



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

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5663

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 mid-term 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, 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 Mem-

bers, 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 dramati-

cally 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 per-

cent—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 An-

dean 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 charge 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 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 non-controversial 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 re-creations. 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 col-

league 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 reshaped 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 our 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 of 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 gentleman 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. Schumer; 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 Presi-

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

NAYS—186

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

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|----------|--------------|----------|
| Bachmann | Giffords | Lee (CA) |
| Chandler | Hinchee | Payne |
| Chu | Johnson (GA) | |

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

NOES—314

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

Lee (CA) Pascrell Sherman
 Levin Pastor (AZ) Shimkus
 Lewis (CA) Payne Shuler
 Lewis (GA) Pearce Shuster
 Lipinski Pelosi Simpson
 LoBiondo Pence Sires
 Loebsack Perlmutter
 Lofgren, Zoe Peters
 Lowey Peterson
 Lucas Pingree (ME) Smith (NJ)
 Luján Platts Smith (TX)
 Lummis Polis Smith (WA)
 Lungren, Daniel Price (NC)
 E. Quigley
 Lynch Rahall
 Maloney Rangel
 Manzullo Reed
 Markey Rehberg
 Matheson Reichert
 Matsui Renacci
 McCarthy (CA) Reyes
 McCarthy (NY) Richardson
 McCaul Richmond
 McCollum Rivera
 McDermott Roby
 McGovern Rogers (AL)
 McIntyre Rogers (KY)
 McKeon Rokita
 McKinley Ros-Lehtinen
 McMorris Ross (AR)
 Rodgers Rothman (NJ)
 McNerney Roybal-Allard
 Meehan Runyan
 Meeks Ruppertsberger
 Mica Rush
 Michaud Ryan (OH)
 Miller (NC) Sánchez, Linda
 Miller, Gary T.
 Miller, George Sanchez, Loretta
 Moore Sarbanes
 Moran Schakowsky
 Murphy (CT) Schiff
 Myrick Schilling
 Nadler Schmidt
 Napolitano Schock
 Neal Schrader
 Noem Schwartz
 Nunes Scott (VA)
 Olver Scott, David
 Owens Serrano
 Pallone Sewell

[Roll No. 665]
 AYES—168
 Ackerman Fudge Napolitano
 Andrews Gerlach Neal
 Baca Gibson Olver
 Baldwin Gonzalez Pallone
 Barrow Green, Al Pascrell
 Bass (CA) Green, Gene Payne
 Becerra Griffith (VA) Perlmutter
 Berkley Gutierrez Peters
 Berman Hahn Pingree (ME)
 Bilbray Hanabusa Platts
 Bishop (GA) Hanna Price (NC)
 Bishop (NY) Hastings (FL) Rahall
 Blumenauer Heinrich Rangel
 Boswell Higgins Reichert
 Brady (PA) Himes Reyes
 Braley (IA) Hinojosa Richardson
 Brown (FL) Hirono Richmond
 Butterfield Hochul Ross (AR)
 Campbell Holt Rothman (NJ)
 Capps Honda Roybal-Allard
 Capuano Inslee Rush
 Cardoza Israel Ryan (OH)
 Carnahan Jackson (IL) Sánchez, Linda
 Carney Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) (TX)
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA)
 Chu Johnson, E. B.
 Cicilline Kaptur
 Clarke (MI) Keating
 Clarke (NY) Kildee
 Clay Kind
 Cleaver Kucinich
 Clyburn Langevin
 Cohen Larson (CT)
 Connolly (VA) Lee (CA)
 Conyers Levin
 Cooper Lewis (GA)
 Costa Lipinski
 Costello LoBiondo
 Courtney Loebsack
 Crowley Lofgren, Zoe
 Cuellar Luján
 Cummings Lynch
 Davis (IL) Maloney
 DeGette Markey
 DeLauro Matheson
 Dent Matsui
 Deutch McCarthy (NY)
 Dingell McGovern
 Doyle McNerney
 Edwards Meeks
 Ellison Michaud
 Engel Miller (NC)
 Fattah Moore
 Filner Moran
 Fitzpatrick Murphy (CT)
 Frank (MA) Nadler

Hurt Miller (MI)
 Issa Miller, George
 Jenkins Miller, Gary
 Johnson (IL) Mulvaney
 Johnson (OH) Murphy (PA)
 Johnson, Sam Myrick
 Jones Neugebauer
 Jordan Noem
 Kelly Nugent
 King (IA) Nunes
 King (NY) Nunnelee
 Kingston Olson
 Kinzinger (IL) Owens
 Kissell Palazzo
 Kline Pastor (AZ)
 Labrador Paul
 Lamborn Paulsen
 Lance Pearce
 Landry Pelosi
 Lankford Pence
 Larsen (WA) Peterson
 Latham Petri
 LaTourette Pitts
 Latta Poe (TX)
 Lewis (CA) Polis
 Long Pompeo
 Lowey Posey
 Lucas Price (GA)
 Luetkemeyer Quayle
 Lummis Quigley
 Lungren, Daniel Reed
 E. Rehberg
 Mack Renacci
 Manzullo Ribble
 Marchant Rigell
 Mariner Rivera
 McCarthy (CA) Roby
 McCaul Roe (TN)
 McClintock Rogers (AL)
 McCollum Rogers (KY)
 McCotter Rogers (MI)
 McDermott Rohrabacher
 McHenry Rokita
 McKeon Rooney
 McKinley Ros-Lehtinen
 McMorris Roskam
 Rodgers Ross (FL)
 Meehan Royce
 Mica Runyan
 Miller (FL) Ruppertsberger
 Young (IN)

Ryan (WI) Scalise
 Schilling Schmitt
 Schock Schweikert
 Scott (SC) Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner Sessions
 Shimkus Shuler
 Shuster Simpson
 Sires Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ) Smith (TX)
 Smith (TX) Pelosi
 Southerland Stearns
 Stivers Stutzman
 Sullivan Terry
 Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry Tiberi
 Tipton Tipton
 Turner Turner
 Upton Upton
 Visclosky Visclosky
 Walberg Walberg
 Walden Walden
 Walsh (IL) Walsh (IL)
 Walz (MN) Walz (MN)
 Webster Webster
 Welch Welch
 West West
 Westmoreland Westmoreland
 Whitfield Whitfield
 Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Wittman Wittman
 Wolf Wolf
 Womack Womack
 Woodall Woodall
 Yoder Yoder
 Young (AK) Young (AK)
 Young (FL) Young (FL)
 Young (IN) Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Bachmann Giffords
 Chandler 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:

NOES—258
 Adams
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Amash
 Austria
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Benishek
 Berg
 Biggart
 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

NOT VOTING—6

Bachmann Chandler
 Bass (NH) 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 Bartlett Bilbray
 Aderholt Benishek Black
 Akin Berg Blackburn
 Amash Biggart Bono Mack

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Boren | Herger | Paulsen | Langevin | Pastor (AZ) | Sherman | Chabot | Hultgren | Reed |
| Boustany | Hinojosa | Pearce | Larsen (WA) | Payne | Shimkus | Chaffetz | Issa | Ribble |
| Brady (TX) | Huelskamp | Pence | Larson (CT) | Pelosi | Shuler | Chu | Johnson (IL) | Rokita |
| Brooks | Huizenga (MI) | Petri | Latham | Perlmutter | Simpson | Cicilline | Johnson, Sam | Rothman (NJ) |
| Broun (GA) | Hultgren | Pitts | LaTourette | Peters | Sires | Clarke (MI) | Jordan | Royce |
| Buchanan | Hurt | Poe (TX) | Lee (CA) | Peterson | Slaughter | Coble | Kildee | Ryan (OH) |
| Buerkle | Johnson (IL) | Pompeo | Levin | Pingree (ME) | Smith (NJ) | Cannolly (VA) | Kind | Ryan (WI) |
| Burgess | Johnson (OH) | Posey | Lewis (GA) | Platts | Smith (TX) | Cooper | King (IA) | Scalise |
| Burton (IN) | Johnson, Sam | Price (GA) | Lipinski | Polis | Smith (WA) | Courtney | Landry | Schilling |
| Calvert | Jordan | Quayle | LoBiondo | Price (NC) | Southerland | DeFazio | Langevin | Schock |
| Campbell | Kind | Rehberg | Loebsock | Quigley | Speier | DeLauro | Lankford | Schrader |
| Canseco | King (IA) | Ribble | Lofgren, Zoe | Rahall | Stark | Denham | Larson (CT) | Schweikert |
| Cantor | Kinzing (IL) | Rigell | Lowe | Rangel | Sutton | DesJarlais | Lipinski | Scott, David |
| Carter | Kline | Roby | Lujan | Reed | Thompson (CA) | Dingell | Mack | Scott, David |
| Chabot | Labrador | Roe (TN) | Lynch | Reichert | Thompson (MS) | Doyle | Maloney | Sensenbrenner |
| Chaffetz | Lamborn | Rogers (MI) | Maloney | Renacci | Thompson (PA) | Duffy | McGovern | Serrano |
| Coble | Landry | Rohrabacher | Markey | Reyes | Tiberi | Duncan (SC) | McHenry | Shuler |
| Conaway | Lankford | Rokita | Matheson | Richardson | Tierney | Engel | McMorris | Shlaughter |
| Crawford | Latta | Roskam | Matsui | Richardson | Tonko | Fincher | Rodgers | Smith (NE) |
| Culberson | Lewis (CA) | Roskam | McCarthy (NY) | Rivera | Towns | Flake | Michaud | Smith (WA) |
| Denham | Long | Ross (FL) | McCollum | Rogers (AL) | Tsongas | Fleming | Miller (FL) | Southerland |
| DesJarlais | Lucas | Royce | McDermott | Rogers (KY) | Turner | Fortenberry | Miller (MI) | Speier |
| Dold | Luetkemeyer | Ryan (WI) | McGovern | Rooney | Upton | Franks (AZ) | Moran | Stark |
| Duffy | Lummis | Scalise | McIntyre | Ros-Lehtinen | Van Hollen | Garamendi | Mulvaney | Stutzman |
| Duncan (SC) | Lungren, Daniel | Schilling | McNerney | Ross (AR) | Velázquez | Garrett | Murphy (CT) | Tonko |
| Farenthold | E. | Schock | Meehan | Rothman (NJ) | Visclosky | Gibson | Nadler | Tsongas |
| Fincher | Mack | Schweikert | Meeks | Rothman (NJ) | Walberg | Gosar | Nunes | Van Hollen |
| Flake | Manzullo | Scott (SC) | Michaud | Roybal-Allard | Walden | Gowdy | Palazzo | Walden |
| Fleming | Marchant | Scott, Austin | Miller (MI) | Runyan | Walz (MN) | Graves (GA) | Pastor (AZ) | Walsh (IL) |
| Flores | Marino | Sensenbrenner | Miller (NC) | Ruppersberger | Wasserman | Grijalva | Paul | Waxman |
| Foxx | McCarthy (CA) | Sessions | Miller, George | Rush | Schultz | Harper | Pearce | Welch |
| Franks (AZ) | McCaul | Shuster | Moore | Ryan (OH) | Waters | Harris | Peters | West |
| Gallely | McClintock | Smith (NE) | Moran | Sánchez, Linda | Watt | Hartzler | Petri | Wilson (SC) |
| Gardner | McCotter | Stearns | Murphy (CT) | T. | Whitfield | Heck | Poe (TX) | Yoder |
| Garrett | McHenry | Stivers | Murphy (PA) | Sanchez, Loretta | Whitfield | Himes | Pompeo | Young (AK) |
| Gibson | McKeon | Stutzman | Nadler | Sarbanes | Wilson (FL) | Huelskamp | Price (NC) | Young (IN) |
| Gingrey (GA) | McKinley | Sullivan | Napolitano | Schakowsky | Wittman | Huizenga (MI) | Quayle | |
| Gohmert | McMorris | Terry | Neal | Schiff | Wolf | | | |
| Goodlatte | McMorris | Thornberry | Noem | Schmidt | Woolsey | | | |
| Gosar | Mica | Oliver | Oliver | Schwartz | Wu | Ackerman | Cummings | Hinojosa |
| Gowdy | Miller (FL) | Owens | Owens | Scott (VA) | Yarmuth | Adams | Davis (CA) | Hirono |
| Granger | Miller, Gary | Pallone | Pallone | Scott, David | Young (FL) | Aderholt | Davis (IL) | Hochul |
| Graves (GA) | Mulvaney | Pascrell | Pascrell | Serrano | | Amash | Davis (KY) | Holden |
| Graves (MO) | Myrick | | | Sewell | | Austria | Holt | Holt |
| Griffin (AR) | Neugebauer | | | | | Baca | DeGette | Honda |
| Griffith (VA) | Nugent | Wilson (SC) | Bachmann | | | Bachus | Dent | Hoyer |
| Hall | Nunes | Womack | Chandler | Giffords | Schrader | Baldwin | Deuth | Hunter |
| Harper | Nunnelee | Woodall | Conyers | Gutierrez | Westmoreland | Barletta | Diaz-Balart | Hurt |
| Harris | Olson | Yoder | | Hinchey | | Barrow | Dicks | Hurt |
| Hayworth | Palazzo | Young (AK) | | | | Bass (CA) | Doggett | Inslee |
| Hensarling | Paul | Young (IN) | | | | Bass (NH) | Dold | Israel |

NOES—263

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Ackerman | Cohen | Gerlach |
| Alexander | Cole | Gibbs |
| Altmire | Gonnolly (VA) | Gonzalez |
| Andrews | Cooper | Green, Al |
| Austria | Costa | Green, Gene |
| Baca | Costello | Grijalva |
| Bachus | Courtney | Grimm |
| Baldwin | Cravaack | Guinta |
| Barletta | Crenshaw | Guthrie |
| Barrow | Critz | Hahn |
| Barton (TX) | Crowley | Hanabusa |
| Bass (CA) | Cuellar | Hanna |
| Bass (NH) | Cummings | Hartzler |
| Becerra | Davis (CA) | Hastings (FL) |
| Berkley | Davis (IL) | Hastings (WA) |
| Berman | Davis (KY) | Heck |
| Bilirakis | DeFazio | Heinrich |
| Bishop (GA) | DeGette | Herrera Beutler |
| Bishop (NY) | DeLauro | Higgins |
| Bishop (UT) | Dent | Himes |
| Blumenauer | Deuth | Hirono |
| Bonner | Diaz-Balart | Hochul |
| Boswell | Dicks | Holden |
| Brady (PA) | Dingell | Holt |
| Bralley (IA) | Doggett | Honda |
| Brown (FL) | Donnelly (IN) | Hoyer |
| Bucshon | Doyle | Hunter |
| Butterfield | Dreier | Inslee |
| Camp | Duncan (TN) | Israel |
| Capito | Edwards | Issa |
| Capps | Ellison | Jackson (IL) |
| Capuano | Ellmers | Jackson Lee |
| Carnahan | Emerson | (TX) |
| Carney | Engel | Jenkins |
| Carson (IN) | Eshoo | Johnson (GA) |
| Cassidy | Farr | Johnson, E. B. |
| Castor (FL) | Fattah | Jones |
| Chu | Filner | Kaptur |
| Cicilline | Fitzpatrick | Keating |
| Clarke (MI) | Fleischmann | Kelly |
| Clarke (NY) | Forbes | Kildee |
| Clay | Fortenberry | King (NY) |
| Cleaver | Frank (MA) | Kingston |
| Clyburn | Frelinghuysen | Kissell |
| Coffman (CO) | Fudge | Kucinich |
| | Garamendi | Lance |

NOT VOTING—8

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 | Berg | Brooks |
| Alexander | Bilbray | Broun (GA) |
| Altmire | Bishop (UT) | Burgess |
| Bartlett | Blackburn | Butterfield |
| Barton (TX) | Blumenauer | Campbell |
| Becerra | Bono Mack | Cantor |
| Benishek | Brady (TX) | Carney |

NOES—295

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Cummins | Hinojosa |
| Davis (CA) | Hirono |
| Davis (IL) | Hochul |
| Davis (KY) | Holden |
| Holt | Holt |
| Dent | Honda |
| Deuth | Hoyer |
| Diaz-Balart | Hunter |
| Dicks | Hurt |
| Doggett | Inslee |
| Dold | Israel |
| Donnelly (IN) | Jackson (IL) |
| Dreier | Jackson Lee |
| Duncan (TN) | (TX) |
| Edwards | Jenkins |
| Ellison | Johnson (GA) |
| Ellmers | Johnson (OH) |
| Emerson | Johnson, E. B. |
| Eshoo | Jones |
| Farenthold | Kaptur |
| Farr | Keating |
| Fattah | Kelly |
| Filner | King (NY) |
| Fitzpatrick | Kingston |
| Fleischmann | Kinzing (IL) |
| Flores | Kissell |
| Forbes | Kline |
| Foxx | Kucinich |
| Frank (MA) | Labrador |
| Frelinghuysen | Lamborn |
| Gallely | Lance |
| Gardner | Larsen (WA) |
| Gerlach | Latham |
| Gibbs | LaTourette |
| Gingrey (GA) | Latta |
| Gohmert | Lee (CA) |
| Gonzalez | Levin |
| Goodlatte | Lewis (CA) |
| Granger | Lewis (GA) |
| Graves (MO) | LoBiondo |
| Green, Al | Loebsock |
| Green, Gene | Lofgren, Zoe |
| Griffin (AR) | Long |
| Griffith (VA) | Lowe |
| Grimm | Lucas |
| Guinta | Luetkemeyer |
| Guthrie | Lujan |
| Gutierrez | Lummis |
| Hahn | Lungren, Daniel |
| Hall | E. |
| Hanabusa | Lynch |
| Hanna | Manzullo |
| Hastings (FL) | Marchant |
| Hastings (WA) | Marino |
| Hayworth | Markey |
| Heinrich | Matheson |
| Hensarling | Matsui |
| Herger | McCarthy (CA) |
| Herrera Beutler | McCarthy (NY) |
| Higgins | McCaul |

McClintock Quigley Shuster
 McCollum Rahall Simpson
 McCotter Rangel Sires
 McDermott Rehberg Smith (NJ)
 McIntyre Reichert Smith (TX)
 McKeon Renacci Stearns
 McKinley Reyes Stivers
 McNerney Richardson Sutton
 Meehan Richmond Terry
 Meeks Rigell Thompson (CA)
 Mica Rivera Thompson (MS)
 Miller (NC) Roby Thompson (PA)
 Miller, Gary Roe (TN)
 Miller, George Rogers (AL)
 Moore Rogers (KY)
 Murphy (PA) Rogers (MI)
 Myrick Rohrabacher
 Napolitano Rooney
 Neal Ros-Lehtinen
 Neugebauer Roskam
 Noem Ross (AR)
 Nugent Ross (FL)
 Nunnelee Roybal-Allard
 Olson Runyan
 Olver Ruppertsberger
 Owens Rush
 Pallone Sánchez, Linda
 Pascrell T.
 Paulsen Sanchez, Loretta
 Payne Sarbanes
 Pelosi Schakowsky
 Pence Schiff
 Perlmutter Schmidt
 Peterson Schwartz
 Pingree (ME) Scott (VA)
 Pitts Scott, Austin
 Platts Sessions
 Polis Sewell
 Posey Sherman
 Price (GA) Shimkus

NOT VOTING—7

Andrews Fudge Sullivan
 Bachmann Giffords
 Chandler Hinchey

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 pro-
 ceedings were postponed and on which
 the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

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 de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 198, noes 227,
 not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 668]

AYES—198

Adams Bilirakis Buerkle
 Aderholt Bishop (UT) Burgess
 Akin Black Burton (IN)
 Alexander Blackburn Camp
 Amash Bonner Campbell
 Austria Bono Mack Canseco
 Bachus Boren Cantor
 Barletta Boustany Capito
 Bartlett Brady (TX) Cardoza
 Barton (TX) Brooks Carter
 Benishek Brown (GA) Cassidy
 Berg Buchanan Chabot
 Bilbray Bucshon Chaffetz

Coble Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Costa
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Denham
 DesJarlais
 Duffey
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Emerson
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Flake
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Mack
 Manullo
 Marchant
 Marino
 McCarthy (CA)
 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

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
 Cravack
 Critz
 Crowley

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)
 Sutherland
 Stearns
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Turner
 Walberg
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

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
 Ruppertsberger
 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 Hinchey Sullivan
 Chandler McHenry
 Giffords Stutzman

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 pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

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 de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 110, noes 317,
 not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 669]

AYES—110

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

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

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.

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Johnson (IL)

NOT VOTING—10

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Bachmann | Ellison | Payne |
| Buerkle | Giffords | Wilson (FL) |
| Carson (IN) | Hinchee | |
| 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

“(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 IMPONEMENT 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 mo-

tion 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 fur-

ther 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.—

(1) 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.

(2) 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 Sen-

ate 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 non-starter. 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 bipartisanism 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 bipartisanism 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 Se-

curity, 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 approved. 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 per-

cent, 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 govern-

ment 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 min-

utes 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 3/4 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 WORSENEDED 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 aid. "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 ade-

quate. 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. PASCARELL), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. PASCARELL. 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 pre-eminent 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 co-sponsored, 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 non-partisan, 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 de-

mands 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 1¼ 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 re-hashed 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 Speaker's 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 our 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 al-

lows 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 of 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 sur-

plus 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 bal-

anced 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 Over-

sight 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 mortally 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 Lalandia

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 co-sponsored 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 gentelady 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 gentelady 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 edu-

cating 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 Commenda-

tion, 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, Non-commissioned 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 Pahoia 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 Pahoia 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 Pahoia 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 Pahoia 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 re-elected 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 Paha 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 | | | | | | 456.15 |
| | 6/05 | 6/06 | Iraq | | 0.00 | | | | | | |
| | 6/06 | 6/07 | Pakistan | | 91.80 | | | | | | 91.80 |
| | 6/07 | 6/09 | Afghanistan | | 39.06 | | | | | | 39.06 |
| | 6/09 | 6/10 | Germany | | 189.82 | | | | | | 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 | | | | | | 630.00 |
| | 6/09 | 6/10 | Qatar | | 296.00 | | | | | | 296.00 |
| | 6/10 | 6/11 | Kuwait | | 83.00 | | | | | | 83.00 |
| | 6/11 | 6/13 | Turkey | | 207.00 | | | | | | 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 | | | | | | 632.00 |
| Hon. Tim Holden | 4/21 | 4/23 | Beijing | | 632.00 | | | | | | 632.00 |
| Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson | 4/21 | 4/23 | Beijing | | 632.00 | | | | | | 632.00 |
| Hon. Dan Lipinski | 4/21 | 4/23 | Beijing | | 632.00 | | | | | | 632.00 |
| Jimmy Miller | 4/21 | 4/23 | Beijing | | 632.00 | | | | | | 632.00 |
| John Anderson | 4/21 | 4/23 | Beijing | | 632.00 | | | | | | 632.00 |
| Ryan Seiger | 4/21 | 4/23 | Beijing | | 632.00 | | | | | | 632.00 |
| Joseph Wender | 4/21 | 4/23 | Beijing | | 632.00 | | | | | | 632.00 |
| Caroline Califf | 4/21 | 4/23 | Beijing | | 632.00 | | | | | | 632.00 |
| Hon. John Duncan | 4/23 | 4/25 | Hong Kong | | 878.00 | | | | | | 878.00 |
| Hon. Tim Holden | 4/23 | 4/25 | Hong Kong | | 878.00 | | | | | | 878.00 |
| Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson | 4/23 | 4/25 | Hong Kong | | 878.00 | | | | | | 878.00 |
| Hon. Dan Lipinski | 4/23 | 4/25 | Hong Kong | | 878.00 | | | | | | 878.00 |
| Jimmy Miller | 4/23 | 4/25 | Hong Kong | | 878.00 | | | | | | 878.00 |
| John Anderson | 4/23 | 4/25 | Hong Kong | | 878.00 | | | | | | 878.00 |
| Ryan Seiger | 4/23 | 4/25 | Hong Kong | | 878.00 | | | | | | 878.00 |
| Joseph Wender | 4/23 | 4/25 | Hong Kong | | 878.00 | | | | | | 878.00 |
| Caroline Califf | 4/23 | 4/25 | Hong Kong | | 878.00 | | | | | | 878.00 |
| Jimmy Miller | 4/25 | 4/27 | Seoul, Korea | | 700.00 | | | | | | 700.00 |
| John Anderson | 4/25 | 4/27 | Seoul, Korea | | 700.00 | | | | | | 700.00 |
| Ryan Seiger | 4/25 | 4/27 | Seoul, Korea | | 700.00 | | | | | | 700.00 |
| Joseph Wender | 4/25 | 4/27 | Seoul, Korea | | 700.00 | | | | | | 700.00 |
| Caroline Califf | 4/25 | 4/27 | Seoul, Korea | | 700.00 | | | | | | 700.00 |
| Hon. John Duncan | 4/25 | 4/27 | Seoul, Korea | | 700.00 | | | | | | 700.00 |
| Hon. Tim Holden | 4/25 | 4/27 | Seoul, Korea | | 700.00 | | | | | | 700.00 |
| Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson | 4/25 | 4/27 | Seoul, Korea | | 700.00 | | | | | | 700.00 |
| Hon. Dan Lipinski | 4/25 | 4/27 | Seoul, Korea | | 700.00 | | | | | | 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]2O2 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-attain-

ment 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-2008-0642; 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 Agen-

cy'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. ROHR-ABACHER, 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. PASCARELL.

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. VISLOSKEY, 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. FALEOMAVAEGA, 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 preven-

tion, 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).