve with a button he was never without. At his funeral—and he was 89 years when he died—we heard countless stories of his commitment to his city that didn't end when he retired. The priest at the funeral told this story. He said that every morning, including the morning Mayor Murray died, he would rise early and walk the streets of International Falls. He would wear his orange highway vest to keep him safe, at 89, and he would have a cup of coffee and a bag for trash, and he would walk the streets of his beloved town collecting trash up until the day he died. He was a public servant to the end. He believed in his town, in his State, and in his country. And that is an example for all of us now.

We are all public servants. We must have a commitment to the larger good, to our country, and to the people we represent. None of us wants to see our economy crippled. Democrats don't want it. Republicans don't want it. So what are we waiting for? It is time for Congress to step forth and show some leadership. It is time for us to work together to show the American people that Washington isn't broken; that, instead, we are willing to put aside our politics to do what we were elected to do, to do what is right for America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 8:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each and, further, that at 8:30 I be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. The reason we are extending morning business is the House is having trouble passing the bill, I understand, and so we are waiting until action is taken. They started at 4:30, and it is taking longer than they anticipated. As I understand, they have another caucus in which they are now engaged. It is 7 o'clock, so that is why I thought that at 8:30 we would have a better idea whether they are going to take action tonight.

Again, I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, we are here awaiting the action of the House of Representatives. We don't know whether the House is going to pass the JOHN BOEHNER proposal, but regardless of what they do, we have the solution right underneath our noses. There have been discussions today. I have had a number of discussions with our colleagues. I have had a discussion first this morning with my colleague from Florida and I have had discussions with others.

It seems to me the obvious solution, since we are now at the eleventh hour and getting close to the 59th minute of the eleventh hour, is that we take elements of the Reid proposal, the McConnell proposal, and the Boehner proposal. So I would suggest our leadership consider, regardless of what happens in the House—because the Senate is going to have to act on something to get 60 votes to meet the filibuster threshold in this Chamber and then send a package back to the House. I would suggest it be this: that we take the Reid proposal which includes the larger amount of spending cuts. Senator REID at first said that is $2.7 trillion. Maybe it has been by CBO marked down to about $2.2 trillion. But whatever that larger amount—clearly larger than the Boehner proposal, even though some would argue it is the Iraq and Afghanistan war wind-down savings we would get, but whatever it is, it is larger than the House proposal—and use that as the first cut by lifting the debt ceiling. But there would be a sequence of events that would happen after that to avoid what the Senate Democrats do not want, which is that the markets and the rating agencies cause the debt instruments—the U.S. Treasury bills—to be downgraded. There needs to be certainty for those rating agencies, for the U.S. Government debt, and it could be achieved this way: We have a BRAC-like committee—that being a committee that would be composed equally of Republicans and Democrats—that would come up with a package that would then come back to each House, no amendments, for an up-or-down vote.

The fail-safe backup, in case that committee were not able to come to agreement or in the event that it came back to both Houses and one of the Houses did not pass it, that we would then have the McConnell proposal, which is that the President would request the increase of the debt and there would be this procedure that Senator MCCONNELL laid out that there would be a resolution of disapproval. If there were such a disapproval, then the President, of course, could veto it. In order for the President's veto to be overridden, there would have to be a two-thirds vote. There would not be a two-thirds vote, and, therefore, there is the assurance that we would have the raising of the debt ceiling to get us through this next year and a half.

It seems as though it is right under our nose, if the parties will just realize that now is the time we have to act to find a workable solution so we can get the votes.

If we can get, with that kind of proposal, 60 votes in the Senate, then it goes down to the House, whether they pass the Boehner proposal or not. At the eleventh hour and the 59th minute, recognizing what is at stake for the country, then the House of Representatives is going to do the right thing and they are going to pass it.

I am just a little country boy, but it seems to me sometimes we get so wrapped up in all the intricate details that the obvious solution is right there under our nose, staring us in the face. I respectfully request the Senate consider this.

I yield the floor.

CRISIS IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to bring attention to the ongoing humanitarian crisis in the Horn of Africa. More than 11 million people—twice the population of my State of Maryland—are now in need of emergency assistance to survive.

Large portions of the Horn of Africa region are now in the grip of one of the worst humanitarian crises in the region in recent decades. Nearly half of the population in Somalia is in urgent need of assistance, and malnutrition rates are on the rise in neighboring Ethiopia and Kenya. Without the immediate action of the international community, it is projected that an additional 180,000 people will perish in the coming months due to the drought and famine.

It is difficult to fully comprehend the levels of human suffering currently occurring in the region, as refugees flee famine-affected areas. People are literally walking for days without food and water to try to reach food and safety. More than 166,000 desperate Somalis are estimated to have fled their country to neighboring Kenya and Ethiopia in recent months—approximately 3,500 people are arriving every day at refugee camps in those countries compounding the already tenuous humanitarian situation in the region.

On July 21, the United Nations declared a famine in two regions in southern Somalia. This declaration is not done lightly and is the first declared since 1992. Famine is only declared when acute child malnutrition rates exceed 30 percent and more than 2 people per 10,000 die per day. The U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, reports that the under-5 death rates in southern Somalia are higher than 4 children per 10,000 per day in all areas and as high as 13 to 20 per 10,000 per day in areas of south central Somalia. Already, outbreaks of measles, cholera, and watery diarrhea have been reported in affected areas as well. Unless this is addressed immediately through immunization campaigns and medical treatment, more people will perish from these preventable diseases.

The United States is one of the largest donors of emergency assistance to the region, helping more than 4.4 million of those in need and providing over $431 million since last October. The actions taken by our Nation and the international community in anticipation of the drought last year has helped save countless lives. Through the Famine Early Warning System, we saw data come in, and we were able to move resources into the region and implement programs to provide food in critically affected areas throughout the Horn of Africa. However, emergency assistance alone cannot solve the underlying long-term problems. The United States continues to provide longer term development assistance through Feed the Future and other programs, which are working in the region to address the root causes of hunger and malnutrition.

USAID Administrator Shah was in Kenya last week and met with Somali refugees there. He met with a woman who had traveled for 33 days by foot with her two children and suffered a robbery along the way, in order to arrive at a refugee camp in Kenya and have access to safety, food, and basic human security. He also visited with a 4-year-old boy who, in the acute malnutrition wing of the hospital at the

camp, weighed only 19 pounds and was reliant on a nasal feeding tube and very specific feeding regimens in order to, hopefully, survive. There are countless more stories like this, of people who risked their lives to bring themselves and their families to a safe environment.

This crisis has several contributing factors—most notably the worst drought on record in 60 years, which has devastated crops and livestock. But another major contributor to this crisis is the complete lack of governance in Somalia, a failed state for more than two decades, and the ongoing conflict there and in particular, the al-Qaida-affiliated Somali militia, al-Shabaab. Since 2009, al-Shabaab has prevented most Western aid organizations from operating in their territory, and it is no coincidence that the areas of famine are areas controlled by al-Shabaab. My sincerest hope is that al-Shabaab will stand aside and allow international organizations to assist people in their territory, people essentially held hostage by this radical, Islamist group.

The U.N. estimates that an additional $300 million will be needed just in the next few months to help those affected by this humanitarian disaster and that approximately $1.8 billion will be needed to fully address the massive scope of this crisis and help the people in the Horn of Africa. Without this crucially important funding, nearly 200,000 people could die. To date, this appeal is less than half way met by the international community. The international community must do more to meet this appeal.

This situation is a clear example of the critical importance of maintaining a strong U.S. commitment to emergency food assistance. The House of Representatives passed a fiscal year 2012 Agriculture appropriations bill that would cut funding for emergency food assistance by 75 percent from just 3 years ago. This comes at a time when not only is there famine in the Horn of Africa, but around the world needs are increasing as food prices remain high and the number of people affected or displaced by natural disasters and conflict continues to increase.

The international disaster assistance level specified in the House State-Foreign Ops appropriations bill for fiscal year 2012 would result in emergency humanitarian programming reaching 19 million fewer disaster-affected people than it would if the account were appropriated at the fiscal year 2011 level, based on average costs per person by the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance at USAID between 2006 and 2009.

If we cut the migration and refugee assistance and emergency refugee and migration accounts, as the House Foreign Operations bill does, we would jeopardize U.S. support for many of the world's 48 million forcibly displaced people, the majority of whom are assisted and protected by the international community. This includes almost 1 million Somalis. Before the current crisis in the Horn, 725,000 Somalis were seeking refuge in the region. Since the onset of the current crisis, 100,000 Somalis have arrived in Kenya and 75,000 in Ethiopia. Obviously, cuts of that magnitude would lead to catastrophic consequences. This could affect millions; primarily women and children suffering from hunger as a result of conflict and natural disasters would lose access to lifesaving food. This would significantly reduce America's ability to address instability in volatile countries and decrease its capacity to respond quickly to the needs of hungry people affected by conflict and natural disasters.

Aside from the national security implications for the United States in this already unstable region, the U.S. Government has a moral responsibility to help the least fortunate, both at home and abroad. As a global leader, the United States should not shy away from helping the least fortunate, regardless of race, religion, or nationality. In addition, the United States should encourage greater international participation. It is the moral, human course of action to take, but it is also the smart thing to do: a more stable and prosperous Somalia keeps the rest of the world and the United States more secure as well.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, today I join Senator MIKE JOHANNS and Congressman ADRIAN SMITH of Nebraska in paying tribute to the National Park Service, which will be celebrating its 95th anniversary this year on August 25, 2011.

The National Park Service currently administers 394 units across 49 States and U.S. territories, including five National Park Service units in our home State of Nebraska. These units consist of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Homestead National Monument of America, Missouri National Recreational River, Niobrara National Scenic River, and Scotts Bluff National Monument. In addition, the National Park Service administers five National Historic Trails, including the California, Oregon, Pony Express, Mormon, and Lewis and Clark.

National Park areas generate $12 billion in tourism dollars to local economies, creating 247,000 private-sector jobs. Within Nebraska, National Park Service units generate approximately 8.8 million in tourism dollars and create approximately 170 private-sector jobs. And in western Nebraska, Agate Fossil Beds and Scotts Bluff monuments, along with the Chimney Rock National Historic Site, which is an affiliated area of the National Park Service, generate close to $3 million in tourism dollars and create 90 private-sector jobs.

Nebraska has been supportive of the mission of the National Park Service even before the agency existed. In fact, in 1914, 2 years before the National Park Service was created, citizens in the Scottsbluff/Gering area sought to get a National Park or Monument established. Prominent local champions included elected officials and newspaper editor, A.B.Wood.

Scotts Bluff National Monument is named for a fur trapper by the name of Hiram Scott who was wounded and deserted by his companions in 1828. He gained immortality by making his way to a magnificent formation of bluffs along the North Platte River before succumbing to his wounds. It was for Hiram Scott that Scotts Bluff National Monument, Scotts Bluff County, and the city of Scottsbluff have been named.

Scotts Bluff National Monument, which rises 4,649 feet above sea level, was an imposing landmark which guided wagon trains along the California, Oregon, Pony Express, and Mormon Trails. Native Americans originally called this natural formation ma-a-pa-te, which translates into ''hill that is hard to go around.''

The Summit Road to the top of the bluff was completed in 1937, allowing visitors to drive to experience the spectacular view of the valley 800 feet below. This road is the oldest existing concrete road in Nebraska and includes the only three automobile tunnels in our State.

In the Scottsbluff/Gering area, numerous events to commemorate the 95th anniversary of the National Park Service have been scheduled for August 2011, beginning with a Kick-Off Ceremony at Scotts Bluff National Monument on August 12, 2011. Platte Valley Attractions, a coalition of visitor venues in and around the area, is hosting a variety of events and special exhibits through grants and donations from local and regional sponsors to commemorate the theme, ''Westward Expansion as seen through National Parks,'' including: Farm and Ranch Museum is hosting westward expansion orientation films and an interactive exhibit of westward expansion transportation methods.

Midwest Theater is hosting both the premiere of a new documentary film on the Pony Express and a film by Ken Burns on America's National Parks.

North Platte Valley Museum is hosting a westward expansion map exhibit.

Western Nebraska Community College is hosting a seminar, ''Recognizing and Preserving Westward Expansion,'' with speakers who are all nationally recognized in their fields.

Western Nebraska Community College sponsored a summer youth camp that developed posters to help promote these commemorative events.

Again, on behalf of the people of Nebraska, we offer our congratulations to Scotts Bluff National Monument on its Kick-Off Ceremony and the National Park Service on its 95th anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL JAMES E. CARTWRIGHT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to GEN James E. Cartwright, who is retiring after 40 years of accomplished military service. Since becoming the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on August 4, 2007, General ''Hoss'' Cartwright has testified numerous times and provided expert testimony, leadership, and advice to Congress, the President, and the American people regarding our Nation's security and the future of our Armed Forces.

General Cartwright hails from Rockford, IL. He graduated from the University of Iowa in 1971 and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps shortly thereafter. The general served as a naval flight officer in the F–4 and as a pilot in the F–4, OA–4 and the F–18. His flying career culminated with command of the First Marine Aircraft Wing in Okinawa, Japan. The general is also a distinguished graduate of the Air Command and Staff College and earned his master of arts in national security and strategic studies from the Naval War College.

After an assignment as the Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment, J–8, on the Joint Staff, then-Lieutenant General Cartwright was selected for promotion to general and became the first Marine Corps officer to lead U.S. Strategic Command. While at STRATCOM, General Cartwright led the development of strategies during a rapidly evolving national security environment, particularly in the areas of cyber, space, nuclear proliferation, and missile defense. He reorganized the command to increase interagency cooperation and streamlined operations. As a result of the changes the general implemented at STRATCOM, the effectiveness of the command for the deployed warfighter increased substantially to meet the new challenges of the 21st century.

During the last 4 years, General Cartwright has served as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. One of his top priorities has been to reduce the loss of American lives in combat by leveraging technology and streamlining acquisition processes to quickly iver new capabilities to the battlefield. His efforts to lead the MRAP program resulted in a 50 percent decrease in deaths attributed to improvised explosive device attacks.

The general can take pride in many other notable accomplishments, including the integration of technologies that enabled the destruction of a failing satellite by a missile for the first time and the successful raid against Osama bin Laden.

During his service, General Cartwright took every opportunity to recognize the efforts and sacrifice of the 2.4 million active, guard and reserve members of the Armed Forces and their families. He remains actively engaged for the benefit of our wounded warriors and always remembers the families of those who made the ultimate sacrifice on our battlefields. General Cartwright will be remembered for his strategic intellect and his ability to drive innovative change. His tenure leaves a lasting legacy to the Armed Forces. I appreciate his extraordinary service to our country and wish him all the best in the next chapter of his life.

NAVAL AIR STATION WHIDBEY ISLAND

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as we celebrate the U.S. Navy's centennial of aviation, I would like to personally recognize the exceptional contributions of the men and women, past and present, who have served at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island.

From the base's commissioning day on September 21, 1942, to the present, it has been the mission-ready men and women of Naval Air Station Whidbey Island who have protected the skies of the Pacific Northwest and projected power throughout the world.

A long tradition of excellence began on Whidbey Island during World War II when it was named Ault Field, in memory of Commander William B. Ault who was missing in action following the Battle of the Coral Sea. During the war, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island's patrol planes flew long-range navigation training missions over the North Pacific to protect the Pacific Northwest from the real threat of attack that gripped Alaska and the region. During this period, the earliest squadrons of F4F Wildcats, PV–1 Venturas, F6F Hellcats and SDB Dauntless's, also etched their place in U.S. Navy's distinguished history.

Naval Air Station Whidbey Island continued their legacy of excellence throughout each subsequent conflict. Their patrol planes proved to be paramount to successful operations during the Korean War and their initial deployments to Southeast Asia in 1972. Today, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island remains the premier naval aviation installation in the Pacific Northwest.

Currently the proud home of the EA–6B Prowlers, EA–18G Growlers, P–3 Orions and the EP–3E Aries, I know Naval Air Station Whidbey Island will continue to protect not only the Pacific Northwest, but the whole United States, for the next 100 years.

In recognition of the past century's naval aviation achievements, I would truly like to thank the men and women both in and out of uniform and the veterans of Naval Air Station Whidbey Island for their service and sacrifice.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS E. ''JAKE'' FISHER

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I pay tribute to a dedicated public servant from my home State of Missouri. Jake Fisher has devoted his professional life to helping others through his work at the University of Missouri Delta Center.

Shortly after graduation from high school, Jake was employed at the University of Missouri Delta Center as a farmworker I. From that position, he was promoted to technician, senior technician, and research specialist. In 1986 he became the assistant superintendent. Three years later, Jake was promoted to Superintendent of the Delta Center and continues to serve in that leadership role today. Next month, Jake will retire after 50 years of dedicated service to agriculture research in Missouri.

Besides his work at the Delta Center, Jake serves on the board of directors for a number of organizations, including Progressive Farm Credit Services of Southeast Missouri, Pemiscot-Dunklin Electric Cooperative, M&A Electrical Cooperative, Associated Electrical Cooperative, and Pemiscot County Port Authority. He is a member of the executive committee of the Research Administrator's Society. Along with his service to these organizations, Jake is a 32nd degree Mason and Shriner.

Due to his selfless efforts, Jake has received numerous awards, including the State Farm Management Award in 1981 by Production Credit Association of Eastern Missouri. He was named ''Man of the Year in Service to Agriculture'' by the Progressive Farmer Magazine in 1995 and in 1996 was granted honorary membership to the University of Missouri Ag Alumni Association. He was awarded a lifetime membership to the Cotton Producers of Missouri in 1997 and in 2000 received the outstanding staff award by the University of Missouri's College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources. In 2001, Jake was named ''Ag Leader of the Year'' by Missouri Ag Industries Council. He was honored with the A.C. Burrows Service Award in 2009 by the Association of Missouri Electrical Cooperatives. In 2011, Jake received the Agribusiness Service Award from the Sikeston, MO, Chamber of Commerce. He was awarded the Frank Stork Democracy Award in 2011 by the Missouri Association of Electrical Cooperatives. In 2006, the conventional soybean variety ''Jake'' was named for Jake Fisher.

Jake is also a loving and devoted husband to his wife of almost 50 years, Shelly, and an outstanding role model for his daughter, Stacey Kersey, and for his grandsons, Gunnar Young and Kasen Kersey.

Thomas E. ''Jake'' Fisher's career has been built on character, dedication, and service to his fellow Missourians. His accomplishments during his 50 years of loyal service will be felt for generations to come. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this great Missourian and extending our best wishes as he begins a new chapter in life.•

REMEMBERING DR. DON LINKER

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Dr. Donald Linker of Marin County, who passed away on June 16, 2011. Dr. Linker dedicated his personal and professional life to helping others and was passionate about living his life to the fullest.

Donald Linker was born and raised in Louisville, KY. He graduated from the University of Michigan and received his doctor of medicine from the University of Kentucky, School of Medicine.

Don served honorably in the U.S. Navy as a doctor treating marines in Vietnam. After his service, he moved to San Francisco, married, and had three children. He opened his own medical practice and after many years of practicing medicine, returned to school and received his master's in public health from UC Berkeley.

Don Linker was an activist and philanthropist who was committed to bettering his community. He was a founding member of the Foundation for Reed Schools in Tiburon and also served a number of other organizations, including the Jewish Community Federation, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the Marin Community Federation, the Bernard Osher Foundation, and the Buck Center for Research and Aging.

Don was an adventurous man with a fiery demeanor and an infectious spirit who loved travel and extreme sports. One of his passions was pushing himself to the limit physically. He loved windsurfing, skiing, and mountain biking, and some of his greatest personal accomplishments involved those activities.

Don was a friend who will be greatly missed by all those whose lives he touched.

I send my heartfelt sympathies to his family, including his son Kevin Linker, daughters Jodi Linker and Dana Linker, son-in-law Richard Steele, brother Stephen Linker and his grandchildren Lauren and Sarah Steele.•

TRIBUTE TO JORDAN BURROUGHS

• Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the best collegiate wrestler in America, Jordan Burroughs, who is an All-American from my alma mater, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Earlier this year Jordan was awarded the Dan Hodge Trophy, which is often referred to as the ''Heisman Trophy of wrestling.'' This award is named in honor of Dan Hodge, who was undefeated during his 3-year career at the University of Oklahoma. The criteria considered for the Hodge Trophy, according to the University of Nebraska, are the wrestler's record, number of pins, dominance on the mat, past credentials, quality of competition, sportsmanship, and heart.

Wrestling at 165 pounds, Jordan compiled an impressive 36-to-0 record this last season and captured his second crown from the National Collegiate Athletic Association; his first was in 2009. Despite Nebraska facing one of the toughest schedules in the Nation this year, Jordan had only three matches this season which did not end by pin, tech fall, or a major decision.

Congratulations also go to Nebraska's head wrestling coach, Mark Manning, who recruited Jordan from Winslow Township High School in Sicklerville, NJ, where Jordan was listed as the seventh best high school wrestler in the country. As Coach Manning says, ''Winning the Hodge Trophy puts Jordan in an elite group of wrestlers and makes a strong statement about him as an athlete.''

Most recently, Jordan Burroughs added to his list of impressive tournament wins by taking home his first senior international wrestling gold medal on July 17, 2011, at the Outstanding Ukrainian Wrestlers Memorial International in Kiev, Ukraine. There will be other matches between now and next year, but his ultimate goal is to compete at the 2012 Summer Olympics in London, England.

From the Garden State to the Cornhusker State, Jordan Burroughs makes us all proud as America's best collegiate wrestler of 2011. As a former Husker, he will forever remain in the hearts of Big Red fans everywhere who will continue rooting for him wherever his travels take him.•

TRIBUTE TO PAMELA LYNNE WELLER

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I wish honor Pamela Lynne Weller, legal special assistant to Commissioner Thomas H. Moore at the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC. Ms. Weller is retiring after more than 26 years of distinguished Federal Government service.

Pamela was born in Baltimore and has lived in Maryland for most of her life. She graduated with honors from the University of Maryland and received her law degree from Georgetown University.

Pamela began her Federal service during her last year of law school, when she worked for Senator Lawton Chiles on the Government in the Sunshine Act, Public Law 94–409, and later for Senator Richard Stone. For part of that time she actually worked for both Senators simultaneously, for Senator Chiles as part of a law school program and as a salaried employee of Senator Stone. After graduation, she continued working for Senator Stone on a variety of important issues through the end of his term of office.

After leaving Senator Stone, she went to work at the Civil Aeronautics Board, CAB, as an assistant to board member James Smith, as the agency worked through the deregulation of the national air transportation system, and then as it wound down its operations prior to being incorporated into the Department of Transportation.

Following nearly 10 years of continuous government service, Pamela went to work in the private sector, opening her own law practice. She continued in this line of work for over 11 years, specializing in family law and real estate transactions.

In 1995, she went back into the public service to become an assistant to Commissioner Thomas H. Moore at the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission. During her work for Commissioner Moore, the longest serving Commissioner in the agency's history, she advised him on all agency actions including rulemakings, enforcement actions and administrative matters. Additionally, she served as acting chief of staff during Commissioner Moore's 9-month stint as acting chairman of the agency in 2001 and 2002. She also helped construct his 2007 legislative proposals to Congress, a number of which were incorporated into the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008, Public Law 110–314.

During her notable tenure at CPSC, Ms. Weller has played a significant role in protecting the public from unreasonable risks of injury posed by consumer products. On numerous occasions, she has demonstrated inspiring leadership and has always been considered a valued employee at the CPSC.

Mr. President, I am pleased to thank Pamela Lynne Weller for her honorable service to our Nation, and I wish her a rewarding retirement.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13441 WITH RESPECT TO LEBANON—PM 16

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the

President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect to the actions of certain persons to undermine the sovereignty of Lebanon or its democratic processes and institutions is to continue in effect beyond August 1, 2011.

Certain ongoing activities, such as continuing arms transfers to Hizballah that include increasingly sophisticated weapons systems, serve to undermine Lebanese sovereignty, contribute to political and economic instability in the region, and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared on August 1, 2007, to deal with that threat and the related measures adopted on that date to respond to the emergency.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 28, 2011*.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1938. An act to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2676. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 65) (Docket No. FEMA–2011–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2677. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 65) (Docket No. FEMA–2011–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2678. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations'' ((44 CFR Part 65) (Docket No. FEMA–2011–0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2679. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Management and Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to acquisitions from entities that manufacture articles, materials, and supplies outside of the United States for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2680. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Obsoleting Rev. Rul. 58–225'' (Rev. Rul. 2011–15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2681. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Department of the Treasury Acquisition Regulation'' (RIN1505–AC04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2682. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Chapter 4 Implementation Notice'' (Notice 2011–53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2683. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services related to the sale of Colt M4 Carbines to the Ministry of Defense of Malaysia in the amount of $50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2684. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Fiscal Year 2010 Report to Congress on Minority Small Business and Capital Ownership Development; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC–2685. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Helicopter Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Northeast United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0078)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2686. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Restricted Areas R–4401A, R–4401B, and R–4401C; Camp Shelby, MS'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2008–0110)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2687. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update of August 2001 Overflight Fees'' ((RIN2120–AJ68) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0326)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2688. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Antidrug and Alcohol Misuse Prevention Programs for Personnel Engaged in Specified Aviation Activities; Final Regulatory Flexibility Determination'' ((RIN2120–AH14) (Docket No. FAA–2002–11301)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2689. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Standards; Rotor Overspeed Requirements'' ((RIN2120–AA62) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0398)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2690. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Vehicle Labeling—Fuel Economy, Greenhouse Gas and Other Emissions'' (RIN2127–AK73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2691. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Manual Requirements'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2001–11133)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2692. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Make Inoperative Exemptions; Vehicle Modifications to Accommodate People with Disabilities, Side Impact Protection'' (RIN2127–AK77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2693. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Insurer Reporting Requirements; List of Insurers Required to File Reports'' (RIN2127–AK90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2694. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials; Miscellaneous Amendments'' (RIN2137–AE46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2695. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials Transportation: Revisions of Special Permits Procedures'' (RIN2137–AE73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2696. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (48); Amdt. No. 3431'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 30789)) received

in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2697. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (81); Amdt. No. 3430'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 30788)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2698. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (136); Amdt. No. 3432'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 30790)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2699. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (25); Amdt. No. 3433'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 30791)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2700. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Quotas and Atlantic Tuna Fisheries Management Measures'' (RIN0648–BA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2701. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program'' (RIN0648–AY33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2702. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program; Amendment 37'' (RIN0648–BA11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2703. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish, Pacific Ocean Perch, and Pelagic Shelf Rockfish for Catcher Vessels Participating in the Limited Access Rockfish Fishery in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA538) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2704. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-Water Species Fishery by Catcher/Processors in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA539) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2705. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Catcher Vessels in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA536) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2706. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch for Catcher Vessels Participating in the Rockfish Entry Level Trawl Fishery in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA543) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2707. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish and Pelagic Shelf Rockfish for Trawl Catcher Vessels Participating in the Entry Level Rockfish Fishery in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA546) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2708. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA542) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2709. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the Directed Butterfish Fishery'' (RIN0648–XA523) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 27, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 1302. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Tracy, California, to the City of Tracy (Rept. No. 112–40).

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1313. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–41).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 401. A bill to help Federal prosecutors and investigators combat public corruption by strengthening and clarifying the law.

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 409. A bill to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs.

S. 839. A bill to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1434. A bill to protect information relating to consumers, to require notice of security breaches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1435. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to exclude child care from the determination of the 5-year limit on assistance under the temporary assistance for needy families program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1436. A bill to provide $50,000,000,000 in new transportation infrastructure funding through bonding to empower States and local governments to complete significant infrastructure projects across all modes of transportation, including roads, bridges, rail and transit systems, ports, and inland waterways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1437. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out programs to provide youth in racial or ethnic minority or immigrant communities the information and skills needed to reduce teenage pregnancies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COBURN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. VITTER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BURR, Mr. COATS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1438. A bill to provide that no agency may take any significant regulatory action until the unemployment rate is equal to or less than 7.7 percent; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 1439. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding ready school needs reviews; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1440. A bill to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1441. A bill to provide assistance for workforce investment activities to unique

populations in Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1442. A bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1443. A bill to extend certain trade preferences to certain least-developed countries in Asia and the South Pacific, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 1444. A bill to provide for the presentation of a United States flag on behalf of Federal civilian employees who are killed while performing official duties or because of their status as Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1445. A bill to designate certain conduct by car and truck rental companies relating to motor vehicle safety defects and recalls as unfair and deceptive acts or practices to be regulated by the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. KYL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COATS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BURR, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1446. A bill to free States to spend gas taxes on their transportation priorities; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1447. A bill to amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to authorize the use of grant funds for dating violence prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1448. A bill to exempt off-highway vehicles from the ban on lead in children's products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 48

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 48, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pharmacists in National Health Services Corps programs, and for other purposes.

S. 252

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 252, a bill to permit a State to elect to receive the contributions of the State to the Highway Trust Fund in lieu of the Federal-aid highway program apportionment of the State for the subsequent fiscal year, and for other purposes.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 387

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of S. 387, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide flexible spending arrangements for members of uniformed services, and for other purposes.

S. 401

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 401, a bill to help Federal prosecutors and investigators combat public corruption by strengthening and clarifying the law.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs.

S. 797

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 797, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 961

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 961, a bill to create the income security conditions and family supports needed to ensure permanency for the Nation's unaccompanied youth, and for other purposes.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1025, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1048, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to the Islamic Republic of Iran, North Korea, and Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1061

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1061, a bill to amend title 5 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the award of fees and other expenses in cases brought against agencies of the United States, to require the Administrative Conference of the United States to compile, and make publically available, certain data relating to the Equal Access to Justice Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1251, a bill to amend title XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1265

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1265, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 1359

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1359, a bill to make the National Parks and Federal Recreation Lands Pass available at a discount to members of the Armed Forces and veterans.

S. 1392

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1392, a bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes.

S. 1433

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1433, a bill to pay personnel compensation and benefits for employees of the Federal Aviation Administration.

S. RES. 132

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 132, a resolution recognizing and honoring

the zoos and aquariums of the United States.

S. RES. 216

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 216, a resolution encouraging women's political participation in Saudi Arabia.

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 216, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1435. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Security Act to exclude child care from the determination of the 5-year limit on assistance under the temporary assistance for needy families program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today too many families are at risk of losing the child care assistance that helps maintain their financial stability and ensure the well-being of their children. That is why I am introducing the Children First Act to address the growing unmet need for affordable and safe child care.

Until now, most states were able to maintain their child care assistance programs through the recession due to the additional $2 billion in Federal Child Care and Development Block Grant, CCDBG, funding for 2009 and 2010 from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, ARRA.

However, with only a portion of these ARRA funds being continued, and with persistent state budget gaps, many states are forced to scale back child care assistance for families. Some states' waiting lists for subsidized child care are beginning to rise and a few states have stopped or plan to stop providing child care assistance to families who are not receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, TANF, together.

Cuts and restrictions in the availability of child care assistance make it harder for parents to afford child care and have forced some parents to leave their jobs and turn to welfare programs for support. Children lose access to the stable, good-quality child care that encourages their learning and development and prepares them for school success. And child care programs can find difficulty filling their classrooms, leading them to lay off staff or close their doors entirely. That is wrong and we can do better.

Child care consumes a large portion of family budgets, and can cost up to $18,773 annually for full-time care depending on where the family lives, the type of care, and the age of the child. Child care prices are higher than other household expenses and typically exceed the average amount families spend on food. In 39 States and the District of Columbia, the average annual price for child care for an infant in a child care center was higher than even a year's tuition at some 4-year public colleges.

Without assistance, many low-income families can find it impossible to secure child care. For example, in 2007, the median monthly income of families receiving child care assistance was just $16,680 a year. Nearly half, 49 percent, of families receiving child care assistance live below the poverty line and 86 percent of these families were single parent households. In these challenging economic times, it is especially important to help low and moderate-income families with their child care costs.

The Children First Act which I am introducing today will help address the growing unmet need for affordable and safe child care. It will help—States meet the significant demand for child care assistance by increasing funding for mandatory child care by $500 million for fiscal year 2012, $700 million in 2013, and $750 million in 2014 thru 2021, resulting in an increase of $3.45 billion over 5 years and $7.2 billion over 10 years.

This increase is necessary because only about one in six children eligible for Federal child care assistance receives help and there have been no increases in mandatory' child care funding since 2007. This increased funding will be used to provide approximately 212,000 additional children access to safe and affordable child care as compared to current funding levels.

The Children First Act would exclude child care from the definition of TANF assistance so that unemployed families who receive child care assistance will not have it count towards the 5-year time limit for Federal TANF assistance. The legislation would also ensure that the minimum child care health and safety standards required for providers receiving Child Care Development Block Grant, CCDBG, funding also apply to providers who receive funding through TANF. In Massachusetts, all licensed providers are required to the same health and safety standards regardless of subsidy type received.

This legislation would increase the availability of child care for parents who are required to work. States are currently prohibited from withholding or reducing assistance to a single parent with children under 6 who does not meet work requirements for reasons related to the unavailability or unsuitability of appropriate, affordable child care arrangements. The Children First Act would prevent States from withholding or reducing cash assistance to parents of a child with children under age thirteen.

Enactment of this legislation is incredibly important for my home State of Massachusetts which currently has approximately 24,000 children on a waitlist for child care subsidies. The high cost of child care is the most significant issue facing families currently on the waitlist in Massachusetts. Massachusetts families pay more on average than families in all other states for child care, with the average price of full time care in center based settings totaling $18,773 for an infant and $13,158 for a preschooler. This legislation will help lower the waitlist and help our children become more productive citizens.

I would like to thank a number of organizations who have been integral to the development of the Children First Act and who have endorsed it today, including the including the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFSCME, the Children's Defense Fund, CLASP, the National Women's Law Center, and the Service Employees International Union, SEIU.

These reforms would significantly increase access to stable and affordable child care to low-income families and would make our Nation's children more prepared for school and success later in life. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to pass this legislation.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1437. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out programs to provide youth in racial or ethnic minority or immigrant communities the information and skills needed to reduce teenage pregnancies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Communities of Color Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Act.

Teen pregnancy is closely linked to a number of issues that affect the welfare of children in our Nation, particularly child poverty. A child in the United States is nine times more likely to grow up in poverty if their mother gave birth when she was a teen, if the child's parents are unmarried when they are born, and if the mother did not graduate from high school.

The United States has the highest teen pregnancy rate of any developed nation. Each year close to 750,000 teens in the United States become pregnant. Despite some progress in reducing teen pregnancy overall, many minority communities continue to struggle with disproportionately high rates of teen pregnancy.

Over half of all Latina and African American girls will become pregnant at least once before they turn 20. In 2009 the teen birth rate for Latinas, African Americans and American Indians/Alaska Natives was more than double the teen birth rate of non-Hispanic Caucasians.

The Communities of Color Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Act takes would address teen pregnancy in communities of color by supporting teenage pregnancy prevention programs that work with community-based organizations that are experienced in serving youth

in ethnic and racial groups with the highest teen pregnancy rates; using multimedia campaigns to provide public health education and increase awareness about teen pregnancy, and researching what factors contribute to disproportionately high rates of teenage and unintended pregnancy in communities of color.

I am proud that our country has made progress in reducing the rate of teen pregnancy by one third over the last decade, but our work is not done. We need to strengthen our efforts, especially among the youth in communities of color who are now so much more likely to face the unexpected and difficult challenges of parenting before they have finished growing up themselves.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, who is sponsoring this legislation in the House, as well as Hispanas Organized for Political Equality, the National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy, the Futures Without Violence, and the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.

I urge my colleagues to join us in taking the next step forward in preventing teenage pregnancy by supporting this important legislation.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1441. A bill to provide assistance for workforce investment activities to unique populations in Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Mr. BEGICH and I recognize that Alaska and Hawaii's educational and workforce needs are linked to the indigenous cultures, learning styles, and geographical realities of our home States. We would like to commend the University of Hawaii Maui College for their hard work and dedication in developing a Remote Rural Hawaii Training Project. Over the years, the University of Hawaii Maui College has led the way in education and workforce development. Since the inception of the Rural Development Project in 1997, the University has supported 300 hundred projects. The initial projects served over 29,000 participants. We would also like to praise Cook Inlet Tribal Council for their dedication and efforts relating to workforce development for Native Alaskans. For example, in fiscal year 2010 the Alaska's People Career center served 2,269 job seekers and they helped 58 people obtain their General Educational Development diploma. These initiatives, many made possible by the unique environment created by the natural resources of Alaska and Hawaii, have proved to be an invaluable source of current and future growth of workforce development and training programs. We are truly impressed by the innovative projects developed by these two organizations and we need continued support for workforce development in these unique populations in Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1441

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Workforce Investment for Unique Populations in Hawaii and Alaska Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. ASSISTANCE TO UNIQUE POPULATIONS IN ALASKA AND HAWAII.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide assistance to the Cook Inlet Tribal Council, Incorporated, and the University of Hawaii Maui College, for the unique populations who reside in Alaska or Hawaii, respectively, to improve job training and other workforce investment activities (as defined in section 101 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.)).

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal year 2012 and each subsequent fiscal year.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1443. A bill to extend certain trade preferences to certain least-developed countries in Asia and the South Pacific, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Asia-South Pacific Trade Preferences Act to help some of the world's poorest countries sustain vital export industries and promote economic growth and political stability.

This legislation will provide duty free and quota free benefits for garments and other products similar to those afforded to beneficiary countries under the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

The countries covered by this legislation are 13 Least Developed Countries, LDCs, as defined by the United Nations and the U.S. State Department, which are not covered by any current U.S. trade preference program: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Kiribati, Laos, Maldives, Nepal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, East Timor, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu.

They are among the poorest countries in the world.

Nepal has per capita income of $240. Unemployment in Bangladesh stands at 40 percent. Approximately 36 percent of Cambodia's population lives below the poverty line.

Each country faces critical challenges in the years ahead including poor health care, insufficient educational opportunities, high HIV/AIDS rates, and the effects of war and civil strife.

The United States must take a leadership role in providing much needed assistance to the people of these countries.

Yet humanitarian and development assistance should not be the sum total of our efforts to put these countries on the road to economic prosperity and political stability.

Indeed, the key for sustained growth and rising standards of living will be the ability of each of these countries to create vital export industries to compete in a free and open global marketplace.

We should help these countries help themselves by opening the U.S. market to their exports as we have done for other developing countries in the past.

By doing so, we will demonstrate the best of American values: reaching out to a neighbor in need and helping him to stand on his own two feet.

Success in this endeavor will ultimately allow these countries to become less dependent on foreign aid and allow the United States to provide assistance to countries in greater need.

But make no mistake. These countries will not automatically receive the trade benefits provided by this legislation.

Our efforts to promote economic growth, jobs, and political stability will fail if these countries are strangled by human rights abuses, corruption, and the absence of the rule of law.

Instead of lifting the citizens of these countries out of poverty and giving hope for a better future, we will ignore our values and sustain the status quo.

So, this legislation has been drafted to ensure that the benefits are granted on a performance-driven basis.

That is, to be eligible, a beneficiary country must demonstrate that it is making continual progress toward establishing rule of law, political pluralism, the right to due process, and a market-based economy that protects private property rights.

So, this legislation would help promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law while sustaining vital export industries and creating employment opportunities.

The beneficiary countries have a clear incentive to stay on the right path or they will lose the benefits of this bill.

I firmly believe that these benefits will make a difference.

The garment industry is a key part of the manufacturing sector in some of these countries.

In Nepal, the garment industry is entirely export oriented and accounts for 40 percent of foreign exchange earnings. It employs over 100,000 workers, half of them women, and sustains the livelihood of over 350,000 people.

The United States is the largest market for Nepalese garments and accounts for 80–90 percent of Nepal's total exports every year.

In Cambodia, approximately 250,000 Cambodians work in the garment industry supporting approximately one million dependents. The garment industry accounts for more than 90 percent of Cambodia's export earnings.

In Bangladesh, the garment industry accounts for 75 percent of export earnings. The industry employs 1.8 million

people, 90 percent of whom are women, and sustains the livelihoods of 10 to 15 million people.

Despite the poverty seen in these countries and the importance of the garment industry and the U.S. market, they face some of the highest U.S. tariffs in the world, averaging over 15 percent.

In contrast, countries like Japan and our European partners face tariffs that are nearly zero.

Surely we can do better.

By targeting the garment industry, we can make a real difference now in promoting economic growth and higher standards of living.

This legislation will help these countries compete in the U.S. market and lift their and let their citizens know that Americans are committed to helping them realize a better future for themselves and their families.

Doing so is consistent with U.S. goals to combat poverty, instability, and terrorism in a critical part of the world. We should not forget that the vast majority of the people from these beneficiary countries are Muslim.

The impact on U.S. jobs will be minimal.

Currently, the beneficiary countries under this legislation account for only 4 percent of U.S. textile and apparel imports, compared to 24 percent for China, and 72 percent for the rest of the world.

These countries will continue to be small players in the U.S. market, but the benefits of this legislation will have a major impact on their export economies.

At a time when we are trying to rebuild the image of the U.S. around the world, we need legislation such as this to show the best of America and American values. It will provide a vital component to our development strategy and add another tool to the war on terror. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1443

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Asia–South Pacific Trade Preferences Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) It is in the mutual interest of the United States and least-developed countries to promote stable and sustainable economic growth and development.

(2) Trade and investment are powerful economic tools and can be used to reduce poverty and raise the standard of living in a country.

(3) A country that is open to trade may increase its economic growth.

(4) Trade and investment often lead to employment opportunities and often help alleviate poverty.

(5) Least-developed countries have a particular challenge in meeting the economic requirements of and competitiveness necessary for globalization and international markets.

(6) The United States has recognized the benefits that international trade provides to least-developed countries by enacting the Generalized System of Preferences and trade benefits for developing countries in the Caribbean, Andean, and sub-Saharan African regions of the world.

(7) Enhanced trade with least-developed Muslim countries, including Yemen, Afghanistan, and Bangladesh, is consistent with other United States objectives of encouraging a strong private sector and individual economic empowerment in those countries.

(8) Offering least-developed countries enhanced trade preferences will encourage both higher levels of trade and direct investment in support of positive economic and political developments throughout the world.

(9) Encouraging the reciprocal reduction of trade and investment barriers will enhance the benefits of trade and investment as well as enhance commercial and political ties between the United States and the countries designated for benefits under this Act.

(10) Economic opportunity and engagement in the global trading system together with support for democratic institutions and a respect for human rights are mutually reinforcing objectives and key elements of a policy to confront and defeat global terrorism.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ASIA OR SOUTH PACIFIC COUNTRY.—The term ''Asia or South Pacific country'' means a country listed in section 4(b).

(2) BENEFICIARY ASIA OR SOUTH PACIFIC COUNTRY.—The term ''beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country'' means an Asia or South Pacific country that the President has determined is eligible for preferential treatment under this Act.

(3) FORMER BENEFICIARY ASIA OR SOUTH PACIFIC COUNTRY.—The term ''former beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country'' means a country that, after being designated as a beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country under this Act, ceased to be designated as such a country by reason of its entering into a free trade agreement with the United States.

SEC. 4. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE; ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized to designate an Asia or South Pacific country as a beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country eligible for preferential treatment under this Act—

(A) if the President determines that the country meets the requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703); and

(B) subject to the authority granted to the President under subsections (a), (d), and (e) of section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2462), if the country otherwise meets the eligibility criteria set forth in such section 502.

(2) APPLICATION OF SECTION 104.—Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act shall be applied for purposes of paragraph (1) by substituting ''Asia or South Pacific country'' for ''sub-Saharan African country'' each place it appears.

(b) COUNTRIES ELIGIBLE FOR DESIGNATION.—For purposes of this Act, the term ''Asia or South Pacific country'' refers to the following or their successor political entities:

(1) Afghanistan.
(2) Bangladesh.
(3) Bhutan.
(4) Cambodia.
(5) Kiribati.
(6) Lao People's Democratic Republic.
(7) Maldives.
(8) Nepal.
(9) Samoa.
(10) Solomon Islands.
(11) Timor-Leste (East Timor).
(12) Tuvalu.
(13) Vanuatu.

SEC. 5. ELIGIBLE ARTICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise excluded from eligibility (or otherwise provided for in this Act), preferential treatment shall apply in accordance with subsections (b), (c), and (d).

(b) CERTAIN ARTICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may provide duty-free treatment to any article described in subparagraphs (B) through (G) of section 503(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)) if—

(A) the article is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country; and

(B) the President determines, after receiving the advice of the International Trade Commission in accordance with section 503(e) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(e)), that the article is not import-sensitive in the context of imports from beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries.

(2) RULES OF ORIGIN.—The duty-free treatment provided under paragraph (1) shall apply to any article described in that paragraph that meets the requirements of section 503(a)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(a)(2)), except that for purposes of determining if the article meets the 35-percent requirement under subparagraph (A)(ii) of such section—

(A) if the cost or value of materials produced in the customs territory of the United States is included with respect to that article, an amount not to exceed 15 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered that is attributed to such United States cost or value may be applied toward meeting the 35-percent requirement; and

(B) the cost or value of the materials included with respect to that article that are produced in one or more beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries or former beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries shall be applied toward meeting the 35-percent requirement.

(c) TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The preferential treatment described in subsection (a) of section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(a)) shall apply with respect to textile and apparel articles described in paragraphs (1), (2), (4), (5), (7), and (8) of subsection (b) of such section and paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection that are imported directly into the customs territory of the United States from a beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country except that such section 112 shall be applied and administered with respect to such articles—

(A) in subsection (a), by substituting ''a beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country (as defined in section 3 of the Asia–South Pacific Trade Preferences Act)'' for ''a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in section 506A(c) of the Trade Act of 1974''; and

(B) in paragraphs (1), (2), (4), (5), (7), and (8) of subsection (b), by substituting ''beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country'' and ''beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries'' for ''beneficiary sub-Saharan African country'' and ''beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries'', respectively, each place such terms appear.

(2) TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES ASSEMBLED FROM REGIONAL AND OTHER FABRIC.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Textile and apparel articles described in this paragraph are textile

and apparel articles wholly assembled in one or more beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries or former beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries, or both, from fabric wholly formed in one or more beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries or former beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries, or both, from yarn originating either in the United States or one or more beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries or former beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries, or both (including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and are wholly formed and cut in the United States, in one or more beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries or former beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries, or any combination thereof), whether or not the textile and apparel articles are also made from any of the fabrics, fabric components formed, or components knit-to-shape described in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 112(b) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)) (unless the apparel articles are made exclusively from any of the fabrics, fabric components formed, or components knit-to-shape described in paragraph (1) or (2) of such section 112(b)).

(B) LIMITATIONS ON BENEFITS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Preferential treatment under this subsection shall be extended in the 1-year period beginning January 1, 2012, and in each of the succeeding 10 1-year periods, to imports of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A) in an amount not to exceed the applicable percentage of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the United States in the most recent 12-month period for which data are available.

(ii) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ''applicable percentage'' means 11 percent for the 1-year period beginning January 1, 2012, increased in each of the 10 succeeding 1-year periods by equal increments, so that for the period beginning January 1, 2022, the applicable percentage does not exceed 14 percent.

(3) HANDLOOMED, HANDMADE, FOLKLORE ARTICLES AND ETHNIC PRINTED FABRICS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A textile or apparel article described in this paragraph is a handloomed, handmade, folklore article or an ethnic printed fabric of a beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country or countries that is certified as such by the competent authority of such beneficiary country or countries. For purposes of this subsection, the President, after consultation with the beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country or countries concerned, shall determine which, if any, particular textile and apparel goods of the country or countries shall be treated as being handloomed, handmade, or folklore articles or an ethnic printed fabric.

(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR ETHNIC PRINTED FABRIC.—Ethnic printed fabrics qualified under this paragraph are—

(i) fabrics containing a selvedge on both edges, having a width of less than 50 inches, classifiable under subheading 5208.52.30 or 5208.52.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States;

(ii) of the type that contains designs, symbols, and other characteristics of Asian or South Pacific prints—

(I) normally produced for and sold on the indigenous Asian or South Pacific market; and

(II) normally sold in Asia or South Pacific countries by the piece as opposed to being tailored into garments before being sold in indigenous Asian or South Pacific markets;

(iii) printed, including waxed, in one or more beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries; and

(iv) fabrics formed in the United States, from yarns formed in the United States, or from fabric formed in one or more beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries from yarn originating in either the United States or one or more beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries.

(4) SPECIAL RULE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Preferential treatment under this subsection shall be extended through December 31, 2019, for textile and apparel articles that are wholly assembled in one or more beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries or former beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries, or both, regardless of the country of origin of the yarn or fabric used to make such articles.

(B) COUNTRY LIMITATIONS.—

(i) SMALL SUPPLIERS.—If, during a calendar year, imports of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A) from a beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country are less than 1 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the United States during that calendar year, such imports may be increased to an amount that is equal to not more than 1.5 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the United States during that calendar year for the succeeding calendar year.

(ii) OTHER SUPPLIERS.—If, during a calendar year, imports of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A) from a beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country are at least 1 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the United States during that calendar year, such imports may be increased by an amount that is equal to not more than ⅓ of 1 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the United States during that calendar year for the succeeding calendar year.

(iii) AGGREGATE COUNTRY LIMIT.—In no case may the aggregate quantity of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A) imported into the United States during a calendar year under this subsection exceed the applicable percentage set forth in paragraph (2)(B)(ii) for that calendar year.

(d) OTHER RESTRICTIONS.—The provisions of subsections (b)(3)(B) and (e) of section 112 and section 113 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721 and 3722) shall apply with respect to the preferential treatment extended under this section to a beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country by substituting ''beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country'' for ''beneficiary sub-Saharan African country'' and ''beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries'' and ''former beneficiary Asia or South Pacific countries'' for ''beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries'' and ''former sub-Saharan African countries'', respectively, as appropriate.

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 6002(a)(2)(B) of the Africa Investment Incentive Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–432) is amended by inserting before ''by striking'' the following: ''in paragraph (3),''.

SEC. 6. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

The President shall monitor, review, and report to Congress, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the implementation of this Act and on the trade and investment policy of the United States with respect to the Asia or South Pacific countries.

SEC. 7. TERMINATION OF PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT.

No duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment extended to a beneficiary Asia or South Pacific country under this Act shall remain in effect after December 31, 2022.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this Act shall take effect on January 1, 2012.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 1444. A bill to provide for the presentation of a United States flag on behalf of Federal civilian employees who are killed while performing official duties or because of their status as Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Civilian Service Recognition Act of 2011. This bill ensures that the next of kin of Federal civilian employees killed in the line of duty are presented a United States flag honoring the service and sacrifice of their loved one. This legislation is cosponsored by Senator LIEBERMAN and is a companion to a bi-partisan bill introduced by Representative HANNA. Representative HANNA's bill was recently reported favorably by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform by unanimous voice vote.

Every day, Federal civilian employees serve our nation at home and abroad, fulfilling critical roles that protect our citizens, our economy, and our freedom. Some put their lives at risk when doing so. Approximately 100,000 Federal civilian employees have served alongside the U.S. military in Iraq and Afghanistan over the last decade. Since 1992, nearly 3,000 Federal civilian employees have died in service of their country, including 24 killed in Iraq and Afghanistan. Employees who make this ultimate sacrifice deserve the utmost gratitude and respect from their nation.

U.S. law currently requires that a United States flag be presented to the next of kin of deceased U.S. military veterans, but no law or government-wide policy requires that Federal civilian employees killed in the line of duty be similarly recognized. Some Federal agencies have already established internal practices to honor employees killed in service with a U.S. flag, but others have not. Every Federal civilian employee who dies as a result of their honorable service to this country should at least be recognized with the symbolic but nonetheless significant appreciation embodied in the presentation of an American flag.

The bill I am introducing today would remedy the current inconsistency. It requires that Federal agencies present a flag to the next of kin of Federal civilian employees killed in the line of duty. In the unusual circumstance where the national security, such as in the case of a covert employee, or employee misconduct dictate otherwise, the requirement would not apply. It is a modest but meaningful step in expressing our condolences and gratitude to the families of those killed while serving this country; reminding Federal employees that their service and sacrifices are appreciated; and highlighting the important role

Federal employees play, sometimes at great personal risk, in promoting the general welfare of this great Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1444

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Civilian Service Recognition Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. PRESENTATION OF UNITED STATES FLAG ON BEHALF OF FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES KILLED WHILE PERFORMING OFFICIAL DUTIES OR BECAUSE OF THEIR STATUS AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) EMPLOYEE.—The term ''employee'' has the meaning given that term in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, and includes—

(A) individuals who perform volunteer services at the discretion of the head of an executive agency; and

(B) an officer or employee of the United States Postal Service or of the Postal Regulatory Commission.

(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, and includes the United States Postal Service and the Postal Regulatory Commission.

(b) PRESENTATION OF FLAG.—Upon receipt of a request under subsection (c), the head of an executive agency shall pay the expenses incident to the presentation of a flag of the United States for an individual who—

(1) was an employee of the agency; and

(2) dies of injuries incurred in connection with such individual's status as a Federal employee.

(c) REQUEST FOR FLAG.—The head of an executive agency shall furnish a flag for a deceased employee described in subsection (a) upon the request of—

(1) the employee's next of kin; or

(2) if no request is received from the next of kin, an individual other than the next of kin as determined by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

(d) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsections (b) and (c) shall not apply if—

(1) the head of the executive agency determines that fulfilling the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) would endanger the national security of the United States or require the disclosure of classified information; or

(2) the employee is excluded from compensation for death under section 8102(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) EMPLOYEE NOTIFICATION.—The head of an executive agency shall provide appropriate notice to employees of the agency of the flag benefit provided under this Act.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Homeland Security, may prescribe regulations to implement this Act.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 588. Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2608, to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 588. Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2608, to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration'', approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742), as most recently amended by section 2 of the Small Business Additional Temporary Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–17; 125 Stat. 221), is amended by striking ''July 31, 2011'' each place it appears and inserting ''July 31, 2012''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 30, 2011.

SEC. 3. REPEALS AND OTHER TERMINATIONS.

(a) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2011.

(2) RULE.—Nothing in this section shall affect any grant or assistance provided, contract or cooperative agreement entered into, or loan made or guaranteed before October 1, 2011 under a provision of law repealed or otherwise terminated by this section and any such grant, assistance, contract, cooperative agreement, or loan shall be subject to the applicable repealed or otherwise terminated provision, as in effect on September 30, 2011.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF TEMPORARY EXTENSIONS.—A repeal or other termination of a provision of law made by this section shall have effect notwithstanding any temporary extension of programs, authority, or provisions under the Act entitled ''An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration'', approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742).

(4) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any savings resulting from this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

(b) POLLUTION CONTROL LOANS.—Paragraph (12) of section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(A) The Administration'' and inserting ''The Administration''; and

(2) by striking ''research and development'' and all that follows and inserting ''research and development.''.

(c) SMALL BUSINESS INSTITUTE.—Subparagraph (E) of section 8(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)) is repealed.

(d) DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE GRANTS.—Paragraph (3) of section 21(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (R) by adding ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (S) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (T).

(e) CENTRAL EUROPEAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION.—Section 25 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 652) is repealed.

(f) PAUL D. COVERDELL DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM.—Section 27 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 654) is repealed.

(g) PILOT TECHNOLOGY ACCESS PROGRAM.—Section 28 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 655) is repealed.

(h) NATIONAL VETERANS BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 33 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657c) is repealed.

(2) CORPORATION.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the National Veterans Business Development Corporation and any successor thereto may not represent that the corporation is federally chartered or in any other manner authorized by the Federal Government.

(i) LEASE GUARANTEES AND POLLUTION CONTROL.—Part A of title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 692 et seq.) is repealed.

(j) ALTERNATIVE LOSS RESERVE.—Paragraph (7) of section 508(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 697e(c)) is repealed.

(k) SMALL BUSINESS TELECOMMUTING PILOT PROGRAM.—Subsection (d) of section 1203 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (15 U.S.C. 657h) is repealed.

(l) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.—Section 411(i) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 694b(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) Without limiting the authority conferred upon the Administrator and the Administration by section 201 of this Act, the Administrator and the Administration shall have, in the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties conferred by this part, all the authority and be subject to the same conditions prescribed in section 5(b) of the Small Business Act with respect to loans, including the authority to execute subleases, assignments of lease and new leases with any person, firm, organization, or other entity, in order to aid in the liquidation of obligations of the Administration hereunder.''.

(2) TITLE 10.—Section 1142(b)(13) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and the National Veterans Business Development Corporation''.

(3) TITLE 38.—Subsection (h) of section 3452 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''any of the'' and all that follows and inserting ''any small business development center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), insofar as such center offers, sponsors, or cosponsors an entrepreneurship course, as that term is defined in section 3675(c)(2).''.

(4) VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999.—Section 203(c)(5) of the Veterans Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development Act of 1999 (15 U.S.C. 657b note) is amended by striking ''In cooperation with the National Veterans Business Development Corporation, develop'' and inserting ''Develop''.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF EMERGING LEADERS PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective October 1, 2011, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may not carry out or otherwise support the program referred to as ''Emerging Leaders'' in the document of the Small Business Administration titled ''FY 2012 Congressional Budget Justification and FY 2010 Annual

Performance Report'' (or any predecessor or successor document).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2011, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''FDA User Fees: Advancing Public Health'' on July 28, 2011, at 9:45 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2011, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 28, 2011, at 10 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2011, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION OPERATIONS, SAFETY, AND SECURITY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Aviation Fuels: Needs, Challenges, and Alternatives.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 28, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of Senator BINGAMAN, that three interns in his office, Shannon Simpson, Brooke Jordy, and Trey Debrine, be granted floor privileges during today's business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two fellows in Senator ROCKEFELLER's office, Dale Orth and Janice Phillips, be granted floor privileges during consideration of S. 123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Emily Boydston and Kevin Paulsen of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are awaiting action of the House of Representatives on their bill. For that reason, I will ask unanimous consent that we recess subject to the call of the Chair, and I will make that motion in just a minute.

For the information of all Senators, I don't expect or anticipate any action here before 9 o'clock, so I doubt we would reconvene before 9 p.m. tonight.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objections the Senate, at 7:43 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 10:45 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DURBIN).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, thank you very much. I apologize to everyone for the late hour. We have been waiting for the House to conduct their business and they are having trouble conducting it. As a result of their not sending us the material we need, we are going to have to wait until tomorrow to do our work.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 29, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, Friday, July 29; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate recess until 11 a.m.; and that at 11 a.m., the Senate be in a period of morning business until 12 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; further, that at 12 p.m. I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. For all Democratic Senators, they should be aware that we are going to have a caucus at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:48 p.m., adjourned until Friday, July 29, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DAVID T. DANIELSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY), VICE CATHERINE RADFORD ZOI, RESIGNED.

LADORIS GUESS HARRIS, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MINORITY ECONOMIC IMPACT, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE JOSE ANTONIO GARCIA, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

EVAN JONATHAN WALLACH, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT, VICE ARTHUR GAJARSA, RETIRING.

RONNIE ABRAMS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, VICE LEWIS A. KAPLAN, RETIRED.

RUDOLPH CONTRERAS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE RICARDO M. URBINA, RETIRED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING S&S FOOD STORES

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in 1961, Lester and Anne Scaff took a leap of faith and purchased a small market on US 41 in Lake City. At that time, the young couple had no idea that their lives and their business were about to grow into a lifetime of joy and community involvement.

Over the years they purchased more stores which came with new challenges to learn and grow. With a strong belief in customer service, the Scaff's growth continued through the 1980s and beyond. They expanded into eight surrounding counties and were able to target their growth to become a leading employer in the region. That original small company now owns 44 convenience stores and 3 Scaff's Markets.

However, from their corporate office, Lester and Anne Scaff still engage in the daily operations using the same careful, guiding hands that crafted the small one-store operation that grew into the people oriented, customer friendly business that exists today. They continue to be thankful for their customers over these 50 plus years.

S&S Food Stores and the Scaffs take pride in being good neighbors. Their commitment to serving their communities has been evident with the many fundraising activities and charitable contributions donated throughout the years. In fact, the S&S team members have collected close to a million dollars for the Children's Miracle Network/Shands Hospital.

Congratulations to Lester and Anne Scaff and the employees of S&S Food Stores for their 50 years of service to the State and their community.

COMMEMORATING THE BIRTH OF MR. LOU LARA

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the birth of Mr. Lou Lara, a constituent of mine who, on this day, turns 103 years old. Over the course of his life, Mr. Lara has given many reasons for his community and indeed his country to be proud. Born in West Babylon, New York, Mr. Lara went on to serve his country in the National Guard. He got an education and went on to become an engineer where he went to work for the government. Despite his age, he continues to enjoy woodworking, and brings a smile and joy to all those around him at Twining Village in Holland Bucks County, where he lives in an independent living community. Mr. Lara's life has served as the model by which many others can use as an example of how to live a fulfilling life while at the same time giving service to one's country and community.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. MEEHAN ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me as I rise to pay tribute to Robert (Bob) Meehan as he retires from Horizon Blue Cross Blue Shield of New Jersey, Inc. It is my distinct pleasure to add my congratulations to that of his family, friends and colleagues as they celebrate in honor of a man who has been involved in every aspect of Horizon's business markets for 20 years. For all the leadership he has shown and the contributions he has made over the years, Bob Meehan is a worthy recipient of the accolades he will receive on July 26, 2011.

I consider it an honor to have served on the Board of Directors of the YMCA of Newark and Vicinity with Bob Meehan for a number of years. Not only has Bob been an asset to the Board with his business savvy and creativity but he also served in several leadership positions including Board President. Bob was instrumental in revitalizing key Y programs and steering the organization through a difficult financial period. He has been a mentor to new Board members and I have been advised that Bob has also been a mentor to many Horizon employees including my New Jersey Chief of Staff.

Bob and I have two other things in common; we both graduated from Seton Hall University and we both spent a number of years with Prudential Insurance Company. Prudential's loss was definitely Horizon's gain as Bob made his mark in a variety of marketing and customer service related areas. His efforts on behalf of the customers and employees of Horizon will long be remembered and Bob's incredible style will be greatly missed by all those who had the pleasure of knowing him.

Mr. Speaker, I know my fellow members of the House of Representatives agree that Bob Meehan has been an integral part of Horizon. Bob's retirement is the culmination of a stellar career and we wish him well in this new and exciting phase of his life.

RECOGNIZING 95 YEARS OF SUCCESS BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I join Senator BEN NELSON and Senator MIKE JOHANNS of Nebraska in paying tribute to the National Park Service, which will be celebrating its 95th anniversary on August 25, 2011.

The National Park Service currently administers 394 units across 49 states and U.S. territories, including five National Park Service units in our home State of Nebraska. These units consist of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Homestead National Monument of America, Missouri National Recreational River, Niobrara National Scenic River, and Scotts Bluff National Monument. In addition, the National Park Service administers five National Historic Trails, including the California, Oregon, Pony Express, Mormon, and Lewis and Clark.

National Park areas generate $12 billion in tourism dollars to local economies, creating 247,000 private-sector jobs. Within Nebraska, National Park Service units generate approximately $8.8 million in tourism dollars and create approximately 170 private-sector jobs. And in western Nebraska, Agate Fossil Beds and Scotts Bluff Monuments, along with the Chimney Rock National Historic Site, which is an Affiliated Area of the National Park Service, generate close to $3 million in tourism dollars and create 90 private-sector jobs.

Nebraska has been supportive of the mission of the National Park Service even before the agency existed. In fact, in 1914, two years before the National Park Service was created, citizens in the Scottsbluff/Gering area sought to get a National Park or Monument established. Prominent local champions included elected officials and newspaper editor, A.B. Wood.

Scotts Bluff National Monument is named for a fur trapper by the name of Hiram Scott who was wounded and deserted by his companions in 1828. He gained immortality by making his way to a magnificent formation of bluffs along the North Platte River before succumbing to his wounds. It was for Hiram Scott that Scotts Bluff National Monument, Scotts Bluff County, and the City of Scottsbluff have been named.

Scotts Bluff National Monument, which rises 4,649 feet above sea level, was an imposing landmark which guided wagon trains along the California, Oregon, Pony Express, and Mormon Trails. Native Americans originally called this natural formation ma-a-pa-te, which translates into "hill that is hard to go around."

The Summit Road to the top of the Bluff was completed in 1937, allowing visitors to drive to experience the spectacular view of the valley 800 feet below. This road is the oldest existing concrete road in Nebraska and includes the only three automobile tunnels in our State.

In the Scottsbluff/Gering area, numerous events to commemorate the 95th anniversary of the National Park Service have been scheduled for August 2011, beginning with a Kick-Off Ceremony at Scotts Bluff National Monument on August 12, 2011. Platte Valley Attractions, a coalition of visitor venues in and around the area, is hosting a variety of events

and special exhibits through grants and donations from local and regional sponsors to commemorate the theme, ''Westward Expansion as seen through National Parks,'' including:

Farm and Ranch Museum is hosting westward expansion orientation films and an interactive exhibit of westward expansion transportation methods.

Midwest Theater is hosting both the premiere of a new documentary film on the Pony Express and a film by Ken Burns on America's National Parks.

North Platte Valley Museum is hosting a westward expansion map exhibit.

Western Nebraska Community College is hosting a seminar, ''Recognizing and Preserving Westward Expansion,'' with speakers who are all nationally recognized in their fields.

Western Nebraska Community College sponsored a summer youth camp that developed posters to help promote these commemorative events.

Again, on behalf of the people of Nebraska, we offer our congratulations to Scotts Bluff National Monument on its Kick-Off Ceremony and the National Park Service on its 95th anniversary.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF BOB MOWBRAY

HON. AARON SCHOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, the small town of Bradford, Illinois this month lost one of its most beloved residents. Bob Mowbray dedicated his life to actually living the words we utter so frequently about loving God and country. He first served his country in his youth, as a corporal in the Marines during the Korean conflict. After he returned home, he served his community in Bradford as the Postmaster for 36 years. He also was a loyal and active member for 58 years of the American Legion, Post #445.

When he was drafted by the Marines, he left behind a promising possible career as a big league pitcher. Even though he chose to return home instead of pursuing his baseball dreams, he never lost his passion for America's pastime.

Anyone who knew Bob knew about his unabashed love for sports, especially the Bears, the Bulls, and the White Sox. But what very few people knew—including those closest to him—was that he acted out his faith in God through his quiet charity. Bob wouldn't talk about it, but he was extremely generous, even giving money to support those he had never met.

Although he never had children of his own, all the children of Bradford—and even many in the surrounding towns—knew about Postmaster Mowbray. Bob brought in countless bags of candy over the years, always having a treat ready to slide over the counter to every kid who came in. And with that piece of candy would come a gentle nod and a warm smile.

Bob Mowbray was a man of few words, but he left a deep impression on many. He will be missed.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF BERNICE FRIEDLANDER

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today it is my honor to pay tribute to Bernice Friedlander, who will mark her 90th birthday on Saturday, July 30, 2011, in Houston, Texas. On this special day we will all look back and see the hallmarks of a life well lived. Her quiet determination, unfailing kindness, and unyielding spirit have made her a pillar not only of a proud and loving family, but of all that have come to know her.

Beneath a humble and quiet exterior lies a generous and kind soul. She is beloved not for a litany of accomplishments, but simply for who she is. With such an uplifting and giving nature it is easy to see why she inspires so much love and warmth in others.

For decades she was the dedicated wife of her beloved husband, the late Silas Friedlander. She has been a wonderful mother to her adoring daughters Nancy and Susie, and a generous and doting grandmother to Kevin, Nick, Tyler, and Ashley.

We throw modesty aside today so that we can give the heartfelt thanks that Bernice is long overdue. Her unending love and devotion to those who have the privilege of calling her family have made their lives so much richer for having had her there. Happy birthday Bernice, may you enjoy yourself in happiness and good health for many years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RUNAWAY REPORTING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce bipartisan legislation, the Runaway Reporting and Improvement Act of 2011, along with my friend and colleague Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am also pleased to be joined by Representatives KAREN BASS, GWEN MOORE, and PETE STARK.

The estimated number of youth that runaway or are 'thrown away' in the U.S. each year is between 1 and 1.7 million. While the reasons youth run away from home vary, the heightened risk for exploitation and victimization are the same for all of them.

One of the risks for runaway girls and young women is an increased risk for sex trafficking. Young girls who runaway or have been 'thrown away' from home are usually propositioned for sex within 24 hours of leaving home. Many runaway youth engage in 'survival sex' in exchange for food and shelter. Other risks include exposure to drugs and alcohol and violence.

One of the few things more terrible than learning a child is missing would be to learn that everything possible isn't being done to find him or her. The National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database is designed to help make information sharing easier so that missing children can be found and provided with any needed services.

According to a New York Times' series, 'Running in the Shadows', as many as 16 percent of reported runaways are never entered in to the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database.

The Runaway Reporting Improvement Act of 2011 would help solve this problem and protect missing children by making two small but useful changes to the Crime Control Act of 1990. First, the bill would require law enforcement agencies to certify that they comply with Federal law by entering all missing children into the NCIC database. Second, it would require that law enforcement officers provide the reporter of a missing child with information about the services of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and the National Runaway Switchboard, as well as 24-hour, toll-free contact information for those resources. NCMEC and NRS have a long and successful history of helping parents and law enforcement agencies work together to find and protect missing kids. Parents and guardians with missing children need to be given information so they are not isolated during this time of crisis.

Mr. Speaker, we simply must do better by our children. The necessary resources are in place but they are not being used to their full potential. The Runaway Improvement Act of 2011 will help ensure that these existing resources are used to find and protect the families that need them the most.

IN MEMORY OF MR. A.J. LEGER, LOCAL ENTREPRENEUR, DEDICATED VOLUNTEER TO SOUTHEAST TEXAS COMMUNITY

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Mr. A.J. Leger, a dedicated community volunteer, a veteran of the Marine Corp, and a shining example of a successful entrepreneur here in America. Growing up in Lafayette, Louisiana, Mr. Leger had a jump start on his career in the restaurant business back in 1952 at the ripe age of 12 years old working as a busboy at Don's Seafood and Steakhouse in his hometown. Who would have thought nearly 16 years later he would own his own restaurant employing his own busboys. His is a story familiar to all of us, as this is the story of America and the opportunities afforded to its citizens.

Soon after his graduation, Mr. Leger married his high school sweetheart, Patricia, before spending 6 years in the Marine Corps. After being honorably discharged, Mr. Leger picked up where he left off on his restaurant career becoming kitchen manager at Don's Seafood in both Baton Rouge and Shreveport locations. In 1968, Mr. Leger decided to cross the Sabine River, and open up with his two business partners one of the longest running and most successful restaurants in Beaumont, Texas, Don's Seafood located right off Interstate 10.

Mr. Leger served for over 40 years as an active member of the Sabine Area Restaurant Association, was awarded Outstanding Restaurateur Sabine Area Chapter by the Texas

Restaurant Association and in 1997 the association selected him for their highest honor by induction to the TRA's Hall of Fame.

In his free time, Mr. Leger could be found cooking for local fundraisers and charitable organizations such as the Young Mens Business League, Greater Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, City of Beaumont, Texas Fire Museum, Boys Haven, and at the Texas State Capitol. Best known for his gumbo, Mr. Leger once said he had ''cooked enough gumbo to float a battleship, over 12,000 lobsters, and millions of pounds of crawfish''.

On Tuesday, May 31, 2011, Mr. Leger went to be with our Lord but he will always be remembered and highly thought of by the many lives he touched and the countless hours he devoted giving back to the community he called home. Mr. Leger leaves behind his high school sweetheart, Patricia, to whom he was married for 52 years and three loving daughters, Rhonda, Angie, and Jodie with families of their own, including five grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, stories like A.J. Leger's remind us of what truly makes America a great Nation. It is an honor to join with the Southeast Texas community in honoring the life of Mr. A.J. Leger.

HONORING ANTHONY ''SONNY'' BERTONE

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Vermont veteran on his 90th birthday, Anthony ''Sonny'' Bertone.

A resident of Bennington, Vermont, Mr. Bertone served his country with bravery and honor in the United States Army during the Second World War. Mr. Bertone was assigned to Company ''C'' of the 634th Tank Destroyer Battalion, a Company that at many times was assigned to campaigns under General George S. Patton.

Mr. Bertone fought in some of the most important campaigns throughout the war, including Normandy and the Battle of the Bulge. Mr. Bertone also fought to secure the Ludendorff Bridge at Remagen, Germany and concluded his service in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Bertone was honorably discharged from the Army in 1945 and received the Croix De Guerre. Upon leaving the Army, Mr. Bertone went on to raise his family in New Jersey before moving to Vermont.

As Vermont's Representative in this Congress, I ask that Mr. Bertone be recognized for his accomplishments and applauded for his service to the state of Vermont and the United States of America.

46TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF MEDICARE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, today, Congressman ED TOWNS joined millions of grateful recipients in celebrating the 46th anniversary of the enactment of Medicare, signed into law on July 30, 1965 by President Lyndon Johnson. Today, Medicare provides comprehensive health care coverage to 47 million Americans, including 39 million seniors and eight million people with disabilities under the age of 65 years old. Many consider Medicare one of the crowning achievements of the Democratic Party.

''On the 46th anniversary of Medicare it is important to recognize the profound impact it has had on American families. Slightly more than half of Americans over the age of 65 years had health coverage in 1964. Today coverage is virtually universal,'' stated TOWNS. ''Because of Medicare, millions of Americans enjoy guaranteed benefits and affordable premiums for health care at a time in their lives when they need it most.''

Medicare is arguably the best anti-poverty program to ever come out of Congress. Nearly 30 percent of seniors lived below the poverty line in 1964. Since Medicare was signed into law that number has dropped to 7.5 percent. Recent studies have shown, the average Medicare beneficiary saves hundreds of dollars per year in premiums because of Medicare. Most Americans believe Medicare must be preserved, regardless of age.

''Support for Medicare is nearly universal among Americans across the political spectrum, yet we have heard recently proposals that would end the program as we know it,'' TOWNS stated. Some of my colleagues passed a budget that would replace Medicare with a voucher system where seniors would be forced to spend $6,000 on average to purchase private insurance. I have made a commitment to vigorously fight any policies that would change Medicare. Medicare is a program that has worked well for millions of Americans and their families and I will do all I can to preserve it.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 308, I was delayed in leaving a meeting with a constituent off the House floor during this two-minute votes series and was unable to cast my vote before the vote was closed.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

INTRODUCTION OF THE BILL TO PROVIDE FOR AN ANNUAL AUDIT OF THE UNION STATION REDEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to require greater accountability for a prized federal asset, Union Station in Washington, D.C. My bill would require an annual audit by the Department of Transportation Inspector General of the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, USRC, and Union Station, which is owned by the Department of Transportation. For decades, no official audit has been performed and, increasingly, questions have been raised about the management and condition of the facility.

Commissioned by Congress, Union Station first opened in 1907 as a train facility for the nation's capital, with a much heralded design by the famous architect Daniel Burnham. The station once was the largest building in the nation's capital. However, Union Station deteriorated from a bustling transportation hub and commercial center as rail use declined in the 1950s. Following a long series of failed ideas, wasted federal funds, cost overruns, major utility needs and mismanagement, Congress passed the Union Station Redevelopment Act (P.L. 97–125) in 1981, authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to create USRC, a non-profit corporation, to spearhead the redevelopment of Union Station into a modern facility, to maintain and expand it into a great intermodal facility, and to protect the federal government's interest in the station. In 1988, Union Station, which had become a neglected, boarded up wasteland hardly fit for trains, reopened after a multi-million dollar renovation with federal funds as a beautiful historically restored facility, shopping mall, and major multimodal transit hub and tourist destination.

When I chaired the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, we held what likely were the first hearings on Union Station since the USRC was formed and the renovations were completed. I was astonished to find that there was no master plan to account for the major renovations and modernizations planned for inside and outside of the station, including reconstruction of Columbus Circle, expanded Metro access for the busiest Metrorail station in the region, development of Burnham Place, a three-million square foot mixed-use development project over the rail tracks, and indispensable expansion of the concourse and waiting areas for Amtrak, the Maryland Rail Commuter Service, MARC, and the Virginia Railway Express, VRE. Today, the various components of Union Station have developed a master plan for the station, including a separate Amtrak master plan that currently is being developed because of the urgent need to improve capacity and service along the Northeast Corridor. Yet both the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management have met significant resistance as we continue to press USRC to create an intercity bus deck in its existing space, in accordance with its mission to develop and maintain a true intermodal facility. It was only after two hearings and letters from the committee and from me that USRC developed a ''pilot'' intercity bus deck. Even so, after failed negotiations with intercity bus companies, it has required many meetings between USRC and me and my staff, a meeting with Chairman MICA and me, and the inclusion of the Department of Transportation, which, by statute, chairs the USRC Board of Directors, to finally jumpstarted meaningful discussions on a permanent intercity bus program.

The audit is particularly essential now because of increasing evidence that USRC may not be able to meet its mandate to be self-supporting. For example, Union Station contains the kind of popular retail shops and restaurants that pay significant taxes everywhere

else in the city, including in other federal buildings. However, USRC has asked the District of Columbia for a reduced Possessory Interest Tax assessment, a tax levied by the District on private businesses located in federal buildings. Yet USRC was given authority under the Union Station Redevelopment Act to negotiate lease agreements in this valuable property in order to ensure that the needs of Union Station would be covered, but USRC has negotiated a master retail lease that obligated USRC to pay half of any Possessory Interest Tax, thereby depriving USRC of significant funds that could be used for station maintenance and improvements. USRC says that its payment of the Possessory Interest Tax would hinder its mission of maintaining and preserving Union Station. The amount of the Possessory Interest Tax is small compared to Union Station's needs and casts further doubt about USRC's ability to meet its congressional mandate to make Union Station self-supporting.

Although USRC was created in 1984 to ensure that Union Station would be self-sustaining, it is impossible for Congress or the public to gauge the health and progress of USRC without a proper audit. Particularly today, when there are no federal funds to rehabilitate Union Station, as Congress provided before, it is essential that we have a definitive and continuing view of the financial viability of Union Station, beginning with a full annual audit that is made available to Congress and to the public.

Major planned development, ongoing negotiations on the intercity bus deck and questions about USRC's maintenance and needed improvements for Union Station make an official annual audit essential. With nearly 90,000 visitors passing through Union Station every day, Congress is obligated to track the financial condition of this great asset in order to protect the significant federal investment and to avoid another cycle of the disrepair that once led to the closure of the facility. The only responsible course is to require a full annual and public audit of this historic federal property.

CONGRATULATING GLEN HAEGE, ''AMERICA'S MASTER HANDYMAN'', ON HIS INDUCTION INTO THE MICHIGAN BROADCASTING HALL OF FAME

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House Floor today to offer my heartfelt congratulations to a wonderful Michiganian who is commonly referred to as ''America's Master Handyman''. When you think of home improvement shows in Detroit, Michigan, one might be quick to mention the popular TV sitcom of the 1990s, ''Home Improvement'' which featured Michigan native Tim Allen as Tim ''The Toolman'' Taylor. As you know, this was a fictional show and character. But what I bet many didn't realize is this: there is a real home improvement expert who does exist in Detroit and has had one of the most successful careers long before Tim Allen hit our TV screens.

His name, Mr. Speaker, is Glen Haege, known quite simply as ''America's Master Handyman''. His name might sound familiar if you are or know someone who is a ''do-it-yourselfer''. Glen is a nationally renowned radio talk show host, television personality, author, and columnist. He offers people advice with any type of home improvement project and has an uncanny ability to answer any question posed to him. Not even the Toolman's right-hand man, Al Borland, could hold a hammer to him.

Glen's training in the home improvement business started at the retail level where he worked as a store manager and a corporate manager. But Glen was a man destined for much larger audiences.

His extraordinary talents recently earned him the very prestigious award presented by the Michigan Association of Broadcasters for his lifetime of accomplishments: Glen was inducted into the Michigan Broadcasting Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to put this prestigious award into perspective. Mr. Haege joins the ranks of the late great Detroit Tigers Broadcaster and Major League Hall of Famer, Ernie Harwell, and the company of other outstanding individuals who have made a long and lasting impact on the industry and whose talents are never to be forgotten. He shares this rare distinction with people like Bob Reynolds, Mike Whorff, Dick Purtan, Ray Lane, Diana Lewis, Mort Crim, Bill Bonds, Sonny Eliot and J.P. McCarthy just to name a few.

Glen's broadcasting career started in 1983 by making appearances on several Detroit radio and TV shows offering insightful home maintenance techniques to those seeking assistance. These appearances catapulted Glen to a new job hosting his own radio show in 1987. He soon began taking on even more responsibilities as magazine writer and columnist for the Detroit News. Glen's polite, courteous and genuine caring personality allowed him to add listeners and their trust to his ever-expanding and popular show, and more and more readers to his columns.

Eventually in 1996, his show became nationally syndicated and was one the best known home improvement shows in the country. His current program on WJR 760–AM, ''The Handyman Show with Glenn Haege'', reaches over 1.3 million listeners a week and airs on 150 radio stations across the U.S.

In addition to his own radio program, Glen stays extremely busy with the little spare time he has by producing television shows, appearing on other radio stations offering free advice and tips, attending home improvement conferences, authoring books, and serving as President and CEO of his own business, H&S Services. Yet he also finds the time to maintain his own website that helps him reach out to even more people seeking guidance on their home improvement projects.

Glen is a great teacher and his considerable expertise helps countless people save time and money, inspires them to believe they can be ''do-it-yourselfers'' while also cautioning them that sometimes professionals are indeed the best option.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. Glen Haege on this most recent recognition as he joins the 2011 Class in the Michigan Broadcasting Hall of Fame. I am very happy to see his hard work, dedication and commitment officially recognized by the Michigan Association of Broadcasters.

Lastly, I want to personally congratulate Glen on this notable achievement and thank him on behalf of the scores of people he has helped by converting their homes into more comfortable, efficient and beautiful living spaces. We are very fortunate indeed to have this outstanding man living in our magnificent state, and I am very proud to call him my constituent and friend.

IN HONOR OF JOSEPH COUNTRYMAN

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Joe Countryman as he retires from his position as President of MBK Engineers. Through his work as an expert engineer, he has protected numerous regions of California, including Sacramento and the Central Valley, from flooding. Over the last 45 years, his engineering excellence has safeguarded the lives, homes and businesses of millions of Californians. I ask all my colleagues to join me today in honoring a true leader of the Sacramento community.

In the Sacramento area, flooding is of paramount concern to all of us. Joe's work has been crucial to protecting us from disaster, first as a senior civilian at the Army Corps of Engineers and then as the President of MBK Engineers. In 1986, during the historic storms, he managed the Folsom Reservoir flood operations for the Army Corps of Engineers. His decisions and resolve helped avoid a potential disaster for hundreds of thousands of residents in Sacramento along the American River, as a catastrophic flood threatened our dams and levees. Since then, he has worked to improve flood control operations at Folsom Reservoir, Oroville Dam, Shasta Dam, and other critically important sites across the Western United States. He has been influential in countless other projects not only in California, but also in Nevada, Utah, and Colorado.

Since I was elected, I have turned to Joe for his advice on a number of flood protection projects. Mr. Countryman is known not only for his incredible work in his field, but for his integrity and ability to communicate complex engineering and hydraulic information to the public. He has received many honors, including the Award of Merit from San Jose State University, the Commander's Award for Distinguished Service by the Army Corps of Engineers, and the American Society of Civil Engineers' Region 9 Lifetime Achievement Award. He is a member of the American Society of Engineers, the Flood Plain Managers Association, the Environmental and Water Resources Institute, and has been acknowledged as a Diplomate Water Resources Engineer for the American Academy of Water Resources Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize and thank Joe Countryman for his remarkable service not only to Sacramento, but to many other communities throughout the nation, and for his innovation and accomplishments in the field of engineering. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Countryman on his service and retirement. His expertise will certainly be missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 307 I was delayed in leaving a meeting with a constituent off the House floor during this two minute votes series and was unable to cast my vote before the vote was closed. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER THE NOMINATION OF REBECCA WODDER

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern regarding the recent nomination of Rebecca Wodder as Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks at the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Until recently, Ms. Wodder served as president of American Rivers, an environmental organization that specializes in the removal of dams across the United States. Under the direction of Ms. Wodder, American Rivers removed over 200 dams in 13 states from 1999 to 2010. In total, the organization claims credit for the removal of 150 dams across America. In many cases, the lawsuits that preceded the removal of these dams cost U.S. taxpayers millions of dollars. This clearly demonstrates that Ms. Wodder's agenda hinges on practices that result in the expenditure of vast amounts of federal time and money in exchange for the promotion of an environmental agenda that has shown questionable results.

The Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks oversees and coordinates all policy decisions made by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service. For someone who has spent much of her career battling the very agencies she will control, this is a prime example of the fox guarding the hen house. Indeed, American Rivers touts the fact that they have ''secured the planned removal of more than 100 dams on some 55 rivers in the next five years.'' I doubt very seriously whether Ms. Wodder will conduct an unbiased assessment on the merits of these and other projects during her tenure at the Interior Department.

American Rivers is currently party to seven lawsuits against American taxpayers and the federal government. At a time when Congress is attempting to get our fiscal house in order, we do not need a litigious leader who has brought millions of dollars in lawsuits against our government.

Furthermore, many Americans living along rivers depend on them to support their livelihoods. During this summer alone, flooding has caused insurmountable damage to these communities. If we are going to expend capital on our inland waterways, Congress and the Obama Administration should be focused on maintaining flood control and preserving valuable river infrastructure, not increasing the disparity of funding between fish and wildlife conservation measures and human protection.

The protection of wildlife is a valid concern that should be addressed in a thoughtful manner. However, when efforts to protect wildlife result in irresponsible policy decisions, we must take a stand for the safety of our constituents.

I was proud to join 38 of my colleagues from all corners of this country in sending the following letter to the Senate. In light of not only the country's current financial crisis but also devastating floodwaters that continue to batter our river communities, I urge all of my colleagues in the House and the Senate to carefully consider the nomination of Rebecca Wodder as Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks. The consequences for millions of Americans could be dire.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI.

DEAR SENATORS: As you consider President Obama's nomination of Ms. Rebecca Wodder as Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks at the Department of the Interior, we respectfully write to let you know of our serious concerns with her record as the head of American Rivers, a single-purpose interest group focused on litigating against the federal government and removing economically important infrastructure. We seriously question whether she could adequately represent broader and more balanced interests at the federal level, especially at a fragile economic time with national unemployment exceeding nine percent.

The position for which Ms. Wodder has been nominated oversees the management of at least 180 million federal acres and would have a direct influence on current and potential federal regulations impacting private lands, water rights, energy projects and other infrastructure. This is troubling given her past activities at the Wilderness Society and American Rivers, a non-governmental organization with a long record of receiving American taxpayer dollars while actively litigating against the federal government on multiple fronts. Between 1988 and 2011, American Rivers has either sued or been a party to 150 lawsuits against various parties, mostly the federal government. In fact, American Rivers is currently party to seven lawsuits against American taxpayers and the federal government.

One illuminating piece of litigation revolves around American Rivers' long-standing lawsuit against the federal government's operation of four multi-purpose dams in the Pacific Northwest. These dams, located on the lower Snake River in Washington state, provide multiple benefits including emissions-free, renewable hydroelectricity (enough power to serve a city the size of Seattle), navigation to deliver agricultural products to market, recreation and the good-paying jobs associated with these benefits. Writing in the August 25, 2003 edition of The Dissident Voice, Ms. Wodder wrote that ''Breaching the four dams on the lower Snake River would be the single most effective way to bring back wild salmon.'' This is a completely unproven statement and the reality is breaching these dams is an extreme action that would have devastating economic impacts across an entire region while not actually assisting fish recovery. Despite broad agreement, including from the Obama Administration, on a biological opinion for Columbia Basin salmon recovery, Ms. Wodder's organization continues an over decade long lawsuit campaign against the federal government in an effort to demolish these dams.

There are numerous examples of how the policies advocated by Ms. Wodder at American Rivers will have serious impacts throughout the country. First, she effectively advocated for federal regulations that caused up to 40 percent unemployment in parts of the San Joaquin Valley, California by diverting farm water under the guise of protecting the Delta smelt, a three-inch fish. Second, she endorsed last Congress' controversial legislation (H.R. 5088 and S. 787) that many argued could allow the EPA to regulate street and gutter water run-off and man-made ditches. This could cause significant job loss throughout rural America and the National Association of Counties, a nonpartisan entity composed of locally elected officials, was concerned that this legislation could lead to ''more court cases'' and federal groundwater regulation. Third, by naming the Susquehanna River as one of ''America's most endangered rivers,'' her organization attempted to stifle the domestic production of affordable natural gas through hydraulic fracturing.

Furthermore, we are also concerned that this appointment may run afoul of President Obama's own goal of ensuring that political appointees would not work on regulations or contracts directly and substantially related to their prior employer. Ms. Wodder has received significant, long-term compensation during her tenure at American Rivers. As previously noted, the organization currently has numerous pending lawsuits against the very agencies over which she would have regulatory authority and for others that directly or indirectly have been involved in litigation with the Interior Department. This creates a very real and serious conflict of interest.

As Members of the House of Representatives, we appreciate the unique role of the Senate in the confirmation process. Nonetheless, the policies advocated by this nominee would be so detrimental to jobs, our economy and the livelihood of rural Americans that we felt compelled to make our views known and ask that you take them into consideration.

Sincerely,

BLAINE LUETKEMEYER.

DROUGHT IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Horn of Africa are facing a devastating crisis. A severe drought has left millions of children, women, and men in Somalia, Ethiopia, Kenya and Djibouti malnourished. Many are on the verge of starvation. According to the World Food Program, more than 11 million people in the Horn of Africa require food assistance due to the drought.

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) reports that below-normal spring rains in the eastern Horn of Africa led to below-normal harvests and shortages of water and grazing resources for livestock. Livestock health has deteriorated markedly, and milk production has declined significantly. Food prices throughout the eastern Horn of Africa continued to rise during the month of June, contributing to food insecurity for the population.

The conditions in Somalia are especially severe. According to the Famine Early Warning

Systems Network (FEWS NET), which is supported by USAID, two areas of southern Somalia are already experiencing famine. Famine exists when at least 20 percent of the population has extremely limited access to basic food requirements, acute malnutrition exceeds 30 percent, and the death rate exceeds 2 out of every 10,000 people per day for the entire population. Death rates are above the famine threshold in two areas and are elevated across the south. Tens of thousands of people have already died in the past three months.

FEWS NET projects that famine will spread across all regions of southern Somalia within one to two months. The network estimates that 3.7 million people are in crisis nationwide, and 3.2 million of them require immediate, lifesaving assistance. These severe conditions are expected to remain at least through December of this year. FEWS NET has declared this Africa's worst food security crisis since Somalia's 1991–1992 famine.

The effects of the drought in Somalia have been exacerbated by the lack of an effective central government and continuing conflict with al-Shabaab terrorists.

Drought has also affected Kenya and Ethiopia, where the situation is complicated by the arrival of large numbers of refugees from Somalia, many of them suffering from acute malnutrition.

The U.S. Government has already spent a total of approximately $458.7 million on humanitarian assistance in the Horn of Africa during fiscal year 2011. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton issued a statement on July 20th expressing concern on behalf of the U.S. Government. She noted that additional international assistance for the region is needed and announced an additional $28 million in U.S. assistance to Somalia and Somali refugees in Kenya. However, more needs to be done. FEWS NET has called for an immediate, large-scale, and comprehensive response to save tens of thousands of lives.

I am deeply concerned that the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2012, which was marked up yesterday, will not provide sufficient funds for critical priorities like these. The bill includes an 18 percent cut in development assistance, which funds projects such as food security and basic education. The bill also cuts international disaster assistance by 12 percent compared to the fiscal year 2011 level and a shocking 42 percent compared to the fiscal year 2010 level. Such drastically reduced funding levels will not allow the United States to help millions of people in need or respond to emergencies, such as famines, hurricanes and earthquakes.

I have seen children who were starving. It is a terrible sight to see. We cannot sit by idly and allow thousands of children to die and not take any action to help them. To do so would be contrary to our national interests and contrary to our values.

I call upon my colleagues and indeed all Americans to show compassion to our brothers and sisters in Africa. And I call upon the U.S. Government to organize a comprehensive effort to save the lives of millions of hungry people throughout the Horn of Africa.

HONORING THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF CRAIG PROSSER

HON. DAVID WU

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Craig Prosser, retiring city manager of Tigard, Oregon. Craig has announced his retirement at the end of July, capping a 35-year career of distinguished service to our community.

Craig began serving Tigard in 1999 as finance director, and since 2005, as city manager. Craig's accomplishments include the formation of the city's first urban renewal district, the Tigard-Lake Oswego Water Partnership, as well as major improvements along Pacific Highway. He also oversaw the opening of the Westside Express Service Commuter line that runs through Tigard. Craig's foresight helped to make Tigard an attractive place to live and do business. Because of his leadership, Tigard was able to retain crucial city services through one of the worst financial crises in our country's history.

Craig has been a consensus builder who has always focused on the needs of the citizens, and he has worked tirelessly to address their concerns. He has approached his work with integrity and a true sense of dedication while empowering staff and those around him. In his retirement announcement Craig said, "I would be willing to put the City of Tigard staff up against any public workforce in the state, if not the nation. The citizens of Tigard are fortunate to have such dedicated elected officials and public employees working on their behalf."

Former Oregon Governor Tom McCall once said, "Heroes are not giant statues framed against a red sky. They are people who say, this is my community, and it is my responsibility to make it better." Craig Prosser truly is an American hero, for he has devoted much of his life to making his community better.

It is my distinct honor to recognize Craig for his outstanding service and for providing a heroic example to us all.

HONORING UNITED STATES MARINE LANCE CORPORAL CODY JAMES ELLIOTT

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor 21-year-old United States Marine Lance Corporal Cody James Elliott of Pismo Beach, California. On June 12, 2011, while out on patrol, LCPL Elliott ran to help his Brother in Arms, Josh McDaniels, who had been injured in an IED explosion. While en route to his fallen comrade—without regard for his own safety—LCPL Elliott was severely wounded by another IED explosion. Every day, magnificent men such as Cody shine on the battlefields of honor, bringing their light of heroism and selflessness to the darkness of war—making us all proud to be Americans. In the blast, LCPL Cody lost his left leg, broke his tibia in his right leg, and lost one of his fingers. In just a few short weeks, he has come a long way in dealing with his wounds and is moving full speed towards recovery. With the help of his family, he continues to recover and show us what it means to bravely serve our country. I ask that this poem penned in his honor by Albert Caswell be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RUN TO ME

(By Albert Caswell)

Run . . .
Run to me . . .
On battlefields of honor bright . . .
There are but all of those who so carry the fight!
All with their most magnificent light! To win that day, to that night!
Who so shine, all in their most sacrificial light . . .
Who for all of their Brothers In Arms, are but so ready to die!
All in the blood that binds them, this most sacrificial tie!
Which brings such tears to the Angel's eyes!
As it was on the day in June, when Cody you so ran . . . as your heart so swooned!
As your Brother Josh lay dying, as you ran to him . . . not asking why then!
All in your most magnificent shades of green, oh yea you United States Marine!
As when that bomb went off, as you lie there in all its cost . . .
All in what you had given, all in what you had lost!
As the tears rolled down your face, all in what this war had brought!
As up ahead but lie a new front . . .
Only twenty-one years old, and barely hanging on . . .
As it was then there you so saw you had a choice!
As you told yourself, get up Marine . . . while listening to your most inner voice!
As from deep down within, but came such a force!
As now Cody, your new life would so begin . . .
With that first step, all in that pain and heartache which lie so up ahead . . .
As somehow, you lifted up your fine head and so said!
I did not die, I am not dead! As you so chose to feel that wind upon your face . . .
All for your Fallen Brothers, all in your heart they now so hold such a special place!
For you've got a life to live, as now you picked up the pace!
A life to lead, as it's now Cody you've so chosen to move at light speed!
For you are a United States Marine, all in what your recovery has so seen . . .
You see, people like you Cody . . . so give to us all what we so need!
Because, You So Teach Us! And You So Beseech Us!
As so deep down inside, You So Reach Us!
With all of your most courageous faith, You So Speak To Us Out On Our Ways!
For you will run, and you will breathe . . . and oh yea Cody you will so succeed!
And if I ever, I so have a son . . . I pray that he may be as courageous as you my son . . .
Whose heart to me so runs! Because, Cody in heaven you need not arms or legs, and that's where you are going one day . . .
And, you will hear our Lord so say, "Cody, Run To Me!"
All for what you gave, Run To Me!

CONGRATULATIONS DIANE HARPER

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr Speaker, I would like to congratulate Diane Harper on her upcoming retirement. After working for Northrop Grumman for almost 23 years, Diane's last day with the company will be July 29, 2011. Having over 40 years of defense-related experience, her career has taken her from the House Armed Services Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives to the Office of the Secretary of Defense to the Department of the Navy. Also at the Northrop Grumman Corporation, she was primarily responsible for acting as the liaison between the United States Congress and the Corporation with regard to legislation relevant to the company and national defense issues.

Diane, and her husband, Mike Harper, have been very encouraging to me and my wife Roxanne during my Congressional service. We appreciate their friendship and wish her Godspeed in the next stage of her life.

IN HONOR OF JAKE FISHER

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Jake Fisher of Portageville, Missouri for his years of service to the University of Missouri Delta Center. The people of my congressional district, the state of Missouri, and Missouri's flagship University are forever grateful for Jake's contributions and commitment to making the Delta Center what it is today, a world-renowned research facility we can all be extremely proud of.

The Delta Center has grown to be the jewel of the University of Missouri land grant system under Jake's leadership. This is a testament to Jake and the dedicated staff and faculty he works with on a daily basis. Every time I visit the Delta Center, I am encouraged by the work I see and what it means for the future of agriculture and our state.

Jake's leadership has been critical in providing the faculty and staff with the vision and necessary resources to discover new solutions, address needs for our state and help the welfare of our citizens through scientific advancement in agriculture. His forward thinking has been instrumental in the Delta Center making great advancements which will lead the future and keep our agricultural producers on the frontline in meeting the challenge of feeding a growing world population.

Not only is the Delta Center a world renowned research facility, it also remains an integral part of the community in Southeast Missouri. Jake has worked to forge a strong partnership between local communities, area producers, the entire Southeast Missouri region and the Delta Center. These partnerships make the Delta Center a special place for the people of Southeast Missouri and have contributed to its successes over the years.

Everybody back in Missouri knows Jake outside of his role at the Delta Center as a selfless member of the community. Whenever there has been a disaster or other challenge facing the community, Jake always lends a helping hand to neighbors in need. When a historic ice storm struck our area in 2009, cutting off power and heating to our residents during the coldest part of the year, Jake was one of the first to step up and help the community by opening up part of the Delta Center as a warming center where many of the utility crews were fed as they worked to restore power.

As Jake steps back from his leadership role at the Delta Center, I am certain the center will be in good hands. However, it will be a difficult transition for many, including me, as he has personified leadership for the Delta Center over the years. It is hard to think of the Delta Center without Jake Fisher.

More than anything, I appreciate having Jake's friendship; and I look forward to keeping it for years to come.

Congratulations, Jake, on a job well done and best wishes for you and Shelly as you enter a new and exciting part of your lives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

SPEECH OF

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes:

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the House's need to reduce the deficit and cut back on spending. Tightening our belts is something we need to do. However, these cuts should be targeted—with a doctor's scalpel instead of a machete—so that we do not collapse the economy that we are trying so hard to build up. Unfortunately, the Interior bill we are currently debating is the work of a machete. This bill cuts or eliminates funding for countless programs that exist to help communities—including the Environmental Protection Agency's Smart Growth Programs and the Office of Sustainable Communities.

The EPA Office of Sustainable Communities is part of an inter-agency partnership with the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It was established to provide a resource for communities who need technical assistance to plan for economic growth and development and account for a changing population.

The services offered by the EPA Sustainable Communities Office are in high demand—they have been able to assist only 9% of interested communities due to budget and time constraints. Since 2005, over 1,300 communities have requested assistance from the EPA; 122 have been assisted, all for a total of $4.5 million.

This is a program that helps local governments expand their economic development options and make their communities more attractive to business and local citizens. The EPA's Office of Sustainable Communities works with HUD and DOT to make government better at helping communities develop housing, transportation and energy efficiency plans. This partnership removes barriers and cuts bureaucratic red tape, which means more efficient investments.

My home state of Missouri is already benefiting from the work of the Partnership for Sustainable Communities. Last fall, my district of Kansas City received a $4.5 million grant from the Partnership. The Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant brings together assistance from HUD, DOT, and EPA to study six development corridors that connect 30 communities to Kansas City's urban core and coordinate housing, transportation and environmental protection along these corridors. The Kansas City region also received a $50 million TIGER grant for investments in regional transit corridors, additional transit centers, bus stop improvements, as well as sidewalk, street, and transit improvements in the city's Green Impact Zone in the urban core.

Kansas City also received a grant that will support outreach and production of a handbook of tools and incentives designed to facilitate the redevelopment of older commercial brownfield sites in urban and suburban locations throughout the city. Commercial brownfields sites often include contamination and can be challenging to redevelopment in suburban communities.

The first phase of the project will inventory the tools, incentives, and techniques available locally to create smart growth designs and revitalize brownfields. Research will then be performed on relevant national models and best practices in these fields. A handbook will be compiled containing information on smart growth techniques for brownfield commercial sites that can cut development costs, offer unique amenities, and respond to environmental impacts. It will also highlight relevant brownfield incentives, tools, and strategies.

A design workshop will be conducted for two local, commercial brownfield sites, one urban and one suburban. The results of the workshop will be incorporated into the handbook, which will be presented at a series of roundtable events held for developers, landowners, and others involved in the redevelopment process. The project will actively seek input from the community on methods to make commercial site reuse attractive and to determine the needs of communities near commercial brownfield sites. The results may be used to suggest improvements to city codes and policies to encourage reuse and smart growth design of brownfield sites. This project will help balance regional growth in urban and suburban locations through marketing assistance for both areas, and encourage mixed-use redevelopment to better meet community service and housing needs.

Additionally, Missouri's capital, Jefferson City, has received EPA assistance to improve an area in the city core that serves as the gateway to the State Capitol and the larger Capital Complex.

Smart Growth projects similar to the projects I highlighted in Missouri are in 200 communities and almost all 50 states. Seven members of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee have at least one Sustainable Communities project in their district. These programs within EPA, HUD, and DOT provide

assistance to communities for the tools they need to create the community that people want to live in. This partnership removes barriers and cuts bureaucratic red tape, which means more efficient investments. If we are truly interested in cutting costs at the government level, we should be promoting efficient and cross-cutting government programs like this one, instead of de-funding them.

IMPACT OF INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION FAILURES

SPEECH OF

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 2011

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, thousands of local community banks operate across the country, making a valuable contribution to America's economy. Colorado has a rich history of community banking, where small business owners and employers can do business with a bank they know and trust, and people know that the money they deposit is being redeployed into the community by an institution that wants to see the community succeed as much as they do.

That shared interest in the community has traditionally led local banks to act in a responsible manner and shield themselves from systemic problems, but they are not immune from tough times. Unfortunately, federal regulators are forcing community banks in particular to fight through the rough economy with one hand tied behind their backs.

In short, we must increase bank lending to improve the economy, but regulators are preventing such lending by forcing banks to hoard capital, and by prohibiting community banks from effectively working with their borrowers. We cannot expect to reinvigorate the economy while this is the case.

Congress has been considering this problem since 2009, and it is time for action. It's been two and a half years since the fall of 2008, and yet we are still facing high unemployment, a weak dollar, and a sluggish economy. It is time to move forward, and we know that to move forward we need to stimulate lending. That is why I support this bill.

IN HONOR OF ROBERT AND GLORIA NOBLE OF QUINCY, MASSACHUSETTS

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Robert and Gloria Noble of Quincy, Massachusetts. They will be recognized for their tremendous contributions to our community on August 1, 2011, when Manet Community Health Center will bestow the first Elizabeth A. Swanton Community Service Award upon Mr. and Mrs. Noble.

This award is presented in memory of Elizabeth A. Swanton, a former member of the board of Manet Community Health Center who passed away in January 2011 at the age of 69. She dedicated 30 years of her life advancing the Manet mission, including her service as President of the Manet Board of Directors. The award recognizes an individual or group who, like Elizabeth Swanton, has demonstrated a significant commitment to volunteerism and community service.

Robert and Gloria moved to Quincy in 1951, a year after they married. Immediately, they immersed themselves in civic life and community service. Some of their more notable roles—and there are many—include Bob's service as Massachusetts Commander of the American Ex-Prisoners of War and Gloria's tenure as Director of D.O.V.E., which seeks to help victims of domestic violence.

For over two decades, they have also helped to organize Quincy holiday celebrations as members of the Quincy Christmas Festival Committee. In 2008, the couple was recognized for their commitment to the community with the Quincy Sun's "Citizen of the Year" award.

Their life has not only been rich in accomplishments and accolades, but also in family. They have been blessed with four children, 10 grandchildren and 9 great-grandchildren, and have been fortunate enough to watch their family grow roots in Quincy.

Bob and Gloria are known throughout Quincy as true local heroes, and they have created a legacy of community service on the South Shore that will be hard to match and surely never forgotten. When I think of them, the words that come to mind include devoted, selfless, caring and committed. Our communities are all better thanks to their tireless activism. They are, without a doubt, a perfect choice for the first-ever Elizabeth A. Swanton Community Service Award.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CECIL L. HEFTEL

HON. COLLEEN W. HANABUSA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tremendous career of the late Representative Cecil L. Heftel. H.R. 2149 is a bill which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4354 Pahoa Avenue in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building."

Known for his prowess in building radio and television broadcasting stations, in 1976, Cecil Heftel was elected to the 95th Congress to represent the First Congressional District of Hawaii. While in Washington, Representative Heftel's first assignments were on the Education and Labor Committee and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Representative Heftel was reelected four times, serving a total of five terms. During the 96th Congress, Representative Heftel was elected to the Ways and Means Committee where he stayed until his resignation in 1986 to run for Governor of Hawaii.

While in office, Representative Heftel sponsored 160 bills and was a champion of tax reform and energy independence, always showing aloha to his constituency. In response to President Ronald Reagan's tax cut proposal, Representative Heftel said "I cannot support a tax proposal which would benefit me so much more than those of my constituents who earn less than $30,000.00 a year." Statements like this would define who Cecil Heftel was, both inside Congress and out.

In 1983 Representative Heftel was involved in a car crash near the Lincoln Memorial that left him with severe injuries. The accident occurred before cars were legally required to have airbags. This experience helped shape Representative Heftel's view of government regulation in the private sector. After the accident, Representative Heftel unsuccessfully filed suit against General Motors, blaming his accident on faulty brakes in his Oldsmobile. Though General Motors had sent Representative Heftel a letter explaining that his specific car model might have faulty brake, he did not receive the letter until after the accident occurred.

Upon his return to the 99th Congress, Representative Heftel immediately introduced legislation that would provide criminal penalties for manufacturers who fail to notify owners of motor vehicle safety defects. This continued a trend of Representative Heftel using his life experience to impact his constituency and put forward efficient and innovative laws that lasted until his resignation.

In 2004 at age 80, Heftel was successfully elected to the state Board of Education for the Oahu-At-Large seat continuing his passion for public service into his golden years.

In light of a career dedicated to advancing the common good, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2149 and name the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4354 Pahoa Avenue in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building."

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION TO CONDEMN THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN NORWAY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution condemning in the strongest possible terms the cold-blooded terror attacks that wounded as many as 96 people and took 76 lives in Norway on July 22, 2011. The attacks commenced with the brutal bombing of government buildings in Oslo, and the violence then reached its peak with a twin attack at a youth camp on Utoya Island, where the majority of casualties were children.

Norwegian Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg condemned the attacks as "peacetime Norway's deadliest day", and I urge my colleagues to stand by Norway, a great friend and ally, in its darkest hour by supporting this resolution.

For the Norwegian government and people, these attacks are an atrocity, a nightmare, and a national tragedy.

For the world, this is a stark reminder that, as long as hatred and intolerance are allowed to persist, even the most peaceful of nations are not immune to its devastating effects.

A founding member of the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Norway is the home of the Nobel Peace Prize and offers a safe haven to refugees and the politically persecuted. Many of its police officers don't carry arms.

To think that even this peaceful society can be the target of brutal, relentless hatred and violence is utterly shocking, and a call for action is necessary. The international community must not stand for this type of ideological violence, and this resolution reaffirms the resolve of Congress to combat all forms of terrorism, both domestically and abroad. It also expresses deep sympathy, solidarity, and condolences for Norway and reaffirms our joint commitment to peace and the elimination of actions motivated by hatred and religious or cultural intolerance worldwide.

Despite the terrible violence committed against unarmed and innocent civilians, the country has courageously demonstrated that their commitment to peace, freedom, and tolerance remains unwavering. Morten Helleso Johansen, an 18-year-old survivor of the attack, expresses this sentiment in no uncertain terms. ''I want to return to that Island next year,'' he says. ''It is the best way to honor the memory of those who died by showing that I'm not afraid, and that I'm not silenced!''

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to personify Morten's courageous spirit by supporting this resolution and honoring the victims and survivors of this tragedy. To those who perpetuate fear, hatred, and intolerance throughout the world, we say: ''We are not afraid, and we will not be silenced!''

IMPACT OF INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION FAILURES

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2056 offered by my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee, Rep. LYNN WESTMORELAND and Rep. DAVID SCOTT. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation which requires the FDIC Inspector General to conduct a comprehensive study of issues raised by persistent failures of U.S. banks. These issues include appraisals, capital, loss share agreements and other issues that arise when a bank becomes vulnerable to closure.

I have heard from banks in my district that have been working with the FDIC to recapitalize and restructure their institutions so they can avoid being closed. They argue that the FDIC offers them little flexibility or time to raise the capital they need or make the changes they need to satisfy the FDIC. I hope the study this bill authorizes will examine these procedures and bring to light any procedural changes that the FDIC can implement to address these concerns.

H.R. 2056 was amended in committee to reflect some additional factors that the FDIC thought were important to include in the study's parameters. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4973–S5025

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1434–1448. **Pages S5017–18**

Measures Reported:

S. 1302, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Tracy, California, to the City of Tracy. (S. Rept. No. 112–40)

S. 1313, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 112–41)

S. 401, to help Federal prosecutors and investigators combat public corruption by strengthening and clarifying the law, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 409, to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs.

S. 839, to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs. **Page S5017**

Measures Passed:

Small Business Program Extension and Reform Act: Senate passed H.R. 2608, to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S4974–75**

Reid (for Landrieu) Amendment No. 588, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4974–75**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–16) **Pages S5015–16**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

David T. Danielson, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy).

LaDoris Guess Harris, of Georgia, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, Department of Energy.

Evan Jonathan Wallach, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

Ronnie Abrams, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Rudolph Contreras, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia. **Pages S5024–25**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S4973, S5016**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5016–17**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5018–19**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5019–23**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5014–15**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S5023–24**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S5024**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S5024**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:48 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, July 29, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5024.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Brian T. Baenig, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Leahy, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

SPECIALTY CROPS AND ORGANICS

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine opportunities for specialty crops and organics in the farm bill, after

receiving testimony from Ann Wright, Deputy Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, and Catherine Woteki, Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Economics, both of the Department of Agriculture; Dennis P. Engelhard, Michigan Bean Commission, Unionville; Kim Tait, Tait Farm Foods, Centre Hall, Pennsylvania; Paul Bencal, Lake Erie Regional Grape Extension, Ransomville, New York; Robert Woolley, Dave Wilson Nursery, Hickman, California; Glenn Abbett, American Fruit and Vegetable Processors and Growers Coalition, LaCrosse, Indiana; and Charles Wingard, Walter P. Rawl and Son, Inc., Pelion, South Carolina.

FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE BUDGETING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine Federal disaster assistance budgeting, focusing on the role of the Federal government in mitigating the economic impact of severe weather events through long-term budgetary planning, after receiving testimony from Kathryn D. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Environmental Observation and Prediction, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; James Rivera, Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Disaster Assistance, Small Business Administration; David C. Trimble, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; Donald J. Wuebbles, University of Illinois, Urbana; and Franklin W. Nutter, Reinsurance Association of America, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, USN for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Chief of Naval Operations, and Lieutenant General Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., USA to be general and to be Commander, United States Northern Command, and Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command, both of the Department of Defense, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

AVIATION FUELS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security concluded a hearing to examine aviation fuels, focusing on needs, challenges, and alternatives, after receiving testimony from Lourdes Maurice, Executive Director, Office of Environment and Energy, Office of Policy, International Affairs, and Environment, Federal Aviation Administration; Terry Yonkers, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment and Logistics, Department of Defense; Judith Canales, Administrator, Rural Business Service, Department of Agriculture; Billy M. Glover, Boeing Commercial Airplanes, Tom Todaro, AltAir Fuels, LLC, and John Plaza, Imperium Renewables, Inc., all of Seattle, Washington; Sharon Pinkerton, Air Transport Association of America, Inc., Washington, D.C.; and Richard L. Altman, Commercial Aviation Alternative Fuels Initiative, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Charles DeWitt McConnell, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Fossil Energy, and Rebecca R. Wodder, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NATIONAL PARKS BILLS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 264, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, S. 265, to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park, S. 324, to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, S. 764, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to make technical corrections to the segment designations for the Chetco River, Oregon, S. 864, to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, S. 883, to authorize National Mall Liberty Fund D.C. to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor free persons and slaves who fought for independence, liberty, and justice for all during the American Revolution, S. 888, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 925, to designate Mt. Andrea Lawrence, S. 970, to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1063, to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska, and S. 1134, to authorize the St. Croix River Crossing Project with appropriate mitigation measures to promote river values, after receiving testimony from Senators Klobuchar and Johnson (WI);

Peggy O'Dell, Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Joel Holtrop, Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Mayor Ken Harycki, and Roger L. Tomten, both of Stillwater, Minnesota; and Jack Hession, Alaska Chapter Sierra Club, Cool, California.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Juan F. Vasquez, of Texas, who was introduced by Senator Cornyn, and Maurice B. Foley, of Maryland, both to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, and Janice Eberly, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Mark D. Acton, of Kentucky, and Robert G. Taub, of New York, who was introduced by former Representative John M. McHugh, both to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

FDA USER FEES

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Food and Drug Administration (FDA) user fees, focusing on advancing public health, after receiving testimony from Margaret A. Hamburg, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 546, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana;

S. 379, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe;

S. 1218, to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina;

S. 703, to amend the Long-Term Leasing Act, with amendments; and

S. 636, to provide the Quileute Indian Tribe Tsunami and Flood Protection, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

INDIAN GAMING REGULATORY ACT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine enforcing the ''Indian Gaming Regulatory Act'', focusing on the role of the National Indian Gaming Commission and tribes as regulators, after receiving testimony from Tracie Stevens, Chairwoman, National Indian Gaming Commission; Ernest Stevens, Jr., and Mark Van Norman, both the National Indian Gaming Association, Washington, D.C.; Jamie Hummingbird, National Tribal Gaming Commissioners/Regulators (NTGCR), Tahlequah, Oklahoma; J. Kurt Luger, Great Plains Indian Gaming Association (GPIGA), Bismarck, North Dakota; Sheila Morago, Oklahoma Indian Gaming Association, Oklahoma City; and John B. Meskill, Mohegan Tribal Gaming Commission, Uncasville, Connecticut.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 401, to help Federal prosecutors and investigators combat public corruption by strengthening and clarifying the law, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 409, to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs;

S. 605, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to place synthetic drugs in Schedule I; and

S. 839, to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, ''Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012''.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 2677–2693; and 6 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 67 and H. Res.377–381 were introduced. **Pages H5732–33**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H5734**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 382, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (H. Rept. 112–185). **Page H5732**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Webster to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5663**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:47 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5675**

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012: The House resumed consideration of H.R. 2584, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012. Consideration of the measure began on July 25th. **Page H5688**

Rejected:

Blackburn amendment that was debated on July 27th that sought to reduce funding for State and Tribal Assistance Grants by $30 million and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 114 ayes to 314 noes, Roll No. 664); **Pages H5688–89**

Richardson amendment that was debated on July 27th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for State and Tribal Assistance Grants by $5 million (by a recorded vote of 168 ayes to 258 noes, Roll No. 665); **Page H5689**

Lankford amendment that was debated on July 27th that sought to amend language relating to Clean Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants (by a recorded vote of 161 ayes to 263 noes, Roll No. 666); **Pages H5689–90**

Gosar amendment that was debated on July 27th that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund by $10 million (by a recorded vote of 130 ayes to 295 noes, Roll No. 667); **Pages H5690–91**

Lankford amendment that was debated on July 27th that sought to eliminate funding for the Council on Environmental Quality and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 198 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 668); **Page H5691**

Broun (GA) amendment (No. 14 printed in the Congressional Record of July 25, 2011) that was debated on July 27th that sought to reduce funding for Smithsonian Institution, Salaries and Expenses by $55,624,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 110 ayes to 317 noes, Roll No. 669); and **Pages H5691–92**

Walberg amendment that was debated on July 27th that sought to reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by $10,600,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 181 ayes to 240 noes with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 670). **Pages H5692–93**

H. Res. 363, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on July 25th.

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 377, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H5693**

Faster FOIA Act of 2011: The House began consideration of S. 627, amended, to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays. **Pages H5693–H5721**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of H. Rept. 112–184, modified by the amendments printed in part B of that report, shall be considered as adopted. **Page H5693**

H. Res. 375, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 663, after the previous question was ordered without objection. **Pages H5678–88**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 2548, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, as the "Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building" and **Pages H5721–22, H5729**

Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 2149, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4354 Pahoa Avenue in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building". **Pages H5728–29**

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measures under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office Designation Act: H.R. 2244, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 67 Castle Street in Geneva, New York, as the ''Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office''; **Pages H5722–23**

Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office Designation Act: H.R. 2213, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Eastport Street in Iuka, Mississippi, as the ''Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office''; **Pages H5723–24**

Sergeant Matthew J. Fenton Post Office Designation Act: H.R. 789, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Main Street in Little Ferry, New Jersey, as the ''Sergeant Matthew J. Fenton Post Office''; **Pages H5724–25**

First Lieutenant Oliver Goodall Post Office Building Designation Act: 1H.R. 1975, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 281 East Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena, California, as the ''First Lieutenant Oliver Goodall Post Office Building''; **Pages H5725–26**

John Pangelinan Gerber Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 1843, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 489 Army Drive in Barrigada, Guam, as the ''John Pangelinan Gerber Post Office Building''; and **Pages H5726–27**

Matthew A. Pucino Post Office Designation Act: H.R. 2062, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Meetinghouse Lane in Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts, as the ''Matthew A. Pucino Post Office''. **Pages H5727–28**

Recess: The House recessed at 6:50 p.m. and reconvened at 11:54 p.m. **Page H5729**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on July 26th:

Instructing the Inspector General of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to study the impact of insured depository institution failures: H.R. 2056, amended, to instruct the Inspector General of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to study the impact of insured depository institution failures. **Page H5729**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to the actions of certain persons to undermine the sovereignty of Lebanon or its democratic processes and institutions is to continue in effect beyond August 1, 2011—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed (H. Doc. 112–47). **Page H5678**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H5663, H5670.

Senate Referrals: S. 1188 was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and S. Con. Res. 26 was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. **Page H5729**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5687–88, H5688–89, H5689, H5689–90, H5690–91, H5691, H5691–92, H5692–93. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:54 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINATION OF USDA RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Rural Development, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture held a hearing on Agricultural Program Audit: Examination of USDA Research Programs. The following Department of Agriculture officials: Edward B. Knipling, Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, Chavonda Jacobs-Young, Acting Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Cynthia Clark, Administrator, National Agricultural Statistics Service; and Laurian Unnevehr, Acting Administrator, Economic Research Service.

DOD'S PLANS FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT AND ACHIEVING AUDIT READINESS

Committee on Armed Services: Panel on Defense Financial Management and Auditability Reform held a meeting to receive testimony on DOD's plans for financial management improvement and achieving audit readiness. Testimony was heard from Robert F. Hale, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Department of Defense; Elizabeth A. McGrath, Deputy Chief Management Officer, Department of Defense; and Asif A. Khan, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, GAO.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a markup of the following: H.R. 2405, the ''Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act''; H.R. 1254, the ''Synthetic Drug Control Act''; and H.R. 1852, the ''Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act.'' The following were ordered reported as amended: H.R. 1254; and H.R. 2405. The following was ordered reported without amendment: H.R. 1852.

INSURANCE OVERSIGHT

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing entitled ''Insurance Oversight: Policy Implications for U.S. Consumers, Businesses and Jobs.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HAGUE CONVENTION ON THE CIVIL ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights held a hearing on Improving Implementation of the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. Testimony was heard from Susan Jacobs, Special Advisor for Children's Issues, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State, and Kurt Campbell, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies held a markup of H.R. 2658, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the ability of the Federal Protective Service to provide adequate security for the prevention of terrorist activities and for the promotion of homeland security, and for other purposes. The bill was ordered reported, as amended, to the full Committee.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee continued markup of the following: H.R. 1981, the ''Protecting Children From Internet Pornographers Act of 2011''; H.R. 1433, the ''Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2011''; H.R. 2633, the ''Appeal Time Clarification Act of 2011''; H.R. 83, the ''Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2011''; and H.R. 2189, the ''Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2011.'' H.R. 1981 was ordered reported, as amended. The markup is scheduled to continue on August 1, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held a hearing on the following: H.R. 50, the ''Multinational Species Conservation Funds Reauthorization Act''; H.R. 1760, the ''Great Ape Conservation Reauthorization Amendments Act''; and H.R. 1761, the ''Marine Turtle Conservation Reauthorization Act.'' Testimony was heard from Teiko Saito, Assistant Director for International Affairs, Fish and Wildlife Service; and public witnesses.

IMPROPER MEDICARE PAYMENTS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Organization, Efficiency and Financial Management held a hearing entitled ''Improper Medicare Payments: $48 Billion in Waste?'' Testimony was heard from Daniel R. Levinson, Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General, Health and Human Services; Michelle Snyder, Deputy Chief Operating Officer, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; Kay Daly, Director of Financial Management and Assurance, GAO; and Kathleen King, Director of Health Care, GAO.

IMPACT OF OBAMACARE ON JOB CREATORS AND THEIR DECISION TO OFFER HEALTH INSURANCE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Health Care, District of Columbia, Census, and the National Archives held a hearing entitled ''Impact of Obamacare on Job Creators and Their Decision to Offer Health Insurance.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WAIVING CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII (REQUIRING A TWO-THIRDS VOTE TO CONSIDER A RULE ON THE SAME DAY IT IS REPORTED FROM THE RULES COMMITTEE)

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a record vote of 8 to 4, a rule waiving clause 6(a) of rule XIII (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee) against certain resolutions reported from the Rules Committee. The rule applies the waiver to any resolution reported through the legislative day of August 2, 2011.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup of H.R. 2484, the ''Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2011.'' The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

SMALL BUSINESSES AND PPACA

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Healthcare and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Small Businesses and PPACA: If They Like Their Coverage, Can They Keep It?'' Testimony was heard from Steven B. Larsen, Deputy Administrator and Director, Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; and public witnesses.

IMPACT OF THE CFPB ON SMALL BUSINESS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight and Regulations held a hearing

entitled "Open for Business: The Impact of the CFPB on Small Business." Testimony was heard from Dan Sokolov, Deputy Associate Director for Research, Markets and Regulations, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a markup on the following: H.R. 2243, the "Veterans Employment Promotion Act"; H.R. 2388, the "Access to Timely Information Act"; and H.R. 2383, the "Modernizing Notice to Claimants Act." The following was forwarded, as amended: H.R. 2383. The following were forwarded without amendment: H.R. 2243 and H.R. 2388.

EVALUATING VA'S SDVOSB CERTIFICATION PROCESS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Evaluating VA's SDVOSB Certification Process. Testimony was heard from Belinda J. Finn, Assistant Inspector General for Audits and Evaluations, Office of Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs; Gregory Kutz, Director, Forensic Audit and Investigative Services, GAO; and Tom Leney, Executive Director, Small and Veteran Business Programs, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, Department of Veterans Affairs.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a markup of the following: H.R. 1154, the "Veterans Equal Treatment for Service Dogs Act"; H.R. 1855, the "Veterans' 'Traumatic Brain Injury Rehabilitative Services' Improvements Act of 2011"; H.R. 2074, the "Veterans Sexual Assault Prevention Act"; H.R. 2530, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for increased flexibility in establishing rates for reimbursement of State homes by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for nursing home care provided to veterans; and H.R. 2646, to authorize certain Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility projects and leases, to extend certain expiring provisions of law, and to modify certain authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes. The following were forwarded, as amended: H.R. 1855 and H.R. 2646. The following were forwarded without amendment: H.R. 1154; H.R. 2074; and H.R. 2530.

NEW IRS PAID TAX RETURN PREPARER PROGRAM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing on the new IRS paid tax return preparer program. Testimony was heard from David Williams, Director, IRS Return Preparer Office, Internal Revenue Service; Jim White, Director, Strategic Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing on Ongoing Intelligence Activities. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

COMMITMENTS AND CHALLENGES

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine United States policy and the Organization for Cooperation in Europe, focusing on making good on commitments and challenges, including unresolved conflicts, ethnic tension, corruption and lack of governance, racism and intolerance, and trafficking in persons, after receiving testimony from Philip H. Gordon, Assistant Secretary, Office of European and Eurasian Affairs, and Michael H. Posner, Assistant Secretary, Office of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, both of the Department of State; Alexander Vershbow, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Office of International Security Affairs; Michael Haltzel, Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies Center for Transatlantic Relations, Washington, D.C.; and Catherine Fitzpatrick, Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights, New York, New York.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 29, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Friday, July 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Following any Leader remarks, Senate will recess until 11 a.m. Following which, Senate will be in a period of morning business. At 12 p.m., the Majority Leader will be recognized.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, July 29

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Resume consideration of S. 627—Faster FOIA Act of 2011 (Budget Control Act of 2011).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Brady, Kevin, Tex., E1430
Capps, Lois, Calif., E1434
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E1435
Crenshaw, Ander, Fla., E1429
Emerson, Jo Ann, Mo., E1435
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1429
Gardner, Cory, Colo., E1436
Green, Al, Tex., E1430
Hanabusa, Colleen W., Hawaii, E1436
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1436
Keating, William R., Mass., E1436
King, Steve, Iowa, E1431, E1433
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E1433
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1430, E1437
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1432
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E1432
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1431
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E1429
Schock, Aaron, Ill., E1430
Smith, Adrian, Nebr., E1429
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1431
Waters, Maxine, Calif., E1433
Welch, Peter, Vt., E1431
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1435
Wu, David, Ore., E1434

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.