

Kildee	Neal	Schwartz
Kind	Olver	Serrano
Langevin	Owens	Sewell
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Sires
Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Slaughter
Lee (CA)	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Levin	Pelosi	Speier
Lewis (GA)	Peters	Stark
Loeback	Pingree (ME)	Sutton
Lofgren, Zoe	Polis	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Lujan	Quigley	Tierney
Lynch	Rahall	Tonko
Maloney	Rangel	Towns
Matsui	Reyes	Tsongas
McCollum	Richmond	Velázquez
McDermott	Rothman (NJ)	Visclosky
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Walz (MN)
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Meeks	Rush	Schultz
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Watt
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Moore	Sarbanes	Welch
Moran	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Schiff	Wu
Napolitano	Schrader	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Campbell	Hinchey	Payne
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Rogers (MI)
Culberson	(TX)	Sánchez, Linda
Franks (AZ)	Johnson (IL)	T.
Giffords	Markey	Van Hollen
Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield

□ 1211

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 533, the rule on H. Res. 340 appears to contain amendments which could be adverse to economic interests in the State of Illinois, subject to further study. The rule is traditionally a procedural, partisan matter. Accordingly, despite my presence on the floor in the center aisle, I chose to abstain. Had I voted, I would have voted, "present."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2109

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from H.R. 2109.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and at noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for

legislative business. The last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. on Friday.

On Monday, the House will begin amendment debate on H.R. 2354, the Energy and Water appropriations bill; and consider H.R. 2417, the Better Use of Light Bulbs Act, under suspension of the rules.

For the remainder of the week, the House will consider H.R. 1309, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2011; H.R. 2018, the Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act of 2011; H.R. 2434, the Financial Services appropriations bill; and potentially legislation relating to the expiring authorization of the FAA.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as a scheduling notice, Members are advised that the House will now be in session during the week of July 18. I expect legislative business for the week to begin on Tuesday, July 19, at 2 p.m., with first votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. The last votes for the week are expected to conclude no later than 3 p.m. on Friday, July 22.

And I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his scheduling information.

I want to pursue what I presume is the reason for not having the district work period that was originally scheduled. My presumption is that we are concerned about the impending arrival of the August 2 date on which America would be put in the position of defaulting on its obligations. I presume that's the reason, that we want to make sure that we are here to work on that issue. Am I correct on that?

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman is correct.

It is my hope that we can have some deliberative processes and open discussions so that we can arrive at an appropriate conclusion of the challenges surrounding the issue of the debt limit expiration. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

I know the gentleman has said in the past that he believes it would be a very bad situation for our economy and for our country if we did not extend the debt limit.

Am I correct that the gentleman still shares that view?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that I have said before that America pays its bills just like the American people are expected to pay their bills at home and in their small and large businesses; but the fact is I think that the American people are expecting us to live up to the promise that we are not going to let spending get out of control again.

So the purpose of the deliberations that are ongoing throughout this Capitol, at the White House, et cetera, are focused—and should be—on making sure we change the system, on making sure that we accomplish the necessary cuts which would exceed the amount that we raise the debt limit, as well as to signal to the American people that we have changed the system; that this kind of unbridled spending ceases and

that we begin to live within our means and get the fiscal house in order so that we can focus on the overriding need for this country right now, which is to create an environment where jobs return.

I know the gentleman has seen today's jobs report. "Disappointing" is an understatement, so I make the point again:

As the gentleman knows, Mr. Speaker, he and I were at a meeting at the White House yesterday with the President in which I said, again, the import of our need to act and act responsibly and not—not—to raise taxes on the American people and the small businesses, and that we need so desperately to begin to create jobs again.

Mr. HOYER. I am pleased, as the gentleman knows, to hear that you want to stop the spiraling deficits that confront our country. I will repeat again because the gentleman keeps mentioning this, and I have enough experience to know what has happened:

In the 30 years that I've been here, of course we've had some few years of the Obama administration, but we had Mr. Reagan's administration, Mr. Bush I's administration, Mr. Bush II's administration, and we ran up—and I know the gentleman knows these figures—over \$6 trillion of deficit during that period of time. However, in the 8 years that Mr. Clinton was President of the United States, we had a \$62.9 billion surplus.

Now, the gentleman makes the point that spending is out of control. The fact is, as the gentleman clearly knows, when you were in charge of the House and the Presidency and the Senate, you increased spending by more than was increased during the Clinton administration by a percentage on an annual basis. So I'm glad to hear that your side now, without fail, talks about spending being out of control. Very frankly, I have the feeling, if your side were spending 5 cents, you would think that we would need to cut an additional 5 cents in revenues so that we could not pay the bills, because that's why we ran up \$6 trillion in deficits: you did not pay for what you bought.

Now, I'm one of those who very strongly believes we ought to pay for what we buy, but I also believe that we ought not to put this country on the brink of financial chaos and bring us down in the eyes of the world because we don't extend our debt.

Very frankly, I think we ought to pay for what we buy. We call that "taxes"—whether it's defending America, paying our FBI, paying people who are researching cancer, heart, lung, diabetes issues. Those are Federal expenditures for which the American people pay through taxes. If we are going to be responsible, we make a very simple judgment: if we want to buy it, we ought to pay for it.

That \$6 trillion of deficit was incurred during those Presidencies, and the President is the only person in America who can stop spending—the only one. You can't do it and I can't do