United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 2011 No. 119

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. 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.

GOVERNMENT'S AUTO PILOT DOWNWARD SPIRAL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. For weeks now, we've faced the artificial Republican debt crisis, which was a crisis of Republican choice. And now with an agreement coming forward, we should ask the question: Is this worse than the default scare? Well, it's hardly clear. What about a government on auto pilot, locked into a slow downward spiral?

First, this empowers the most reckless and extreme elements, not just in the House Republicans today but is a blueprint for mischief for either party in the future. Next, we are starting down a path of budget cuts that all experts assure us will weaken the economy at exactly the time we need to strengthen economic growth, not reduce demand. Clearly it is a step backwards from reforming how the country does business.

The fixation on triggers, formulas, and supercommittees will make it easier for Congress to duck the difficult policy work and harder to do it, if Congress wants to try.

Even as it would appear we avoid outright default, this agreement casts a long-term shadow over our Nation's reasonableness and our reliability for the next 2 years and beyond. And remember the drama over the continuing resolution earlier this year? There are still two potential government shutdowns over the next 14 months that will invite more legislative blackmail over an extreme agenda since it's clear that recklessness works.

This is all the more frustrating because the path forward is clear. The public strongly supports a balanced approach which would include tax reform that would raise money while making the Tax Code more fair and simple.

Everyone knows we must deal with health care costs; and until recently, there was bipartisan agreement as to how to do that. We should accelerate the health care reforms which are already enacted into law but do it faster to improve care and lower costs.

Do we need to require a commission to implement bipartisan suggestions to right-size the military, both its mission and its budget? Absolutely not. There are ideas floating around and support on both sides of the aisle to do that now.

Most important, perhaps, we should revitalize the economy by rebuilding and renewing America, financed by modest increases in user fees. One of the things that is actually the most simple would be to implement bipartisan suggestions to reform agriculture, to save money while helping people who farm and people who eat by reducing massive unnecessary subsidies to large agribusiness.

This agreement delays the important work while it weakens both the economy and the decision-making process. Government on auto pilot in a slow downward spiral is not a victory.

THE REPUBLICAN SOLUTION TO THE DEBT CRISIS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, here we are, after a long weekend of hyperbole and backroom deal cutting at the White House, and here's the product right here.

If you look through it, it's pretty interesting. There's no balance. There are no revenues. God forbid we would ask, as the Republicans call them, ''the job creators,'' the millionaires and billionaires, to pay anything toward further supporting our country, to close some of the tax loopholes that allow hedge fund managers to pay taxes at half the rate of their clerks, you know, things like that. No, that would be a reach too far to ask them to share in the sacrifice.

What we do see here is that there will be cuts, and very few are specified. But strangely enough, there's one that the Republicans always go after because, you know, they hang out at the country club, and at the country club, nobody's worried about putting their kid through college. But the one specified cut in here is in graduate school financial assistance.

Now, that's kind of peculiar. We have a doctor shortage looming, and medical school is phenomenally expensive. But I guess it's just going to be the rich kids who are going to go to medical school in the future, not the middle-class kids, not the struggling kids. Just the rich kids. So that's the one specified cut, the ''one'' specified cut. The rest, we don't even know.

Talking about a pig in a poke, this is a pig in a poke. Where's that $1 trillion of cuts going to come from? First round, second round, another $1.5 trillion, and not one penny in revenues. And the grand result is about $2.5 trillion of deficit reduction.

Printed on recycled paper.

If we just let all the Bush tax cuts expire—all of them—if we went back to the bad old days of the Clinton tax rates that the Republicans claimed would destroy the economy—except actually what happened was, we had 3.8 percent unemployment, and we paid down debt with the Clinton tax rates. But, yes, ''the job creators'' had to pay a little bit more. Those were really bad times, the Republicans would have us believe. So we don't want to go back there. We want to stay in the current day.

We have been cutting taxes now for 11 years of Bush tax cuts, 3 years with Obama as a coconspirator on the Bush tax cuts. Where are the jobs? Well, let's just keep doing it, and maybe it will create jobs.

It's not going to create jobs. There are no jobs. There are no jobs in this package.

At the least, at the least, they could have extended the Federal Aviation Administration authority. Now, most people think, what does that mean? Well, a week ago last Friday, authority to run the Federal Aviation Administration expired. The air traffic controllers are working under emergency provisions, and they're being paid out of the trust fund, which is being drawn down. But all of the taxes went away. So we're walking away from $200 million a week—that is in taxes that would come from users of the system. Most of the airlines have raised their ticket prices to capture that money.

Four thousand Federal employees have lost their jobs or are laid off, are collecting unemployment. Republicans don't care about Federal employees; so let's put that aside.

□ 1010

But 90,000 private sector construction workers and small businesses are also unemployed because we have brought all the safety and security improvements across the entire system to a screeching halt because we are not collecting taxes, which the airlines are now capturing for profits. Could that be in here? That would put 94,000 people back to work. No, that's not in here. That's too much to ask.

There isn't a single job in this package. The biggest problem in America, the greatest deficit we have is in job creation. If we could get back down around 5 percent unemployment, guess what: Those people are working, they are not drawing unemployment benefits, they are not drawing food stamps because they are desperate to put food on the table and the unemployment isn't enough, and a quarter of the deficit would go away with people working.

How about transportation infrastructure? One hundred and fifty thousand bridges are crumbling, need to be replaced or rehabilitated; a $70 billion backlog in critical investment in our transit systems across the country, all made in America, manufacturing jobs, engineering jobs. No, can't do those sorts of things in this bill.

We can't make investments because the Republicans say everything government does is bad. So we can't even make investments. We can't discriminate between wasteful spending, consumptive spending, and investments that will put people back to work, as they claim government can't put people back to work.

That's funny. I wonder who built our national highway system. I don't think it was the private sector. I don't think it was the financiers on Wall Street. The billionaires and the millionaires are escaping any meaningful taxation at this point, seeing the lowest level of taxation on their incomes since, you know, forever, basically.

We can't ask them to do anything. We can't invest, we can't create jobs, and we are going to cut student financial aid for sure and a few other things.

DEBT CEILING

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we will be gathering this morning in a number of conferences and caucuses to assess the work over the weekend that addresses a procedural process that most Americans were never made aware of for the last 100 times since 1917, that we raise the debt ceiling. It is tragic that these two words have become such dastardly words in the American psychic and the American vocabulary, and it has been characterized as reckless spending in Washington more than what it is, which most Americans do at the end of the month, and that is to pay their bills.

I had the privilege of joining in a balanced budget process in the 1990s, and, frankly, it was a joy. It was good to do good things in a bipartisan manner on behalf of the American people.

Out of that process came something called the Children's Health Insurance Program that helped insure, over these last couple of years, millions and millions of children and, yes, we had a balanced budget. In the course of it, of course, in the rush of doing that budget we skewed the reimbursements for physicians, the doctors that you see in your hamlets and villages and counties and cities and States, the doctors that many of you send to medical school who happen to be your children, the doctors who take an oath to care for the American people.

Yes, we skewed their reimbursement. So, now, every year we have to confront the unfairness of how we reimburse our doctors, the doctors who work in public health institutions, county hospitals, clinics. This is what happens when you rush to do something that should be ordinary.

So today I rise looking towards the meetings that will go on today. In many of them we will huddle together to try and do the right thing. But I asked months ago for us to raise the debt ceiling, as has been done 17 times for the President of the United States, President Reagan and other Presidents who have asked to have that done, and then begin to look long term. As Mark Zandi has indicated, and a number of economists have said, immediate cuts will be damaging to this economy.

But I rise today to speak of the vulnerable persons who really can't speak for themselves. Many people think seniors have lobbyists in one of the major, largest, if you will, lobbying group for seniors, and they do a great job.

But I know seniors who really are huddled in small apartments and old, old homes left to them by their deceased spouse, something they paid for but has deteriorated over the years. Because we are not helping seniors with their rehab anymore, and many of them got reverse mortgages that really took them to the cleaners and left them with nonperforming contractors who did a poor job on their homes, these are the seniors who don't have voices.

Or, maybe, the vulnerable families in Latino and African American communities where the wealth distinction has showed, where our majority Americans, white Americans, have a wealth factor of $113,000; and, respectively, African Americans have $5,000; and Hispanics, Latinos at $6,000. Now that doesn't cover all. There are people in Appalachia and other places around the Nation where that disparity is very, very strong.

But it does mean that there is a population of vulnerable Americans. And the question is whether or not the approach that we are going to take today in doing something as simple as raising the debt ceiling to allow us to pay our bills has a dastardly part to it that causes the laying off of hundreds of thousands of Americans because there is no job creation.

Because when you cause us to stop spending money to encourage the economy to move such as the 3 million jobs that were created with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, then there is no job creation. Our private sector is not moving as fast as we would like.

We hope this will spur them on, but I have heard that before. I have heard, during the TARP and the bailout of banks, just give us a chance. And you ask any small business around America whether they are able to access capital to build their structure and their business, small businesses that I truly believe are the backbone of America. If we did nothing on this floor but every day do something, give a gift to small businesses and health care, give a gift to them in tax relief, give a gift to them in incentive to grow their business, and you would see Americans being hired.

Small businesses are as small as one individual sitting in front of their computer. That is what we should be doing.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about going forward with a complex approach to the debt ceiling while thousands of Americans are out of jobs, where airlines are taking money they should not take, while the FAA is shut down. We have many other problems to take care of while construction jobs are at a standstill.

What about the vulnerable Americans? That's what my concern will be about as we go through these meetings and approach this floor today.

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 10 o'clock and 18 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. DENHAM) at noon.

PRAYER

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

God of the Universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon those who have worked so hard these past few days to help bring our Nation to a level of security. Not all are completely satisfied, but help us all to proceed graciously, remaining vigilant for those values held most dear while being just.

In the days that come, help each Member to understand well and interpret positively, as they are able, the positions of those with whom they disagree. Grant to each the wisdom of Solomon, and to us all the faith and confidence to know that no matter how difficult things appear to be, You continue to walk with our Nation, as You have done for over two centuries.

May all that is done today in the people's House 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.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. 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, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan 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. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 375, legislative business is not dispensed with on this day.

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.

THE WINNERS TODAY ARE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today the agreement that we will be voting on is another example of the historic pivot here in Washington because never before in history has an increase in our Nation's debt limit been tied to cuts in spending.

No longer will the debate be about how much more is the Federal Government going to spend; the debate now is how much spending is going to be cut.

This legislation will require more than $2.1 trillion in Federal spending cuts; puts in place firm caps to hold down future spending; both Houses of Congress must have an up-or-down vote on a balanced budget amendment; it does not impose any job-killing tax increases; it avoids a default on Federal obligations that would be disastrous to our economy; and it begins a process to put this Nation on a path to prosperity.

We have so much more that still needs to be done, but this is further progress in turning the Federal Government toward fiscal sanity so we can leave a better America for our children and our grandchildren.

ORDINARY FOLKS EXCLUDED

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, it seems whenever important decisions are made by a few people inside a room inside the Beltway, ordinary folks are not only excluded from the room but seem to be excluded from the minds of the people in the room.

I'm talking about ordinary folks working to keep their heads above water; ordinary folks working to keep their mortgage, keep their homes; retirees living on a fixed income; students hoping to have help in going to college; those who are working to improve people's health and our Nation's energy supply—ordinary folks.

What makes anyone think that a supercommittee of 12 people operating in a room inside the Beltway in November is going to do a better job looking after the interests of ordinary folks.

REMEMBERING JUDGE MATTHEW J. PERRY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, South Carolina lost one of its greatest leaders, United States District Judge Matthew J. Perry. Judge Perry symbolized courage and leadership and was a towering figure during the civil rights movement of the 1950s through the 1970s.

After having served in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1945 as a sergeant in the Quartermaster Corps, Judge Perry graduated from South Carolina State with a B.S. in business. He went on to graduate from South Carolina State Law School in 1951. As a young attorney, Judge Perry established his credibility in South Carolina by defending many of the students protesting segregation during sit-ins.

In 1976, he was nominated by Senator Strom Thurmond to the U.S. Military Court of Appeals in Washington. In 1979, he was the first African American to be appointed as a U.S. District Judge for South Carolina. He has been the recipient of the Order of the Palmetto, the highest civilian honor of the State of South Carolina.

Our Nation has truly lost a legend who has made a difference for all of the people of South Carolina.

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

DEBT CEILING LEGISLATION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is a little different than the Reid bill we voted on

on Saturday. It actually increases military spending $78 billion over the bill that we voted on on Saturday, and it decreases domestic spending by $80 billion. And it doesn't end the wars, unlike the Reid bill we voted on on Saturday.

It has one specified cut—student financial aid. That's the only cut specified. What kind of world do you people live in?

And, of course, it doesn't ask a single thing of millionaires, billionaires, corporations that avoid taxes. It doesn't close a single loophole. It doesn't ask one millionaire or billionaire just to go back to Clinton-era taxes. And it does nothing about our most serious deficit in this country, and that is the jobs deficit.

Unless you really believe that tax loopholes, tax cuts, and cutting investment in aviation and surface transportation creates jobs on your planet, this bill creates none here today.

CRISIS OF DEBT

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a crisis. It's not a crisis of a debt ceiling. It's a crisis of debt, of Washington spending too much, not taxing or borrowing too little. The problem isn't the debt ceiling; it's the debt. We can no longer continue to commit generational theft by our uncontrolled spending habits to our children and grandchildren.

Luckily, the Congress has made significant progress in the first six budget bills in cutting real spending for this upcoming fiscal year. And House Republicans have fundamentally changed the debate in Washington. We are no longer talking about job-killing tax increases. We're talking about spending cuts and long-term spending reform—our goals from day one.

It's time for President Obama and the Senate Democrats to join us in our efforts to control spending before time runs out. We must solve this crisis to encourage job creation and return America to its greatness. America's great people are ready.

□ 1210

AND JUSTICE FOR ALL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. It really is about justice for all. The question becomes as we go into our conferences and caucuses to discuss this new debt ceiling legislation: Who will this help?

Will it help the small businesses, which are the backbone of America? Will it help the students who are now standing at the doors of colleges and seeing them slam shut? Will it help those in nursing homes who now, because of drastic cuts in Medicaid, will see their places of abode lost? Will it help the hospitals, which care for the sick, because there is no Medicare reimbursement or Medicaid?

We are going to be looking at this to see how it helps or hurts the American people; but I tell you who it helps: big businesses. Are they going to now step in and create jobs? Because, when we cut across the board, public sector jobs will be cut all across America.

It has always been the government that stoops and comes in to raise the American people up when there is a need. Are we going to help the returning soldiers, 160,000-plus, who have PTSD? For those who want to come into the workplace, will the corporate sector now stand up and be counted?

Will only the friends of the Republicans be helped and not the poor and working Americans—where is the justice for all. That's where we needed bipartisanship on something that has already been done a hundred times: the simple raising of the debt ceiling; instead we have put the burden now on the backs of those who cannot speak for themselves.

ENCOURAGING THE IRON WILL OF SUCCESS IN AMERICA; A NATION PLUMMETING INTO MEDIOCRITY

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Instead of appealing to America's greatest aspirations, hopes, and dreams, there are those who are appealing to our basest character, using fear and envy and greed to prey upon those we are supposed to lead. We can no longer sow the seeds of this dependency, feed it with despair in hopes of reaping the benefits of power, all the while weakening the iron will of this Nation and plummeting it into mediocrity.

We must encourage inventiveness, entrepreneurship, and the risk that comes with leadership. We must not attack and mock those who work hard. It is not a path to greatness but a road to mediocrity and servitude where people are encouraged not to reach for the stars but to grab what they can get from the government.

Those who prey upon the fears of the weak insult them twice—once in trying to frighten them, another for believing they are too weak to understand they're being fooled. We have had enough of unemployment, of the weakening of our Nation, the drama of hand-wringing, the cowardice of blaming, finger-pointing and deflection, insults to opportunities of job creators, and the ransom we pay to other nations in the form of energy, manufactured goods and massive interest on our massive debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for leaders to stop using ''success'' as a dirty word and as a justification to take more and more from those who create jobs. Whether the worker wears a blue collar or a blue suit, all work is good and noble, and it is time to encourage, not to criticize, the work.

TO HOLD THE PRESIDENT ACCOUNTABLE

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Today, the Senate will begin debate on the debt ceiling agreement. It is being billed as a two-step approach to hold President Obama accountable:

To hold the President accountable or to hamstring his agenda to revive and redirect our economy to domestic manufacturing and clean energy—or to limit investment in infrastructure, education and health care?

To hold our President accountable or to stifle our meager recovery to make it harder to create jobs and lower the unemployment rate?

To hold our President accountable or to use the forced caps to undermine Republicans' main target—the Affordable Care Act? Saying there will be no cuts to Medicare services is a sham because cuts to Medicare providers will reduce beneficiaries' access to needed care.

To reduce domestic discretionary spending to the lowest level since Eisenhower years? We might as well resign ourselves to giving up our place of leadership in the world.

We do need a clean debt ceiling but with no conditions; and, yes, we need to reduce our deficit. I didn't like the suggestion that all of the Bush tax cuts expire when I first heard it, but if we end them now, we could save $2.5 trillion over the next 10 years.

Not a bad place to start.

A BALANCED BUDGET, NOT A BALANCED APPROACH

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

Ms. FOXX. At the beginning of the debt ceiling debate, House Republicans made it clear that if the President and congressional Democrats wanted us to pay their bills, they were going to have to commit to cutting up the credit cards.

The simple truth is that in just 7 months, House Republicans have already changed the broken political system in Washington to move away from ''how much can we spend?'' to focus on how we can stop spending money we don't have.

House Republicans have led the fight for controlling spending and saving our children and grandchildren from national bankruptcy, voting to actually shrink a Federal Government that has done nothing but expand for 40 years. The cuts may be small relative to the size of the problem, but the change in direction is historic. For the first time in the history of modern Federal budgeting, House Republicans will cut discretionary Federal spending for 2 straight years.

President Obama wanted a ''balanced approach'' to solve our debt crisis, which means historic tax increases on job creators. We don't need a ''balanced approach,'' Mr. Speaker. We need a balanced budget.

IN HONOR OF THE CHERISHED LIFE AND CAREER OF A FINE PHYSICIAN, DR. ROBERT McGUIRE

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. I rise today to honor the life and career of one of the finest physicians and gentlemen I have ever met, Dr. Robert McGuire of Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Dr. McGuire's career brought to his attention and to his care thousands of women in my State, and he made their lives better, including my own. Through his skill, through his patience and attention to the people he was treating, he made the profession of medicine honorable and cherished by the people he served so well.

His career has ended so he might fight his own battles with cancer. I wish him the very best regards in his fight. I thank him for the difference he made in my life and in the lives of thousands of women in my State of Wyoming. I wish him Godspeed.

Take care, Dr. Robert McGuire.

WE MUST MOVE FORWARD, ENACTING COMMONSENSE SOLUTIONS TO REVIVE THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Mr. DOLD. Our economy has seen incredibly weak economic growth over the last two quarters. Just today, we found out that manufacturing is at its lowest level in the past 2 years. My district, the 10th District of Illinois, is one of the largest manufacturing districts in our Nation, and there is no doubt that families are struggling.

I am optimistic that Washington is finally coming together and finding common ground on this debt ceiling debate. We must—I emphasize—we must move forward. Hardworking taxpayers have had enough, and I get it. We must have spending discipline here in Washington—no more budget tricks, no more accounting gimmicks, no more empty promises. American families have to tighten their belts, and they should expect that Washington will do the same. Now is the time to move forward and focus on jobs.

If we are serious about paying down the debt and increasing revenue, then we must empower job creators. Small businesses in our Nation are overburdened by economic uncertainty, government regulations and redtape. We need to implement commonsense solutions that create jobs and get our economy moving again.

□ 1220

MOURNING THE LOSS OF ARMY FIRST LIEUTENANT DIMITRI DEL CASTILLO

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the duty we perform today to cut and cap America's spending, to put us on track to a balanced budget, and to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution are vitally important but pale in comparison to the sacrifices and duties of our Armed Forces, our men and women in uniform.

It is with profound sadness today that I join with the family and friends and the neighbors of United States Army First Lieutenant Dimitri del Castillo in mourning his loss. On June 25, 2011, he was killed while fighting in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

In 2004, it was my privilege to nominate Dimitri for an appointment as a cadet to the United States Military Academy at West Point. Upon his graduation, he was commissioned in the Infantry, where he sought out the Army's toughest challenges immediately. He graduated from the demanding Airborne and Ranger courses and later passed a series of rigorous skill and endurance tests to earn the Army's coveted Expert Infantryman Badge.

Dimitri deployed with his unit to Afghanistan in April of 2011, and while conducting combat operations he was tragically killed when his unit came under fire by enemy forces. For his heroic actions that day, Dimitri was awarded posthumously the Bronze Star Medal and the Purple Heart.

Though we mourn his loss, we are immensely proud of Dimitri's accomplishments and we are immensely proud of the men and women who fight for us every day to make it possible to savour the freedom left to us by our founders. May the Lord bless and keep Dimitri's soul, and may God help his family find comfort in the nobility and valor of his deeds.

COAL-POWERED ENERGY

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, we are in an historic heat wave in this country, and I'm not talking about the debate on the debt limit, I'm actually talking about the temperature outside. And what's noted is that many leaders throughout this country—whether they're local Mayors or Governors—are saying, if you're poor, get to a cooling shelter, stay inside, stay in the air conditioning.

Well, we're fortunate in this country to have low-cost power generated by coal. In rural Illinois, the average salary is $58,000 a year, the average utility bill is $121 a month, which means they pay about $1,500 a year for the utility cost. However, in France, they pay 20 cents per kilowatt hour. Just think what the cost would be here if we had to double our electricity rates.

Talk about a burden on the poor and rural Americans when, instead of $1,500 a year, they would have to pay $3,000 a year just to seek relief from these hot summers.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as we are dealing with this debate over the debt limit, I think one thing that's become clear as people have followed over the last few weeks is that Washington has a spending problem. And regardless of the resolution of today's action in the House and Senate, I hope nobody thinks that this is the end of this debate. Frankly, this is just the beginning of the debate to finally cut spending in Washington and put real controls in place.

I think as we look over the next few months, we need to continue to push for a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution because ultimately that's the kind of accountability that we need to ensure that we change the culture of spending in Washington. Clearly, tax cuts will not solve this problem, that will only make matters worse; but if the problem is spending, why would you want to send even more money up to Washington to let them spend even more?

We've got to control spending; we've got to start making cuts today; but we ultimately need that accountability that comes with a balanced budget amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 or 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.

SUSPENDING IMMIGRATION STATUS PETITION AND INTERVIEW TIME REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 398) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the

Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 398

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

SECTION 1. TOLLING PERIODS OF TIME TO FILE PETITION AND HAVE INTERVIEW FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 216 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) SERVICE IN ARMED FORCES.—

''(1) FILING PETITION.—The 90-day period described in subsection (d)(2)(A) shall be tolled during any period of time in which the alien spouse or petitioning spouse is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States and serving abroad in an active-duty status in the Armed Forces, except that, at the option of the petitioners, the petition may be filed during such active-duty service at any time after the commencement of such 90-day period.

''(2) PERSONAL INTERVIEW.—The 90-day period described in the first sentence of subsection (d)(3) shall be tolled during any period of time in which the alien spouse or petitioning spouse is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States and serving abroad in an active-duty status in the Armed Forces, except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from waiving the requirement for an interview under subsection (c)(1)(B) pursuant to the Secretary's authority under the second sentence of subsection (d)(3).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 216(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186a(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(g)(1))'' and inserting ''(h)(1))''; and

(B) by striking ''(g)(2))'' and inserting ''(h)(2))''.

(2) REFERENCES.—Section 216 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(3), by striking ''Attorney General's'' and inserting ''Secretary's'';

(B) by striking ''Attorney General'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security''; and

(C) in subsections (c)(1)(B) and (d)(3), by striking ''Service'' and inserting ''Department of Homeland Security''.

SEC. 2. COMPLIANCE WITH PAYGO.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 materials on H.R. 398, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, which provides relief to military servicemembers serving overseas who marry foreign spouses.

Our Nation's military should not have to worry about red tape while they are abroad protecting our freedoms. When a U.S. citizen or a permanent resident marries a foreign spouse, that spouse becomes a conditional permanent resident. After 2 years, the couple files a petition with the Department of Homeland Security for the removal of the conditional status. If the petition is successful, the immigrant becomes a permanent resident.

The petition generally must be filed before the second anniversary of the spouse's becoming a conditional permanent resident.

Upon the filing of the petition, DHS interviews the couple to determine whether there was any marriage fraud. The interview must be conducted unless DHS waives the deadline for the interview or the requirement for the interview.

This timetable is reasonable under normal circumstances. However, what happens when the U.S. citizen or permanent resident spouse is serving overseas in active duty status in the Armed Forces?

It would certainly be a disruption to the military to have a member of the Armed Forces deployed overseas travel for a personal interview with DHS. Our military's focus should be on defending freedom, not bureaucracy.

While it is true that DHS can choose to delay this process in appropriate circumstances, this bill's provision should be standard policy while the spouse is serving abroad. Of course, the petition and interview would still take place when the spouse is no longer on active duty.

This bill is good for our military, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the author of H.R. 398, I support this bill. It's a small measure to help support members of our Armed Forces who are serving overseas and their families here at home.

Our troops, who take up our country's call to service and volunteer to place themselves in harm's way, face uncertainties every day. For countless soldiers, the peace of mind that they get from family back home helps to keep them focused on the important job at hand. For that reason, it is critical that we not add to their burdens and instead seize the opportunity to alleviate even a small amount of the anxiety they feel.

As the chairman has indicated, there is a conditionality placed on residents gained through marriage. Couples are given a 90-day period just before the second anniversary of the grant to file to remove the conditions, and then they get only 90 days to appear in person for an interview. Now, only after this is done are the conditions removed. And if the conditional status is not removed in this way, the residence is terminated and the foreign national spouse could be deported. That means that either the spouse of one of our soldiers could be deported or the soldier himself could be deported.

Now, it's pretty hard to appear for the interview if you're serving in Iraq, and we certainly don't want our soldiers or their spouses to be deported. So I support this measure.

In 2008, as chairwoman of the House Immigration Subcommittee, I convened a hearing on the immigration needs of America's fighting men and women. At the hearing, we heard from members of the Armed Forces about countless challenges that they face because of our rigid and unyielding immigration system.

□ 1230

This bill will help to resolve just one of those challenges. It will not excuse military families from the requirements. It will simply allow them to put off those requirements if they choose during overseas deployments.

Of course, there are many problems with our country's immigration laws that this bill does not address, too many to count. And as we know from our 2008 hearing, those problems will continue to unnecessarily tear military families apart, distract from our mission abroad, and betray the fundamental values that we claim to hold dear.

But despite this great need, it is only this small bill, a bill that should help a few dozen servicemembers a year, that is on the floor for action.

I commend my colleagues LAMAR SMITH, ELTON GALLEGLY, and JOHN CONYERS for joining me in introducing this very modest measure.

Our men and women on the front lines are standing in defense of our country, and their loved ones back home stand in defense of them. As Members of Congress, it's both a responsibility and an honor to provide whatever support we can. And while this bill may be small, it is important for the few dozen soldiers it may help each year. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 398.

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. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

NON-IMMIGRANT NURSES VISA REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1933) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirements for admission of non-immigrant nurses in health professional shortage areas, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1933

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

SECTION 1. REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION OF NONIMMIGRANT NURSES IN HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF AUTHORIZED ADMISSION.—Section 212(m)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(m)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) The initial period of authorized admission as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) shall be 3 years, and may be extended once for an additional 3-year period.''.

(b) NUMBER OF VISAS.—Section 212(m)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(m)(4)) is amended by striking ''500.'' and inserting ''300.''.

(c) PORTABILITY.—Section 214(n) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) A nonimmigrant alien described in subparagraph (B) who was previously issued a visa or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) is authorized to accept new employment performing services as a registered nurse for a facility described in section 212(m)(6) upon the filing by the prospective employer of a new petition on behalf of such nonimmigrant as provided under subsection (c). Employment authorization shall continue for such alien until the new petition is adjudicated. If the new petition is denied, such authorization shall cease.

''(B) A nonimmigrant alien described in this paragraph is a nonimmigrant alien—

''(i) who has been lawfully admitted into the United States;

''(ii) on whose behalf an employer has filed a nonfrivolous petition for new employment before the date of expiration of the period of stay authorized by the Secretary of Homeland Security, except that, if a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) is terminated or laid off by the nonimmigrant's employer, or otherwise ceases employment with the employer, such petition for new employment shall be filed during the 45-day period beginning on the date of such termination, lay off, or cessation; and

''(iii) who, subsequent to such lawful admission, has not been employed without authorization in the United States before the filing of such petition.''.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 3-year period beginning on the commencement date described in paragraph (2), the amendments made by section 2 of the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-95), and the amendments made by this section, shall apply to classification petitions filed for nonimmigrant status. This period shall be in addition to the period described in section 2(e) of the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999.

(2) COMMENCEMENT DATE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall determine whether regulations are necessary to implement the amendments made by this section. If the Secretary determines that no such regulations are necessary, the commencement date described in this paragraph shall be the date of such determination. If the Secretary determines that regulations are necessary to implement any amendment made by this section, the commencement date described in this paragraph shall be the date on which such regulations (in final form) take effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 H.R. 1933, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this legislation on behalf of myself and Representatives CUELLAR, HINOJOSA, ROSKAM, and RUSH.

A number of American hospitals have great difficulty attracting nurses. These include hospitals that serve mostly poor patients in inner-city neighborhoods and some hospitals in rural areas. For example, St. Bernard Hospital in Chicago is the only remaining hospital in an area of over 100,000 people and almost all of its patients live in poverty. St. Bernard almost closed its doors in 1992 primarily because of its inability to attract registered nurses.

Congress passed the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act in 1999 to help hospitals like St. Bernard. It created a new H–1C temporary registered nurse visa program with 500 visas available each year that allowed nurses to stay for 3 years.

To be able to petition for a foreign nurse, an employer had to meet four conditions. First, the employer had to be located in a health professional shortage area; second, the employer had to have at least 190 acute care beds; third, a certain percentage of the employer's patients had to be Medicare patients; and fourth, a certain percentage of patients had to be Medicaid patients.

The H–1C program adopted the protections for American nurses contained in the expired H–1A nursing visa program. For instance, a hospital had to agree to take timely and significant steps to recruit American nurses. Also, hospitals had to pay the prevailing wage.

The H–1C program contained new protections such as requirements that foreign nurses could not comprise more than one-third of a hospital's registered nurses. The H–1C program was extended in 2006 but expired in December of 2009, though many nurses still remain on 3-year visas issued before that date.

Sister Elizabeth Van Straten, president of St. Bernard Hospital, wrote to me last December that ''because of the sunset, in combination with the extended approval period for green cards, nurses are now forced to leave our institution, and the rate of loss continues to increase. This loss cannot be sustained. As the only hospital serving one of the most difficult sections of Chicago, and perhaps the entire country, we need the extension of the visa program to survive.''

I introduced H.R. 1933 to help St. Bernard and other, similar hospitals. The bill reauthorizes the H–1C program for another 3 years. The number of visas that may be issued in each fiscal year cannot exceed 300. An alien may be admitted for 3 years, and this stay may be extended once for an additional 3 years.

The H–1C program ensures continued care for patients in inner-city and rural communities. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will not repeat the information provided by Chairman SMITH. I will simply state that the H–1C program was first created in 1999 to address shortages in both rural and inner-city hospitals. The 500 visas per year actually only go to 14 hospitals in the United States spread out across America. And of course the program has now expired.

As Chairman SMITH has indicated, this bill would reauthorize but reduce the number from 500 to 300, create certain other protections as mentioned by the chairman, and allow the maximum stay to go to 6 years. Because the bill would double the duration of H–1C status, I offered an amendment in committee, which was accepted by all, to make the H–1C visas portable among the 14 hospitals authorized to employ H–1C nurses. Right now, the nurses are entirely dependent on their employers to provide them their immigration status, and visa portability would level the playing field and allow a nurse to switch employers if something was wrong.

I appreciate the Chairman's willingness to accept that, and I thank the chairman for introducing this bill and working with me to ensure that H–1C

nurses are better protected against exploitive situations.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1933, as amended.

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. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2480) to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2480

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Administrative Conference of the United States Reauthorization Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 596 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 596. Authorization of appropriations

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subchapter not more than $2,900,000 for fiscal year 2012, $2,900,000 for fiscal year 2013, and $2,900,000 for fiscal year 2014. Of any amounts appropriated under this section, not more than $2,500 may be made available in each fiscal year for official representation and entertainment expenses for foreign dignitaries.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 materials on H.R. 2480, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1240

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this bill on behalf of myself, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Lately, the need to reform Federal administrative law has become urgent. Every day the long promised economic recovery seems more like a mirage. Our top priority should be to create jobs. Protecting job creators from overregulation will help create jobs. According to the Small Business Administration, regulations impose a $1.75 trillion burden annually on the American economy. Reducing this burden will hasten our economic recovery.

The Administrative Conference of the United States is a small but important institution. It is a narrowly focused, nonpartisan body that offers an outstanding forum to reform Federal administrative law. Regulatory agencies must be efficient, effective, and accountable. This is the heart of the Conference's historical mission. Over the years, its recommendations have saved taxpayers tens of millions of dollars. For example, the Social Security Administration saved $85 million by adopting a recommendation to eliminate an unnecessary step in its appeals process. The Conference's budget was $1.8 million at the time. And the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation saved more than $9 million in the first 18 months of a pilot program implementing an ACUS recommendation to make greater use of alternative dispute resolution. ACUS currently is urging agencies to expand their use of video hearings. The Social Security Administration already has saved $59 million by doing more hearings by video conference. This ACUS recommendation has the potential to save millions more across the Federal Government.

Due to a lack of funding, the Conference went dormant in 1996. It was revived in the 111th Congress, and I am glad that once again it is able to contribute to administrative law reform. The Conference is uniquely positioned to generate much savings for very little cost. Recommendations from the Conference save taxpayer dollars by helping agencies work more effectively. The Conference also helps agencies adopt better and less burdensome regulations to reduce that $1.75 trillion regulatory burden on the economy. Additionally, the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law's December 2006 interim report on regulatory reform contains numerous suggested reforms that ACUS could examine and help agencies implement.

During these difficult economic times, everyone has to tighten their belts, including Federal agencies. If American families have to make tough economic choices, so should Congress. The amount authorized by this bill, $2.9 million annually for the next three fiscal years, was a bipartisan compromise. It reduces the Conference's authorization level by almost 10 percent while enabling the Conference to perform its most critical work. The Conference's past successes raise the prospect for a high return on the taxpayers' investment. It is a reasonable authorization level in light of the current need to reduce Federal spending, and I recommend it to my colleagues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It's been a pleasure working with Chairman SMITH, who yields the time, never as much as I may consume, but yields the time, which I'm always appreciative of, and we've worked in a bipartisan manner on this, and I appreciate his working with me on that.

The Federal administrative law and rulemaking processes are among the most important ways by which our Nation implements public policy. Each year, agencies issue regulations to ensure that the food we eat, the air we breathe, and the cars we drive are safe. Although regulations play a critical role in virtually every aspect of our daily lives, there is only one independent, nonpartisan Federal entity that Congress can rely on to ensure that these regulations work as intended. The Administrative Conference of the United States, known as ACUS, is that critical entity.

First established by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the Conference is a nonpartisan, public-private resource that provides invaluable guidance to Congress about how to improve the administrative and regulatory processes. ACUS is charged with making recommendations for the improvement of administrative agencies and their procedures, particularly with respect to efficiency and fairness. Over the years, the Conference has helped agencies implement many cost-saving procedures and made numerous recommendations to eliminate excessive litigation costs and long delays.

Just one agency alone, the Social Security Administration, estimates that the Conference's recommendations to change that agency's appeals process yielded approximately $85 million in savings. Another recommendation by the Conference, namely, that agencies use alternative dispute resolution methods to avoid costly and time-consuming litigation, resulted in more than $100 million in savings government-wide. Several other ACUS recommendations have greatly increased the efficiency of other administrative procedures by eliminating duplicative hearings and streamlining appeals from agency action, thereby also resulting in cost savings in the millions of dollars.

In what is truly a rare and historic example of agreement, Supreme Court Justices Stephen Breyer and Antonin Scalia have jointly testified before our committee in strong support of the Conference, not once but on two occasions, and I must say I enjoyed both of

their comments and their friendship. Justice Breyer extolled the ''huge'' savings to the public resulting from the Conference's recommendations, while Justice Scalia likewise agreed that ACUS is ''an enormous bargain.'' Perhaps most importantly, ACUS can play a major role in helping agencies become even more efficient and effective, especially given the present budgetary constraints.

As reported by the Judiciary Committee, H.R. 2480, the Administrative Conference of the United States Reauthorization Act of 2011, authorizes $2.9 million to be appropriated to the Conference for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2014. With this modest reauthorization, we will ensure that the Conference will continue to return to American taxpayers many multiples of that investment in the form of recommendations that will make Federal agencies more effective.

H.R. 2480 reflects a long history of bipartisan support for ACUS. Once again, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, LAMAR SMITH, a gentleman and a scholar, and the Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee Chairman HOWARD COBLE, a gentleman and a scholar as well, for working with me on this legislation, and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to secure final passage of H.R. 2480 by the other body. Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2480, as amended.

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. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING GREATER AUTHORITY AND DISCRETION TO CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2715) to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2715

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

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON LEAD IN CHILDREN'S PRODUCTS.

(a) PROSPECTIVE APPLICATION OF LEAD LIMIT FOR CHILDREN'S PRODUCTS.—Section 101(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 1278a(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) APPLICATION.—Each limit set forth in paragraph (2) (except for the limit set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B)) shall apply only to a children's product (as defined in section 3(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a))) that is manufactured after the effective date of such respective limit.''.

(b) ALTERNATIVE LIMITS AND EXCEPTIONS.—Section 101(b) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1278a(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) FUNCTIONAL PURPOSE EXCEPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, on its own initiative or upon petition by an interested party, shall grant an exception to the limit in subsection (a) for a specific product, class of product, material, or component part if the Commission, after notice and a hearing, determines that—

''(i) the product, class of product, material, or component part requires the inclusion of lead because it is not practicable or not technologically feasible to manufacture such product, class of product, material, or component part, as the case may be, in accordance with subsection (a) by removing the excessive lead or by making the lead inaccessible;

''(ii) the product, class of product, material, or component part is not likely to be placed in the mouth or ingested, taking into account normal and reasonably foreseeable use and abuse of such product, class of product, material, or component part by a child; and

''(iii) an exception for the product, class of product, material, or component part will have no measurable adverse effect on public health or safety, taking into account normal and reasonably foreseeable use and abuse.

''(B) MEASUREMENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), there is no measurable adverse effect on public health or safety if the exception described in subparagraph (A) will result in no measurable increase in blood lead levels of a child. The Commission may adopt an alternative method of measurement other than blood lead levels if it determines, after notice and a hearing, that such alternative method is a better scientific method for measuring adverse effect on public health and safety.

''(C) PROCEDURES FOR GRANTING EXCEPTION.—

''(i) BURDEN OF PROOF.—A party seeking an exception under subparagraph (A) has the burden of demonstrating that it meets the requirements of such subparagraph.

''(ii) GROUNDS FOR DECISION.—In the case where a party has petitioned for an exception, in determining whether to grant the exception, the Commission may base its decision solely on the materials presented by the party seeking the exception and any materials received through notice and a hearing.

''(iii) ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE.—In demonstrating that it meets the requirements of subparagraph (A), a party seeking an exception under such subparagraph may rely on any nonproprietary information submitted by any other party seeking such an exception and such information shall be considered part of the record presented by the party that relies on that information.

''(iv) SCOPE OF EXCEPTION.—If an exception is sought for an entire product, the burden is on the petitioning party to demonstrate that the criteria in subparagraph (A) are met with respect to every accessible component or accessible material of the product.

''(D) LIMITATION ON EXCEPTION.—If the Commission grants an exception for a product, class of product, material, or component part under subparagraph (A), the Commission may, as necessary to protect public health or safety—

''(i) establish a lead limit that such product, class of product, material, or component part may not exceed; or

''(ii) place a manufacturing expiration date on such exception or establish a schedule after which the manufacturer of such product, class of product, material, or component part shall be in full compliance with the limit established under clause (i) or the limit set forth in subsection (a).

''(E) APPLICATION OF EXCEPTION.—An exception under subparagraph (A) for a product, class of product, material, or component part shall apply regardless of the date of manufacture unless the Commission expressly provides otherwise.

''(F) PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED PETITIONS.—A party seeking an exception under this paragraph may rely on materials previously submitted in connection with a petition for exclusion under this section. In such cases, petitioners must notify the Commission of their intent to rely on materials previously submitted. Such reliance does not affect petitioners' obligation to demonstrate that they meet all requirements of this paragraph as required by subparagraph (C)(i).'';

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''include to,'' and inserting ''include''; and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (8) and inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) EXCEPTION FOR OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to an off-highway vehicle.

''(B) OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'off-highway vehicle'—

''(i) means any motorized vehicle—

''(I) that is manufactured primarily for use off public streets, roads, and highways;

''(II) designed to travel on 2, 3, or 4 wheels; and

''(III) that has either—

''(aa) a seat designed to be straddled by the operator and handlebars for steering control; or

''(bb) a nonstraddle seat, steering wheel, seat belts, and roll-over protective structure; and

''(ii) includes a snowmobile.

''(6) BICYCLES AND RELATED PRODUCTS.—In lieu of the lead limits established in subsection (a)(2), the limits set forth for each respective material in the notice of the Commission entitled 'Notice of Stay of Enforcement Pertaining to Bicycles and Related Products', published June 30, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 31254), shall apply to any metal component part of the products to which the stay of enforcement described in such notice applies, except that after December 31, 2011, the limits set forth in such notice shall not be more than 300 parts per million total lead content by weight for any metal component part of the products to which such stay pertains.

''(7) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN USED CHILDREN'S PRODUCTS.—

''(A) GENERAL EXCLUSION.—The lead limits established under subsection (a) shall not apply to a used children's product.

''(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'used children's product' means a children's product (as defined in section 3(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)) that was obtained by the seller for use and not for the purpose of resale or was

obtained by the seller, either directly or indirectly, from a person who obtained such children's product for use and not for the purpose of resale. Such term also includes a children's product that was donated to the seller for charitable distribution or resale to support charitable purposes. Such term shall not include—

''(i) children's metal jewelry;

''(ii) any children's product for which the donating party or the seller has actual knowledge that the product is in violation of the lead limits in this section; or

''(iii) any other children's product or product category that the Commission determines, after notice and a hearing.

For purposes of this definition, the term 'seller' includes a person who lends or donates a used children's product.''.

SEC. 2. APPLICATION OF THIRD PARTY TESTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 14(d) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2063(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), by striking ''random'' and inserting ''representative''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REDUCING THIRD PARTY TESTING BURDENS.—

''(A) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Commission shall seek public comment on opportunities to reduce the cost of third party testing requirements consistent with assuring compliance with any applicable consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation. The request for public comment shall include the following:

''(i) The extent to which the use of materials subject to regulations of another government agency that requires third party testing of those materials may provide sufficient assurance of conformity with an applicable consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation without further third party testing.

''(ii) The extent to which modification of the certification requirements may have the effect of reducing redundant third party testing by or on behalf of 2 or more importers of a product that is substantially similar or identical in all material respects.

''(iii) The extent to which products with a substantial number of different components subject to third party testing may be evaluated to show compliance with an applicable rule, ban, standard, or regulation by third party testing of a subset of such components selected by a third party conformity assessment body.

''(iv) The extent to which manufacturers with a substantial number of substantially similar products subject to third party testing may reasonably make use of sampling procedures that reduce the overall test burden without compromising the benefits of third party testing.

''(v) The extent to which evidence of conformity with other national or international governmental standards may provide assurance of conformity to consumer product safety rules, bans, standards, or regulations applicable under this Act.

''(vi) The extent to which technology, other than the technology already approved by the Commission, exists for third party conformity assessment bodies to test or to screen for testing consumer products subject to a third party testing requirement.

''(vii) Other techniques for lowering the cost of third party testing consistent with assuring compliance with the applicable consumer product safety rules, bans, standards, and regulations.

''(B) REGULATIONS.—Following the public comment period described in subparagraph (A), but not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Commission shall review the public comments and may prescribe new or revised third party testing regulations if it determines that such regulations will reduce third party testing costs consistent with assuring compliance with the applicable consumer product safety rules, bans, standards, and regulations.

''(C) REPORT.—If the Commission determines that it lacks authority to implement an opportunity for reducing the costs of third-party testing consistent with assuring compliance with the applicable consumer product safety rules, bans, standards, and regulations, it shall transmit a report to Congress reviewing those opportunities, along with any recommendations for any legislation to permit such implementation.

''(4) SPECIAL RULES FOR SMALL BATCH MANUFACTURERS.—

''(A) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION; EXEMPTION.—

''(i) CONSIDERATION; ALTERNATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—Subject to subparagraph (C), in implementing third party testing requirements under this section, the Commission shall take into consideration any economic, administrative, or other limits on the ability of small batch manufacturers to comply with such requirements and shall, after notice and a hearing, provide alternative testing requirements for covered products manufactured by small batch manufacturers in lieu of those required under subsection (a) or (b). Any such alternative requirements shall provide for reasonable methods to assure compliance with any applicable consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation. The Commission may allow such alternative testing requirements for small batch manufacturers with respect to a specific product or product class or with respect to a specific safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation, or portion thereof.

''(ii) EXEMPTION.—If the Commission determines that no alternative testing requirement is available or economically practicable, it shall exempt small batch manufacturers from third party testing requirements under subsections (a) and (b).

''(iii) CERTIFICATION.—In lieu of or as part of any alternative testing requirements provided under clause (i), the Commission may allow certification of a product to an applicable consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation, or portion thereof, based on documentation that the product complies with another national or international governmental standard or safety requirement that the Commission determines is the same or more stringent than the consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation, or portion thereof. Any such certification shall only be allowed to the extent of the equivalency with a consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation and not to any other part of the consumer product safety rule, ban, standard, or regulation.

''(iv) RESTRICTION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), and except where the Commission determines that the manufacturer does not meet the definition of a small batch manufacturer, for any small batch manufacturer registered pursuant to subparagraph (B), the Commission may not require third party testing of a covered product by a third party conformity assessment body until the Commission has provided either an alternative testing requirement or an exemption in accordance with clause (i) or (ii), respectively.

''(B) REGISTRATION.—Any small batch manufacturer that utilizes alternative requirements or an exemption under this paragraph shall register with the Commission prior to using such alternative requirements or exemptions pursuant to any guidelines issued by the Commission to carry out this requirement.

''(C) LIMITATION.—The Commission shall not provide or permit to continue in effect any alternative requirements or exemption from third party testing requirements under this paragraph where it determines, based on notice and a hearing, that full compliance with subsection (a) or (b) is reasonably necessary to protect public health or safety. The Commission shall not provide any alternative requirements or exemption for—

''(i) any of the third party testing requirements described in clauses (i) through (v) of subsection (a)(3)(B); or

''(ii) durable infant or toddler products, as defined in section 104(f) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 2056a(f)).

''(D) SUBSEQUENT MANUFACTURER.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect third party testing or any other requirements with respect to a subsequent manufacturer or other entity that uses components provided by one or more small batch manufacturers.

''(E) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) the term 'covered product' means a consumer product manufactured by a small batch manufacturer where no more than 7,500 units of the same product were manufactured in the previous calendar year; and

''(ii) the term 'small batch manufacturer' means a manufacturer that had no more than $1,000,000 in total gross revenue from sales of all consumer products in the previous calendar year. The dollar amount contained in this paragraph shall be adjusted annually by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers published by the Department of Labor.

For purposes of determining the total gross revenue for all sales of all consumer products of a manufacturer under this subparagraph, such total gross revenue shall be considered to include all gross revenue from all sales of all consumer products of each entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such manufacturer. The Commission shall take steps to ensure that all relevant business affiliations are considered in determining whether or not a manufacturer meets this definition.

''(5) EXCLUSION FROM THIRD PARTY TESTING.—

''(A) CERTAIN PRINTED MATERIALS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The third party testing requirements established under subsection (a) shall not apply to ordinary books or ordinary paper-based printed materials.

''(ii) DEFINITIONS.—

''(I) ORDINARY BOOK.—The term 'ordinary book' means a book printed on paper or cardboard, printed with inks or toners, and bound and finished using a conventional method, and that is intended to be read or has educational value. Such term does not include books with inherent play value, books designed or intended for a child 3 years of age or younger, and does not include any toy or other article that is not a book that is sold or packaged with an ordinary book.

''(II) ORDINARY PAPER-BASED PRINTED MATERIALS.—The term 'ordinary paper-based printed materials' means materials printed on paper or cardboard, such as magazines, posters, greeting cards, and similar products, that are printed with inks or toners and bound and finished using a conventional method.

''(III) EXCLUSIONS.—Such terms do not include books or printed materials that contain components that are printed on material other than paper or cardboard or contain nonpaper-based components such as metal or plastic parts or accessories that are not part of the binding and finishing materials used in a conventional method.

''(B) METAL COMPONENT PARTS OF BICYCLES.—The third party testing requirements established under subsection (a) shall not apply to metal component parts of bicycles with respect to compliance with the lead content limits in place pursuant to section 101(b)(6) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008.''.

(b) PROHIBITED ACT.—Section 19(a)(14) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2068(a)(14)) is amended by striking the period and inserting '', or to subdivide the production of any children's product into small quantities that have the effect of evading any third party testing requirements under section 14(a)(2);''.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF AND PROCESS FOR UPDATING DURABLE NURSERY PRODUCTS STANDARDS.

(a) UPDATING STANDARD.—Section 104(b) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 2056a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) PROCESS FOR CONSIDERING SUBSEQUENT REVISIONS TO VOLUNTARY STANDARD.—

''(A) NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF VOLUNTARY STANDARD.—When the Commission promulgates a consumer product safety standard under this subsection that is based, in whole or in part, on a voluntary standard, the Commission shall notify the organization that issued the voluntary standard of the Commission's action and shall provide a copy of the consumer product safety standard to the organization.

''(B) COMMISSION ACTION ON REVISED VOLUNTARY STANDARD.—If an organization revises a standard that has been adopted, in whole or in part, as a consumer product safety standard under this subsection, it shall notify the Commission. The revised voluntary standard shall be considered to be a consumer product safety standard issued by the Commission under section 9 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2058), effective 180 days after the date on which the organization notifies the Commission (or such later date specified by the Commission in the Federal Register) unless, within 90 days after receiving that notice, the Commission notifies the organization that it has determined that the proposed revision does not improve the safety of the consumer product covered by the standard and that the Commission is retaining the existing consumer product safety standard.''.

(b) APPLICATION OF STANDARD.—Section 104(c) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 2056a(c)) is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4) and inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) APPLICATION OF ANY REVISION.—With respect to any revision of the standard promulgated under subsection (b)(1)(B) subsequent to the initial promulgation of a standard under such subsection, paragraph (1) shall apply only to a person that manufactures or imports cribs, unless the Commission determines that application to any other person described in paragraph (2) is necessary to protect against an unreasonable risk to health or safety. If the Commission determines that application to a person described in paragraph (2) is necessary, it shall provide not less than 12 months for such person to come into compliance.''.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF SECTION 106 TO FDA-REGULATED PRODUCTS.

Section 106(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 2056b(a)) is amended by inserting ''or any provision that restates or incorporates a regulation promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration or any statute administered by the Food and Drug Administration'' after ''or by statute''.

SEC. 5. APPLICATION OF PHTHALATES LIMIT.

(a) ACCESSIBLE, PLASTICIZED COMPONENT PARTS.—Section 108 of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 2057c) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (e) as subsections (e) through (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) APPLICATION.—Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, subsections (a) and (b)(1) and any rule promulgated under subsection (b)(3) shall apply to any plasticized component part of a children's toy or child care article or any other component part of a children's toy or child care article that is made of other materials that may contain phthalates.

''(d) EXCLUSION FOR INACCESSIBLE COMPONENT PARTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The prohibitions established under subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to any component part of a children's toy or child care article that is not accessible to a child through normal and reasonably foreseeable use and abuse of such product, as determined by the Commission. A component part is not accessible under this paragraph if such component part is not physically exposed by reason of a sealed covering or casing and does not become physically exposed through reasonably foreseeable use and abuse of the product. Reasonably foreseeable use and abuse shall include swallowing, mouthing, breaking, or other children's activities, and the aging of the product.

''(2) LIMITATION.—The Commission may revoke an exclusion or all exclusions granted under paragraph (1) at any time and require that any or all component parts manufactured after such exclusion is revoked comply with the prohibitions established under subsections (a) and (b) if the Commission finds, based on scientific evidence, that such compliance is necessary to protect the public health or safety.

''(3) INACCESSIBILITY PROCEEDING.—Within 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall—

''(A) promulgate a rule providing guidance with respect to what product components, or classes of components, will be considered to be inaccessible for purposes of paragraph (1); or

''(B) adopt the same guidance with respect to inaccessibility that was adopted by the Commission with regards to accessibility of lead under section 101(b)(2)(B), with additional consideration, as appropriate, of whether such component can be placed in a child's mouth.

''(4) APPLICATION PENDING COMMISSION GUIDANCE.—Until the Commission promulgates a rule pursuant to paragraph (3), the determination of whether a product component is inaccessible to a child shall be made in accordance with the requirements laid out in paragraph (1) for considering a component to be inaccessible to a child.''.

SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO MODIFY TRACKING LABELS REQUIREMENT.

Section 14(a)(5) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2063(a)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Effective 1 year'' and inserting ''(A) Effective 1 year'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) The Commission may, by regulation, exclude a specific product or class of products from the requirements in subparagraph (A) if the Commission determines that it is not practicable for such product or class of products to bear the marks required by such subparagraph. The Commission may establish alternative requirements for any product or class of products excluded under the preceding sentence consistent with the purposes described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 7. IMPROVED PRODUCT IDENTIFICATION FOR PUBLIC DATABASE.

Section 6A(c) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2055a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A), by inserting ''or paragraph (5)'' after ''paragraph (4)(A)'';

(2) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''determines that the information in such report or comment is materially inaccurate, the Commission shall—'' and inserting ''receives notice that the information in such report or comment is materially inaccurate, the Commission shall stay the publication of the report on the database as required under paragraph (3) for a period of no more than 5 additional days. If the Commission determines that the information in such report or comment is materially inaccurate, the Commission shall—''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) OBTAINING CERTAIN PRODUCT IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission receives a report described in subsection (b)(1)(A) that does not include the model or serial number of the consumer product concerned, the Commission shall seek from the individual or entity submitting the report such model or serial number or, if such model or serial number is not available, a photograph of the product. If the Commission obtains information relating to the serial or model number of the product or a photograph of the product, it shall immediately forward such information to the manufacturer of the product. The Commission shall make the report available in the database on the 15th business day after the date on which the Commission transmits the report under paragraph (1) and shall include in the database any additional information about the product obtained under this paragraph.

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to—

''(i) permit the Commission to delay transmission of the report under paragraph (1) until the Commission has obtained the model or serial number or a photograph of the consumer product concerned; or

''(ii) make inclusion in the database of a report described in subsection (b)(1)(A) contingent on the availability of the model or serial number or a photograph of the consumer product concerned.''.

SEC. 8. SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.

Section 27(b) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2076(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''and physical'' after ''documentary'';

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking ''and'';

(3) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10) and inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

''(9) to delegate to the general counsel of the Commission the authority to issue subpoenas solely to Federal, State, or local government agencies for evidence described in paragraph (3); and''; and

(4) in paragraph (10) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''(except as provided in paragraph (9))'' after ''paragraph (3)''.

SEC. 9. DEADLINE FOR RULE BY CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION ON STANDARDS FOR ALL TERRAIN VEHICLES.

The Commission shall issue the final rule described in section 42(d) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2089(d)) not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 10. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) CPSA.—Section 14 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2063) is further amended by redesignating the second subsection (d) as subsection (i).

(b) CPSIA.—Section 101(a)(1) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (15 U.S.C. 1278a(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''(as defined in section 3(a)(16) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(16)))'' and inserting ''(as defined in section 3(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)))''.

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as provided otherwise, the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1250

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2715, a bill that modifies the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008, also called CPSIA, and provides relief to address a number of unintended consequences that arose after CPSIA became law.

This bill is a win-win. It is good for American consumers and American businesses as well. It is also a bipartisan bill. And I want to thank Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman UPTON, as well as Ranking Member WAXMAN and my counterpart, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for all of their hard work in getting this important bill to the floor today.

We passed CPSIA almost unanimously in 2008, and many of its features have advanced the cause of children's safety. But there also have been unintended consequences for many businesses, small and large alike. For 3 years now, we have heard the pleas of these businesses, asking for relief from the CPSIA mandates. We have also heard from the CPSC that it lacks the authority and flexibility to grant relief where needed.

On August 14, the last deadline looms, the final drop-down to the 0.01 percent lead content limit. Without swift action, we face empty store shelves that have been cleared of perfectly safe products because of what I believe was simply a drafting oversight. The bill makes the August 14 limit prospective in nature, permitting retailers to sell their existing inventory so long as it was made prior to August 14 and is compliant with the current lead limit of 0.03 percent, which was specifically approved by Congress for the last 2 years.

In a true spirit of bipartisanship, Ranking Members WAXMAN and BUTTERFIELD agreed to act swiftly to address this situation. While we don't necessarily agree on the best way to address all of the unintended consequences of CPSIA, we move the bill in response to the enormous threat facing stakeholders in the children's product industry in just less than 2 weeks.

In addition to addressing the immediate deadline, this bill goes a little farther to address the pain so many of our constituents are facing. ATVs, bikes, books, things that were never intended to be covered by the law but were ensnared by its wide reach nonetheless, will no longer face an uncertain future and are exempted from testing requirements.

Used children's products were also banned for sale as a result of the 2008 law. Thrift stores and charity retail outlets such as Goodwill Industries and even the local church bazaars were forced to toss anything made for a child under the age of 12 because it is impossible to tell whether an item was made in compliance with the law without its original packing or a dated sales receipt. As a result, the law essentially made all used children's products contraband. This wasteful result removed perfectly safe products from the reach of individuals who rely on the value and savings such stores provide in order to provide decent clothing for their children.

Manufacturers of other products will also see some relief from the most costly mandate of the CPSIA—third-party testing and the continuing compliance testing. This bill directs CPSC to seek comments within 60 days on how the current third-party testing regime can be altered to reduce costs.

Small batch manufacturers, who were among the hardest hit by CPSIA, will also find some relief in this bill. These manufacturers are generally stay-at-home moms with an entrepreneurial spirit or mom-and-pop retail outlets that handpick unique toys and other items for sale in their community. Almost universally, these small businesses got into business because they wanted to ensure their own children had safe toys. Almost universally, these small businesses have either closed shop or are on the verge of closing shop because of the onerous requirements of the CPSIA and the costs imposed.

The bill directs the Consumer Product Safety Commission to address the special situation of these businesses by finding alternative, more affordable testing methods or by exempting these businesses from testing altogether if no such alternative exists.

The bill creates a functional purpose exception process that we hope will give the CPSC more flexibility to exempt products from lead limits where there is no health risk. The exception process created in the original CPSIA has failed to permit a single exception for any children's product from the statutory lead limits established in the CPSIA, even in cases where the CPSC determined that such products pose no risk to children.

We have a narrow window of opportunity to address those mandates that threaten the survival of scores of businesses and the livelihoods of the individuals and families those businesses support. And I would like to thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, as well as the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WAXMAN, as well as their staffs for working throughout the weekend to find a compromise that we both can support.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of this very important bill. Almost 3 years ago, President Bush signed H.R. 4040, the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act, into law. While that bill passed this House by a vote of 424 to 1, it soon became evident to all of us that providing some of the extraordinary protections for children in that bill would be a challenge for some businesses, especially our smallest manufacturers. Many of them testified before our subcommittee, and we heard their concerns.

So I have worked very closely with Chairman BONO MACK in crafting this compromise to provide targeted and sensible relief for businesses from some of CPSIA's requirements without sacrificing the health and safety of our children. I am pleased that we are able to present it to the House today for immediate consideration. The bill is a marked change from where we started with H.R. 1939, and I am pleased with the bipartisan changes reflected in today's bill.

Businesses are provided with relief through prospective application of the 100 parts per million lead content limits. That means, Mr. Speaker, businesses won't have to pull products from store shelves that meet the current legal limit of 300 parts per million on the effective date of the 100 parts per million limit. We also include an exemption for off-road vehicles, like ATVs, snowmobiles, and dirt bikes, from meeting the lead content limit. The safety of our young people is paramount when designing and building off-road vehicles, and constructing strong, rigid parts for these vehicles often requires more lead than CPSIA would otherwise allow.

Further, the bill codifies a stay of enforcement by the CPSC with respect to the lead content limit of bicycles until

December 31, 2011, and relaxes the ultimate lead content of bicycles to 300 parts per million.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides significant relief for small batch manufacturers. I have a tremendous amount of respect for America's small businesses and believe we must do all we can to protect them from overly burdensome regulations. At the same time, though, we have an obligation to protect America's children from potentially dangerous products. The only way to know if those products are safe is to test them.

Taking the unique circumstances of small batch manufacturers, the bill requires CPSC, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, to consider potential economic and administrative burdens to small batch manufacturers when developing third-party testing requirements. It further permits the CPSC to provide alternative testing requirements. After notice and a hearing, if the commission determines there is no economically practicable alternative, they can exempt the product from third-party testing altogether.

I am pleased that this bill provides specific relief from testing for ordinary books and magazines. Our colleague, Mr. EDOLPHUS TOWNS from New York, has been concerned about ordinary books becoming an unintended consequence of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act. Manufacturers of ordinary books and magazines should not be subject to third-party testing. Still subject to testing will be books that have plastic parts, like pop-up books, those with nonpaper-based accessories, or anything else that has inherent play value.

I strongly support the consumer product safety information database created by H.R. 4040, and that has been somewhat controversial. But I support the database creation. It went live earlier this year and has been extremely successful in helping to educate the public about potentially unsafe products. This bill takes some sensible steps to make the database even more effective.

The bill requires the commission, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, to seek out more information about the products reported by consumers to the database, like a product's serial number, a model number, or a photograph of the product in question. I think the more information that is provided, the better and more effective the database will be for consumers and businesses alike.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I support this bill. I believe it provides a strong compromise that will reduce burdens on businesses and continue to protect American consumers.

□ 1300

Again, I want to thank our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Chairwoman BONO MACK, for working with me in a bipartisan fashion to find solutions, commonsense, practical solutions for the American people.

I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the full committee, the ranking member of the full committee, all of the stakeholders who had a part in crafting this compromise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

Mr. REHBERG. First of all, Madam Chairman, thank you for the fine work on this piece of legislation, something that's truly overdue.

Mr. Speaker, the difficulty we had was a number of years ago, a piece of legislation went through this Congress with all the right things attached. We wanted to address lead in children's toys. True to Washington, D.C., form, the bureaucrats carried it to the extent that no longer made any kind of a common sense.

When it came to time for the regulations to be crafted, I started receiving phone calls from my motorized vehicle dealers around the State of Montana, those that sold youth motorcycles, snowmobiles and ATVs, and they were being told that they had to take those units out of their showroom, eat the inventory, and could no longer sell their parts for repairs. Why? Because there was lead in some of the repair parts or on the units themselves.

Now, I don't know if there is anybody in America that allows their children to chew on battery cables and valve stems, but they were determined to be toys, and it doesn't make sense. I come from a ranching family, and on my place we allow our children the opportunity to be trained on the smaller units to herd our livestock for the specific purpose that we don't want them on the larger vehicles. Try as we might to get the administration to change their regulations, they were not willing to do that.

Today we are dealing with H.R. 2715, and it addresses a very important issue, kids just want to ride. They want the opportunity to ride the motorized vehicles, whether it is a snowmobile, a 4-wheeler or an ATV, for the specific purpose not just of recreation, but in a work setting as well.

Because we could not make this change, we had to do it legislatively. We were successful in putting on riders on the appropriations bill year after year that said no money could be spent on the enforcement of this particular piece of legislation and the rules and regulations that were crafted thereafter. We will no longer have to do that with the passage of this bill.

So it's with a great deal of appreciation that I say to Mrs. BONO MACK, thank you for bringing this piece of legislation forward; for the minority, thank you for your kind support as well in helping to move this forward and ultimately we can make the right commonsense decision, and that is to remove this aspect of this onerous regulation so once again, a kid, children, can ride the right vehicles so they won't be on the larger 4-wheel units, the larger snowmobiles and the larger motorcycles.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman from Montana for working with us in crafting this compromise, and I hope he is satisfied with the ATV component. He has worked very hard and his staff has worked very hard to bring it to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of our full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008.

The 2008 act was a historic piece of legislation, both because of the landmark health and safety protections in that bill for young children and because of the near unanimous support for that legislation from Democrats and Republicans. And it has been a success.

Because of the Consumer Product Safety Act, we now have in place basic safety standards for keeping toxic lead and phthalates out of children's products. The CPSC has made long overdue revisions to safety standards for cribs. Manufacturers and retailers have begun the process of testing to make sure children's products are proven safe before they have been put on the store shelves and into the hands of children.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission, after years of atrophy due to budget cuts and neglect, has been reinvigorated and become proactive, rather than reactive. As a result, we have seen a decline in the number of children's products that have to be pulled from homes and store shelves. The agency is intercepting more dangerous products at the border.

And, finally, the American public has since March had access to consumer product safety information in a database that they can review about injuries from consumer products. Consumers now have free and open access to information that for too long remained hidden inside the CPSC.

But like any law, the 2008 act had some rough edges that needed to be smoothed out.

For example, there are some products that require a small amount of lead to maintain their strength and durability and don't pose a serious threat to public health or safety. ATVs and bicycles are examples of these.

Some businesses expressed concern that they could find themselves with inventory that meets the current legal limit of 300 parts per million that can no longer be sold when the limit drops to 100 parts per million on August 14, just 2 weeks away.

The smallest of small businesses are worried that they can't bear the cost of complying with these requirements in the way that larger businesses can.

This bill addresses these concerns without jeopardizing our children's

safety. It is a compromise bill in the best sense.

Some Members on the other side wanted bigger changes to the 2008 act and some Members on our side do not believe every provision in the bill is needed. But thanks to the hard work of my colleagues, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BARTON and Mr. DINGELL, and the leadership of Chairman UPTON, we have arrived at a bill that I can support and urge my colleagues to join in supporting as well.

I think we have struck the right balance. We have fixed valid problems and keep in place valuable health and safety protections for children. That has been my primary goal throughout this process.

It was a long road to get to this place and after many hours and many months of tough negotiating, what we have here is a compromise that epitomizes bipartisanship. Neither side got everything it wanted, but both sides gave up enough that we were able to come up with something that was sensible and reasonable and that we can move quickly through this body. I hope the Senate sees it that way and can move quickly on this bill.

We all share the belief that American businesses should be able to grow and flourish. I also think we all share the belief that consumers, especially children, deserve safe products.

Again, I commend Chairwoman BONO MACK and Chairman UPTON for their willingness to hear us out and to work with us. I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD for fighting for a balanced approach that keeps large and small businesses competitive and continues to keep our children safe from potentially dangerous products.

I also want to thank the other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee that have been active and helped us to get to today, including Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. ESHOO.

Mrs. BONO MACK. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't appear that I have any other speakers on this side. I think their attention might be directed in another direction today; so I am prepared to close.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the individuals, all of the Members, all of the staff who have played a part in crafting this compromise. It's a good bipartisan compromise that we can all live with. I look forward to the President signing it into law after the Senate passes it, hopefully very soon, and hopefully our small businesses will be able to continue to be profitable.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I also just want to echo the sentiments of both my colleagues who just spoke about the importance of this bill and thank them for their cooperation and the hard work that they put into this over the weekend. Again, I would like to thank the staffs of both the minority and the majority side.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise as an original co-sponsor and in strong support of H.R. 2715, a bill that will fix many of the unintended consequences of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act (CPSIA) of 2008. I, along with my colleagues, Messrs. RUSH, BARTON, WHITFIELD, and WAXMAN, helped write CPSIA in response to the massive influx of dangerous and tainted Chinese imports during what some have termed ''the summer of recalls'' in 2007. The House's bill was negotiated in a bipartisan manner. It was reported favorably by the Committee on Energy and Commerce through a unanimous vote and then passed by the full House, 407–1. Then our dear friends in the Senate got hold of the bill, and we have been trying to fix the mess ever since.

Although this process has taken over two-and-a-half years, I am pleased that H.R. 2715 will solve in great measure the problems CPSIA has caused. This bill will ensure that CPSIA's lead limits are prospective. It will put in place a waiver process to exempt from CPSIA's lead limits products that do not pose a danger to children's health and safety. H.R. 2715 will make the common-sense clarification that CPSIA's lead limits do not apply to bicycles, all-terrain vehicles (ATVs), and books. Finally, the bill will allow the Commission discretion to prescribe alternative third-party testing requirements with a view toward helping smaller businesses with more finite resources comply with the law. It bears mentioning that all of these changes will not undo the strict protections built into CPSIA to keep kids safe from dangerous products.

H.R. 2715's significant improvements to CPSIA come as a result of bipartisan negotiation and cooperation. Despite the turmoil and rancor in Congress over the past few months, this bill shows that the House of Representatives can still legislate and do so in a manner befitting our Founding Fathers' vision of representative government. I would like to thank my friends and colleagues, Messrs. UPTON, WAXMAN, and BUTTERFIELD for their fine work on H.R. 2715. Mrs. BONO MACK, in particular, deserves praise and congratulations for her success on this bill, her first as Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade. Although often overlooked, the work of staff on H.R. 2715 demands deserved recognition, especially that of Gib Mullan and Michelle Ash, Republican and Democratic counsels, respectively. Their steadfast determination and hard work have made this bill a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 2715 and in so doing help put CPSIA's long and storied legislative sage to rest. We should all support this bill with the knowledge that it—in a manner pleasing to Hippocrates—will do no harm. I pray our colleagues in the other body will adhere to this principle in their expeditious consideration of H.R. 2715.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bi-partisan legislation that will help protect consumers against dangerous products that may do them harm. This legislation affects a broad spectrum of our economy, from the manufacturers of toys to the children that play with them. I am truly delighted that Democrats and Republicans were able to come together to support a plan to increase the safety of all children's products manufactured in this country. I am also pleased that this bipartisan agreement addresses some of the unintended consequences of the original legislation without sacrificing the safety requirements that I believe are necessary to protect our children.

Our committee has had several months of consultation with industry officials to alleviate the burden placed on them by the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act's (CPSIA) new standards and regulations. These common sense reforms such as allowing flexibility for the CPSC to exempt specific products and exclude certain used children's products were supported by many of the stakeholders that will be affected by the legislation we are considering today.

I again want to commend Chairman BONO MACK and Ranking Member BUTTERFIELD for coming together and bringing this improved legislation to the floor. I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on this legislation, I also urge my colleagues to continue to work together in the spirit of bi-partisanship to protect the standards of safety that our constituents demand of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2715.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

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 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2715, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 398, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1933, by the yeas and nays.

The first two electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING GREATER AUTHORITY AND DISCRETION TO CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2715) to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 683]

YEAS—421

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—2

Kucinich

NOT VOTING—9

Baca
Bachmann
Giffords
Gohmert
Green, Gene
Hinchey
Landry
Moore
Olver

□ 1428

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENDING IMMIGRATION STATUS PETITION AND INTERVIEW TIME REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 398) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 684]

YEAS—426

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)

Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Baca
Bachmann
Giffords
Green, Gene
Hinchey
Olver

□ 1446

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NON-IMMIGRANT NURSES VISA REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1933) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirements for admission of non-immigrant nurses in health professional shortage areas, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 17, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 685]

YEAS—407

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—17

Amash
Blackburn
Broun (GA)
DeFazio
DesJarlais
Duncan (TN)
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (GA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Nugent
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Rohrabacher
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—8

Baca
Bachmann
Duffy
Giffords
Green, Gene
Hinchey
Moore
Posey

□ 1454

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 365, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–190) on the resolution (H. Res. 384) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 365, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 384 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 384

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution 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) one hour of debate, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 15 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). 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, the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the 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 may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, after months and months of debate, we have arrived at the ultimate goal to which we are all committed: a bipartisan agreement to avert the debt ceiling crisis looming right before us. Even more importantly, we have crafted a plan that addresses the real underlying challenge of our ballooning national debt.

The bipartisan agreement before us today is an historic achievement. Mr. Speaker, this is the 76th time that we have raised the debt ceiling since 1962. Seventy-five times it has been raised. This is the 76th time. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is the very first time that we have done so while making corresponding cuts in spending that exceed the ceiling increase. To most of us, this is just good common sense. It's the only responsible thing to do. Yet 75 times before, no connection was made between the debt ceiling and efforts to tackle our debt.

With today's underlying legislation, we are fundamentally changing the way business is done here in Washington. We are setting a new precedent for fiscal discipline and accountability. This is a tremendous achievement that will have a profound and lasting impact on our budget and our economy in both the short, medium and long term. This is an especially critical point to focus on.

□ 1500

Today's legislation has dramatic implications for both the budget and our economy. Mr. Speaker, as you know very well, the two are inextricably linked. This is why our fiscal situation is so important. We don't need a balanced budget for the sake of a balanced budget, we need to balance our budget because job creation and economic growth depend on it.

There is a reason why the major credit agencies have said that our AAA credit rating is in jeopardy if we don't dramatically cut spending. Multitrillion-dollar deficits and a national debt that approaches 100 percent of GDP are not sustainable. Democrats and Republicans alike recognize that. If we want to inspire confidence in the U.S. economy, create jobs, and restore our position as the world's most vital and dynamic economy, we absolutely must chart a new fiscal course.

The bipartisan agreement that we will consider today does just that. It makes meaningful, immediate spending cuts. It sets up a process that guarantees votes in both Chambers by Thanksgiving on an even bigger package. This will give us the time necessary to go beyond cuts to significant new reforms. That includes reforming entitlement programs to keep them solvent and ensure that they don't force us back onto a path of spiraling deficits and debt.

Mr. Speaker, by setting up this process, we can responsibly make the hard but essential choices that will restore our economy and unleash its power to create new opportunities for Americans. The underlying legislation will also impose additional automatic cuts, should Congress fail to continue on a path to real reform.

Mr. Speaker, we are all in this together, Democrat and Republican alike. We all stand to suffer tremendously if we fail to either raise the debt ceiling or take this opportunity to fundamentally change course. We will all suffer if we fail to continue the process of meaningful reform. But by coming together and enacting real reform, by remaining committed to this joint effort into the future, we can all share in the benefits of a surging economy and job market. We can't approach a challenge of this magnitude as Republicans and Democrats first, but as fellow Americans who share a commitment to our prosperity as a Nation now and into the future.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, after a tense standoff over a self-inflicted crisis, I'm extremely disappointed with the solution that is being proposed today.

It's important that we raise the debt ceiling; in fact, it is the duty of every Member of Congress to ensure we pay our bills. Unfortunately, we have reached this point because some on the other side see paying our bills as optional and have asked a king's ransom for doing so. In the process, the majority has shown the world that our democracy is currently dysfunctional. Even if we avoid default, the process that got us to this point has already shown the world that the greatest nation on Earth can barely keep the lights on.

Recently, IMF Chief Christine Lagarde told CNN in not so many words that we are destroying the world's faith in our ability to be the most powerful economy on Earth and our ability to pay our bills. This dysfunction is only highlighted further by the proposed creation of a so-called ''Super Committee,'' a closed-door committee that will determine how to cut another $1 trillion in government spending while 523 elected Representatives are told to sit on the sidelines and vote up and down when all is said and done. I repeat what I said last week, my constituents did not send me to Congress to sit on sidelines while the most important issues of our time are being decided.

The crumbling faith in our democracy is already having an effect on our

economy. Just last week, Roll Call reported that the prolonged debate over raising the debt ceiling resulted in an increase in Federal borrowing costs—a fancy way to say that interest rates for car loans and home mortgages are higher now than they should have or would have been.

Furthermore, today's agreement does nothing to create jobs for the 25 million Americans who failed to find full-time jobs last month. On Friday, we will receive a jobs report that will provide even more evidence that while Congress has shrugged aside the urgent need to create jobs, millions of Americans continue to suffer. This bill does nothing to serve them.

The majority has steadfastly refused to consider a balanced approach to reducing our deficit, rejecting attempts to close tax loopholes for the rich and extend unemployment benefits for those unable to find work. Instead, they have decided to only consider the draconian cuts that threaten to reverse whatever fragile economic recovery is underway.

On Sunday, Mohamed El-Erian, the CEO of a major financial firm, spoke of the damage that proposed cuts will inflict on our economy. While speaking on ABC, he said, ''Unemployment will be higher than it would have been otherwise, growth will be lower than it would have been otherwise, and inequality will be worse than it would have been otherwise.'' He added, ''We have a very weak economy. Withdrawing more spending at this stage is going to make it even weaker.''

Today's agreement will endanger the potential for new jobs while asking absolutely nothing of those in our country who are the most well off.

Democrats will continue to vigorously fight for Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare to ensure that not a penny is cut from the checks of seniors and working people who rely on these programs every day. It is a contract.

We believe that ultimately we must take a balanced approach to reducing our deficit. Tax loopholes must be closed, and those who have benefited the most in this country must be asked to pay their fair share. And regardless of the outcome of today's bill, these are the priorities for which I will continue to fight.

Especially as the debt debate continues, I urge my colleagues to look towards a balanced approach and return this country to its rightful place as a shining example of democracy and equality for which we should once again aspire.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that this is a very unique moment for us. We have the ability to come together at a time when we are faced with a deadline. That deadline, as we all know, is midnight tomorrow.

The commitment that has been made to Social Security, Medicare, our veterans, and other programs is one which we, as Republicans, clearly stand by. And I've got to say that we know that since those programs have been put into place, when it comes to Social Security and Medicare, every working American has been forced to pay into the Medicare and Social Security funds through their FICA tax. By virtue of that contract that we have, we stand here strongly committed—contrary to what many people may say—to ensuring the solvency and the strength of Social Security for today's retirees and future generations as well. And I believe that this package that we have here today, that will enjoy bipartisan support, reaffirms that exact commitment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. RANGEL. My colleagues, I'm voting against the rule because, in the later years in this Congress, I've seen a whole lot of things, but it's never been this polarized, it's never been in terms of attacking a President, and it's never been risking the whole fiscal credibility of the great United States of America in order to make political gains.

Clearly, when everyone talks about everyone must make a sacrifice, I assume that we're talking about a sacrifice in cutting the budget, not receiving the benefits; the protections of some programs and not others. And then on the other side, I have to pause because I don't see any sacrifice. It's assumed by the general public that the sacrifice means that maybe if you became wealthy under the great support that you received from this country, that you'll make some small sacrifice; or maybe that sacrifice could be interpreted as that when you received preferential treatment in the Tax Code for all of these years, that you're willing to say I don't need it now, you were there when I needed you.

□ 1510

But I think it's safe to say that the American people will be making sacrifices, and they're making it for a crisis that they're so far away from.

The people that enjoyed the crisis in terms of financial gain are not asked even to say ''I'm sorry.'' And the people that really love, respect, and hope, and dream, that lost their homes and their jobs, their self-esteem, these are the ones that will make further sacrifices. Only this time it won't be the executive branch. It certainly won't be the courts. It would be our own colleagues, from the Senate and from the House. A group of ''super members'' will go into a room to decide for us what the next trillions of dollars is going to be cut from a budget.

And if they can't succeed, then there would be an automatic cut right across the board regardless of whether or not some programs should survive and others should be abolished.

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

Mr. DREIER. May I yield my friend an additional 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker, and I ask him to yield to me.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of this great committee. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the patriotism that you have shown not only to the committee and the Republican Party but to this great country over the years.

I'm just so sorry on this great occasion that you would take your chairmanship to produce a rule like this that Americans cannot see their way clear to say this has been fair and this has been equal.

I yield back the balance of my time. Thank you so much.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my friend, and I would like to have a discussion with him, if I might. I would yield an additional 30 seconds and ask him to yield to me, especially if he wants to continue.

Mr. RANGEL. I'm so sorry.

Mr. DREIER. I yielded time to my friend and then asked him to yield to me.

Mr. RANGEL. Oh, yes, I didn't understand you had made that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DREIER. I will yield an additional 30 seconds, and I would hope that he would continue what he was saying in the first half of his presentation about me rather than the last half.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that it is very clear that what we have before us is in fact a bipartisan agreement to do exactly what my friend at the end of his statement was saying. We want very much to ensure that people are able to keep their homes. We want to ensure that people are able to see their businesses thrive. We want job opportunities to be created for every American.

I know my friend agrees that getting our fiscal house in order, it is going to be critically important to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would say to my friend that frankly we're in a position where 75 times since 1962 we've increased the debt ceiling without focusing on the challenge of the debt itself.

Mr. RANGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you.

The answer to this problem is three things: jobs, jobs, and more jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I totally associate myself

with the remarks of my very good friend from New York and say that jobs, jobs, jobs continue to be our top priority. And I believe that this legislation before us is going to go a long way towards doing just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to 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, I think that my friend from California, the chairman, my friend from New York, the chairman emeritus, have it exactly right. The issue is jobs. And that's really what this bill on the floor today is about.

One of the reasons, but for sure not the only reason, that our companies aren't hiring and our economy is not growing is uncertainty about interest rates. If you're thinking about adding on a new store or hiring more people to do more R&D and you think the interest rates are going to rise, you don't to it. If you're not sure what they're going to do, you don't do it. And we've been living under a period of uncertainty for two reasons with respect to interest rates.

The first is are we going to default on our national obligations? The House today will and should emphatically say no, we will not. And then the second question is will Uncle Sam continue to eat up too much of the entrepreneurial capital in this country to finance ever-growing Federal deficits?

The House today will and should, in my view, approve the bill before us that will begin to make a reduction in that deficit. This bill will reduce our projected deficit by anywhere from 25 to 35 percent. And it's important to understand what history tells us about sincere and legitimate deficit reduction.

In 1993, President Bill Clinton's plan was supposed to reduce the deficit by 28 percent. It did not. It reduced the deficit entirely. That bill was supposed to generate $500 billion in deficit reduction. In fact, it generated $1.6 trillion in deficit reduction. That's the elixir that the American economy needs now.

And I do not, my colleagues, believe that this is the only step that we need to accomplish in order to reduce unemployment. But it is an essential step. And for that reason, I am pleased to join with both Republicans and Democrats in voting ''yes'' for this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. I would like to thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my friend for his very thoughtful statement.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would say to my friend, Mr. Speaker, that if we look back on the juxtaposition of that projected $500 billion in deficit reduction and the $1.6 trillion that we attained, we know why it is that that came about. It was gross domestic product growth. And my friend and I have been working together for many years focused on how it is that we can get our economy growing.

In so doing, I believe as we continue to focus on that, that we will be able to see benefits beyond those anticipated today when it comes to deficit reduction if we're able to generate—unfortunately, we have had 1.3 percent GDP growth reported from the last quarter. If we can get to 3, 4, 5 percent GDP growth, my friend knows very well that we're going to be in a position where we will be able to see an even greater reduction of the deficits in years to come.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I agree with him, and I think that we owe it to the country to find common ground on economic growth.

The best deficit reduction plan is full employment. And the best full employment plan will be one that we could come together on. I think today is an important first step. It came too late, it was ugly getting here, but I'm glad we got here.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for his very thoughtful remarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the gentlelady, my good friend from New York.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the rules of the House. The Sergeant of Arms is to remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Sergeant of Arms will restore order to the gallery.

The Sergeant at Arms will remove the disturbance from the gallery.

□ 1520

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had no idea that my pending remarks would lead to such a wellspring of apparent support.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the last rejoinder between the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from California, spending cuts at this level are not going to create any jobs. The idea that spending cuts and deficit reduction will lead to unprecedented economic prosperity is absolutely a false economic premise. Getting control of our fiscal house to make sure that we make productive investments and create jobs will create jobs.

With respect to the proposal underlying this rule, Mr. Speaker, there's plenty for members of both parties to find objectionable, and they might be right, but the choice before us is not that between this proposal and some platonic ideal. It is between this proposal and catastrophic default tomorrow.

Unlike the cynical bill this Chamber passed on a party-line vote last week, this bill commits America to meeting its obligations for the longer term, it leaves all options on the table, including revenue for the bipartisan committee this fall to further reduce the deficit, and having triggers, painful for both parties, adds real accountability and strict enforcement.

The American people understand we need a balance to restore fiscal responsibility and grow our economy. Recent GDP and manufacturing numbers are painful reminders, Mr. Speaker, of the fragility of our economy and its recovery, and the actions of House Republicans, sadly, have only exacerbated that by pulling back on key investments in infrastructure and innovation.

It's time to end the reckless game of chicken being waged here in this House. I commend President Obama and other leadership for leading the adult conversation to bring about this compromise. It is now time for us to do the responsible thing and bring to heel the wolf at the door.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that it is very interesting that as we have come together in a bipartisan way to address the crisis of increasing our debt ceiling, tackling the challenge of reducing the $14.3 trillion national debt that we have, we had this disruption in the gallery.

Now I turned around, Mr. Speaker, and looked up there, and I will tell you—I don't know if you saw the placard that they were carrying—it had in great big letters across it, Create Jobs. Create Jobs is the message that they had. And, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what we are doing, again working very diligently in a bipartisan way to ensure that we do just that.

With that, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to a hardworking member of the Committee on Rules, my good friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from California, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

I just did an interview with the TV station in my district. One of the questions that the interviewer asked is, ''What does this mean to the average person in your district? People are paying attention to what's going on in D.C.''

And I said, ''That's probably the best thing that's happened out of this whole debate, that people are paying attention. Had they been paying attention

the last 40 years, we wouldn't be in the situation that we're in.''

I then pointed out to her that in today's dollars, Federal spending per U.S. household went from $11,431 in 1965 to $29,401 in 2010. That tells us all that we need to know. The Federal Government is addicted to spending. We need to cut spending, not raise taxes, and this compromise bill does that.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from California said, we want to create jobs, and the best way to do that is to stop taking money out of the private sector, stop overtaxing the people in this country, leave that money in the private sector and allow it to be used to create jobs.

This is not a perfect bill. We all say it's not a perfect bill, both sides of the aisle. That generally means that it's a good bill because it's not perfect, and when people want compromise and they hear that, then they know that's right.

But the change in direction is historic. We're going from seeing how much money we can spend to how much can we cut. I am intrigued at a lot of my colleagues across the aisle, they've obviously been on the road to Damascus, because their whole language has changed in response to this bill, but I am glad they have finally seen the light and I hope in the future they're going to join us in more efforts like this.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Tea Party for extorting a deal made in their image and their image alone. The cuts will be deep, they will be lasting, and they will weaken an already depressed economy. What's clear is that the Tea Party is so ideologically driven to kill government that they're willing to kill the private sector, kill jobs, and kill growth in the process.

What's more, these cuts will be loaded onto the backs of seniors and the American middle class, all while asking the wealthiest among us to sacrifice nothing. Once again, the rich will feel no pain and the vulnerable will pay for their spoils.

Mr. Speaker, the process in which we got here has undermined our democratic system. While Democrats and the President negotiated in good faith, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle demonstrated a craven willingness to risk financial collapse for their extreme demands. As Democrats conceded time after time and provision after provision on this deal, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle just continued to issue new demands, all the while compromising nothing. Moreover, I am very concerned with the precedent set by this ''super committee'' whose establishment threatens our democratic process with its unconstitutional structure.

Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say if this bill passes, it may be the single worst piece of public policy to ever come out of this institution. I cannot support this rule, and I urge my Democratic colleagues not to be complicit in a Republican plan to eventually cut Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid and investment in our future, all while asking the rich to sacrifice nothing.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say to my fellow Angeleno that, while I've associated myself with the remarks of most of my other colleagues, I'm hard-pressed to associate myself with her remarks.

With that, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to another hardworking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Lawrenceville, Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I was excited to come down here today, because when I ran for Congress, there was just a short list of things that I wanted to do when I got here. I'm one of the new guys, one of this crowd of 96 new freshmen.

Two things among those: Number one, folks back home said we're spending too much. $1.091 trillion is how much we spent in discretionary spending in 2010. This bill that the Rules Committee brings to the floor today brings it down to $1.043 trillion, a $50 billion cut from 2 years ago, not decreasing the rate of growth but actually changing the trajectory of spending in this country. That's what folks back home said they wanted me to do.

Number two, I hold in my hand the United States Constitution. I turn to the back; conveniently enough in my edition, there's a little blank space after Amendment 27. There is space for Amendment 28, and for the first time in 15 years, this bill guarantees us a vote on a balanced budget amendment. If you don't trust your Members of Congress, trust your United States Constitution, and trust that this bill gives the American people a vote that they have not had in far too long.

□ 1530

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Collinsville, Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I am not coming down here to blame one side or the other for the financial position that we are in because we all have a part to play in the story, but this is a great day. I was also asked earlier about how I felt about today, and I told them I felt relieved.

I was afraid of the credit markets. I was afraid of rising interest rates. Whatever recovery we are having, I was afraid that it could stem that tide. So I do feel a great relief. This is one of the few times, in the 103 times that we have actually cut spending, when we tried in attempting to raise the debt limit. We can no longer continue to spend and borrow 42 cents of every dollar that we spend. It's ridiculous, and this is starting to change that process.

We are going to have discretionary cuts. We are going to have entitlement reforms.

I do like the supercommittee: bicameral, bipartisan, equally divided. When have we had a committee where we have equally divided the decision-making not upon majority and minority side, but equally divided, three Republicans, three Democrats in the House; three Republicans, three Democrats in the Senate? If this committee can't start addressing our entitlement reforms, then I am afraid we are never going to do it.

So I have great faith in my colleagues who will be put on this committee. We really have to make the great choices.

I appreciate the Rules Committee for bringing this to the floor, and my good friend, DAVID DREIER. And I hope that we will continue to move forward, pass the rule, and pass the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself 30 seconds to comment on the supercommittee.

When was the last time we had a bipartisan group like that? Simpson-Bowles, which got absolutely nowhere; the Gang of Six in the Senate, again which got absolutely nowhere. And six and six, I can imagine what it is going to be like to get somebody to be the seventh vote on the other side.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is a great big difference between the commissions that have been established in the past and the fact that this is a congressional committee, for the first time made up of our colleagues from the House and the Senate.

The gentlewoman is absolutely right. These outside commissions that have been there have made recommendations and they have gone virtually nowhere.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. If I may respond to the gentleman, I don't think the Gang of Six was any outside committee.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend from New York for yielding to me.

I rise today in opposition to the Budget Control Act amendment. Over the past months, I have been urging for a clean vote to raise the debt ceiling, a vote that has taken place 75 times since FDR was President, 18 times under Reagan, eight times under Bush. And I think that's what we should have done, and then put our heads together.

You see, I disagree with my friends on the other side of the aisle. It isn't just entitlement reform that we need;

although, we do need entitlement reform. It isn't just for government to spend less that we need; although, we do need government to spend less.

But what happened to fairness? Why are we asking this bill to balance our budget on the backs of the middle class and poor people? Why do we not have anything in this bill that makes millionaires and billionaires, who can afford to pay a little bit more, pay a little bit more? Why don't we close tax loopholes so that Big Oil and gas and other corporations pay their fair share? Why don't we do any of that whatsoever?

So this bill is unbalanced to begin with. Now we are talking about some supercommittee, even amounts of Democrats and Republicans, even amounts from the Senate and the House. To me, that's a recipe for gridlock. And I guarantee you, my colleagues, we're going to be here at that point after Thanksgiving when nothing is going to happen, and we are going to wind up with entitlement cuts that are going to hurt my seniors and your seniors with Medicare and graduate medical education in New York, which is so important. Hurt that, hurt the providers.

Who are we kidding? We're going to cut from the providers, the hospitals and think it's not going to impact on patient quality and patient care? What about the doc fix, when our doctors say, We're not taking Medicare patients anymore?

This bill, to me, is a pig in a poke, and I'm not willing to buy a pig in a poke.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I first yield myself 30 seconds.

I was engaging in a colloquy with my good friend from Rochester, the distinguished ranking minority member, and I would be happy to yield to her in just a moment, Mr. Speaker. But back to this issue of this joint select committee that is going to be charged with coming up with $1.5 trillion in proposed cuts, and their recommendations will be sent to both Houses of Congress for an up or down vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is unprecedented, because unlike the commissions that have been put together, the Bowles-Simpson Commission, unlike this little caucus of Senators that my friend just mentioned, this Gang of Six, there is no legislative authority or power.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

There is no legislative authority or power. This time this demonstrates that Members of the House and Senate will, in fact, come together and work in a bipartisan way to ensure that we bring about meaningful spending cuts to the tune of $1.5 trillion. That's the difference that exists with this proposal that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Moore, Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question this isn't a perfect bill. There's a lot of things that I would have liked and I know that other Members on my side of the aisle would have liked. We would have liked deeper spending cuts. We would have certainly liked some entitlement reform in this. We would have preferred to mandate that this House and the other body take up a balanced budget amendment and give the people in the States an opportunity to render a decision on that. Those things aren't in this bill.

I know there's things that some of my friends on the other side wanted: higher taxes, no changes in entitlements. They didn't get everything they wanted either.

But this bill does adhere to the principles our Speaker laid out at the very beginning of the negotiations.

First, most importantly, and both sides agree on this, it avoids default. It avoids the United States not paying its obligations for the first time in 235 years. I am glad both sides cooperated and got that done.

Secondly, it actually cuts spending and links those spending cuts to the raising of the debt ceiling. There's more spending cuts than there is increased borrowing going forward. That's a good thing.

Third, no new taxes, something that would be a killer on the new economy.

And, finally, while we don't get a guarantee of a balanced budget amendment, we do get a guaranteed vote.

This is exactly what the American people have asked us to do: come together, compromise, work together on their behalf, and let them get about their business without creating additional problems for them.

With this bill, we put the American people first. We're going to continue to work on their problems. So I urge that we pass the rule and the underlying legislation.

I thank my friend for giving me the time to speak.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a challenging day. It's a difficult day, but it's a day that we're making a decision, a big decision, an important decision that the United States of America will not default on its obligations. This sends stability to the financial markets all around the world, and it really embellishes our stature as the gold standard. And that is very important.

It also gives us until 2013 for us to be able to revisit this again, as the President of the United States asked. And I think another important thing that it does is it helps us to hurry up and get this all-consuming issue of the debt and the deficit and the raising of the debt ceiling off the front burner so we can immediately put jobs back on the front burner.

So, ladies and gentlemen, we must focus our attention now on jobs. That's what the American people want us to do. On this Friday, we're going to have a jobs report. And I want us to carefully look at that jobs report, and especially look at that side of the jobs report that shows the number of jobs we're losing in the public sector.

□ 1540

So as we are here engaging, and some of my friends are celebrating, the whole issue of us cutting $2.5 trillion out of our budget over the 10-year period, it is important to know that there is a cost for this, my friends, and that cost is a loss of public jobs.

So as we set this new commission up, this new committee, we have got to make sure that as these cuts go forward that we understand the sensitivity of trying to make these cuts away from putting more of our people on the jobless rolls. Right now, the greatest contribution that the Federal Government is making to jobs is putting more people out of jobs.

So I ask that we take time now, now that we are going to put this issue behind us, to focus like a laser beam on jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to one of our diligent new members of the freshman class, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I want to thank the distinguished chairman from San Dimas, California.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, our getting our fiscal house in order is one of the most important things that we can do in this body to jump-start our economy.

Just recently our economy has seen weak economic growth, especially over the last two quarters. Just today we find out that manufacturing is at its lowest level in the last 2 years. In my district, the 10th District of Illinois, we have one of the largest manufacturing districts in the country, and there is no doubt that families—not only in the 10th District, but across the land—are struggling.

Today I am optimistic that Washington is finally coming together in a bipartisan way to find some common ground on this debt ceiling debate. We must, we must move forward. Hard-working taxpayers have had enough, and I get it. We have spending discipline here in Washington, no more budget gimmicks, no more accounting tricks, no more empty promises. American families have had to tighten their belts all across the land. American businesses had to do the same. They should expect the Federal Government should follow suit. Now is the time to move forward and focus on jobs.

If we were serious about paying down our debt and increasing revenue, then we must empower job creators. Small businesses in our Nation are overburdened by economic uncertainty, government regulations, and redtape. We need to implement commonsense solutions and create jobs to get our economy moving again.

As a small business owner, Mr. Speaker, I employ just under 100 families, and for me that's an enormous responsibility. We have to move forward. We have to empower job creators. We have to talk about getting 9.2 percent unemployment down so that we can get our economy going and bring additional revenues into the Federal coffers by putting more people back to work.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Budget and Ways and Means Committees.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy.

Well, we are facing an artificial Republican debt crisis that was a crisis of choice, of their choice. Remember, we have repeatedly increased the debt ceiling for Republican and Democratic administrations and congresses year in and year out.

This proposal moving forward is very troubling on several levels. First, it empowers the most reckless and extreme elements, not just in the House Republican Caucus today, but it is a blueprint for mischief for either party in the future.

Next we are starting down a path of more budget cuts at a time when all the experts assure us this will weaken the economy, when, instead, we should be strengthening, dealing with economic growth, not reducing demand. It's all the more frustrating because there is a path going forward that is clear.

The public strongly supports a balanced approach, which should include tax reform that would raise money while make the Tax Code more fair and simple. Do we need a commission to implement suggestions, to right-size the military, both its mission and its budget? Absolutely not.

There are lots of ideas and support on both sides of the aisle that could be enacted to achieve this goal. But the magnitude of the trigger actually invites mischief. Again, when we have seen the Republican ''take no prisoners'' attitude, what leads anybody to believe they won't do it in this case?

Most important, we should be revitalizing the economy by rebuilding and renewing America, financed by modest increases in user fees. This has support all across the business community, labor, environment, local government, even some of my Republican friends, but they take this off the table.

And, last but not least, one of the most simple things we could do would be to implement agricultural reform to save money and help people who farm and people who eat, rather than lavish subsidies for large agribusiness. These are things that we should be doing. These are things that actually could have bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, this agreement, if it goes forward, will delay that important work of reform and fiscal responsibility while it weakens both the economy and the decisionmaking process for years to come. Government on autopilot in a slow, downward spiral is not a victory in anybody's book.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would say to my very good friend that I agree with some of the remarks that he made on doing things like eliminating agricultural subsidies. I would say to my friend from Oregon, who is still in the Chamber here and now walking off the floor, I would say to my friend that I agree with his remarks about the need for us to focus on agriculture subsidies and bringing about a reduction there.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

I would say that we are trying to work this out with a spirit of bipartisanship. My friend began his statement by saying that this was a crisis developed by Republican policies.

Since we are working in a bipartisan way, I think the notion that recognizing that an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending over the past 4 years clearly played a role in getting us exactly where we are.

I yield 1½ minutes to another one of our hardworking new Members of Congress, the gentleman from Little Rock, Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, when I announced and wanted to run for Congress, my focus primarily was on the debt, on the issue of the debt and the impact that the debt was going to have on my daughter and my little boy. My daughter, Mary Katherine, is sitting with me right here today for this historic day. It's critically important to me. And a lot of the folks back home that I hear from, when they contact me, they contact me about the debt and about spending.

Now I came up here to do something about it, and I have been watching this debate closely, and I have been a supporter of the Speaker both on the plan last week, and I am a supporter of the agreement that is going to come before us today. Is it perfect? Absolutely not. Is it great? Absolutely not. It is good? It's a good first step.

I would say this: If a President and a Senate that I agreed with put this type of plan forward, I would reject it out of hand.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. If a deal, an agreement like this, came from a President with which I generally agree, and a Senate with which I generally agreed, I would reject it out of hand. But that's not what we have. We have divided government. We have this Chamber controlled by a different vision for America.

So I believe this is about as good as we are going to get, and I am supporting it because it is consistent with my principles. There are no tax increases. It controls spending now, controls spending in the future, and allows us to vote on a balanced budget amendment.

These are all things that I can support. These are the principles that we have been fighting for over the last few months. And I would say this: If this were the only step ever in dealing with the debt, I would vote ''no,'' but it's not.

□ 1550

It's only the beginning. We didn't get in this mess with one bill or one piece of legislation. It took a long time and a lot of votes, and it's going to take a long time and a lot of battles to get out of it. And this is a good first step.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from references to guests on the floor of the House.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. At this point I'm very happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, my good friend from St. Joseph, Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. I appreciate the minute.

My constituents are saying get the job done. Vote for the rule and vote for the bill. The President said about a year ago, I want to say it was the State of the Union Address, the debt today is unsustainable. He's right. And for the first time, we are coupling an increase in the debt ceiling with real reductions in spending. No, this is not reducing the rate of growth in spending. This is actually reducing spending. In fact, at the end of the day, when we look at fiscal year 2012 versus fiscal year 2011, we are going to be spending less money in 2012 than we did in the 2011.

Nobody—nobody—is coming to our offices and saying cut our spending. But, in fact, the American public is saying, Federal Government, cut your spending. That's what this bill will do. It's going to reduce spending. Yes, it's going to increase the ceiling on the debt, but it's coupled with real reforms that I think the American public want, and that's why it's going to have some bipartisan support when we deal with this issue a little bit later on this afternoon.

So I commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle. Let's get the job done. Let's get it over with so we can get to the business of running the rest of the government and the country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to another one of our thoughtful new Members, the gentleman from Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you for the opportunity to address the Chamber this morning.

I am pleased to speak on behalf of this bill, a bill that will address the

terrible uncertainty that has been taking place over the course of these last few weeks—the seniors, the taxpayers, the small business people who have been speaking to me as I have been making the phone calls and talked with them about the concerns that they have in this era of uncertainty.

I've heard commentary that this is identified as a crisis caused by Republicans when, in fact, the crisis has been the business as usual which has been taking place in Washington, D.C. This is finally a time in which we looked at the issues that are before us and made the tough decisions to address the long-term unsustainability of this debt; $14.2 trillion in debt is going to be facing the next generation. I note that there are arguments that somehow it was policies of Big Oil and health care, the things that have been Republican policies when, in fact, if you look just at the beginnings of this administration, there was the commitment to Medicare, there were the subsidies to Big Oil, we were in with the subsidies, not just to Big Oil, but also involved in two wars and the debt was $162 billion. Now it's 1.2 trillion.

We must take these kinds of steps and work together. This is a solution that will allow a genuine bipartisan opportunity to address this for the future generations, create predictability, and allow us to get back to creating jobs. I urge Members from both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the era of debts and deficits must come to an end. However, in addressing this problem, we must look at what got us here. It wasn't overspending on low-income housing, job training or education—which all stand at historically low levels. It was two unfunded wars and the Bush tax cuts which keep on giving to America's wealthiest.

Unfortunately, the legislation before us today keeps every tax break for the wealthy and means billions more in resources will be used to fund these two wars.

We keep hearing how critical this bill is to getting our economy back on track. It is hard to imagine how this legislation will do so. I cannot support any proposal with such big cuts in education, economic development and job training that will hamper our recovery. In the weeks leading up to today there was a lot of rhetoric for shared sacrifice. Unfortunately, what we are considering today places the burden of the fiscal mess squarely on our Nation's working families, and that is something I cannot support.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and vote ''no'' on this ill-conceived legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say that your superb presiding over this House is only exceeded by the gentlewoman from Hinsdale, Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), and I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it's been a long road and one with more uncertainty than the American people should have to put up with. Fortunately, the ugly part of the process is behind us, and it's time to come together behind a realistic deal that will restore strength to the economy and deliver peace of mind to the American public.

I believe that this is that deal. It's not perfect, but with a majority in just one Chamber, House Republicans negotiated a compromise that will be part of the debt solution, not part of the debt problem. It will stop a job-killing default, but cut spending even more. And it will hold Congress and the President accountable with automatic spending cuts and a guaranteed vote on the balanced budget amendment. Most importantly, it doesn't raise taxes—something that would damage our recovery.

We have changed the conversation. The President is no longer asking for a blank check; he is negotiating with us to cut spending. This is how we'll end this spiral of debt that is draining our economy of capital, competence and jobs.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have contributed to this discussion, and I urge them to support this bipartisan deal. Let's get the job done.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm very happy to yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from Clinton Township, New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Thank you, Chairman DREIER, for your leadership on this extremely important issue.

I rise in support of the rule, and I rise in support the underlying legislation which is, by its nature, bipartisan, bicameral and a compromise that avoids default, adds certainty to our economic recovery, and puts our Nation on a sustainable path towards fiscal responsibility. What we need in America is jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs, and this will help that effort forward.

This support is consistent with my longstanding efforts to bring fiscal sanity to New Jersey and to be among those attempting to bring it here to Washington. The main portions of the compromise have been outlined, but for the first time the narrative on Capitol Hill is no longer how much can government spend, but how we can best reduce spending. This new awakening to fiscal prudence is in the best interests of the Nation and, indeed, I believe is the critical issue of our generation.

I commend Speaker BOEHNER for his superb leadership on this issue, and I shall vote for the rule and the underlying legislation in the belief that it will help move our Nation forward.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we should never have found ourselves where we are today, facing a self-inflicted crisis and being asked to vote for a bill that has so many flaws. The prolonged debate that led us here has caused the world to question our Nation's credibility and already inflicted harm on the U.S. economy.

□ 1600

The irony of our situation is the other side claims to be bringing certainty to the market, but the reality is they have undermined faith in the United States Government's ability to lead the global economy. Throughout this debate, Congress has gotten lost in the crisis created instead of the true crisis of unemployment that faces our constituents. Nobody, even Members of Congress, especially Members of Congress, should have the ability to bring the faith in the American Government to its knees.

It's high time we address the crisis of jobs in our country and resolve the self-inflicted crisis we are facing today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, 224 years ago this summer, the framers of our Constitution were in Philadelphia at Constitution Hall, and they were working very hard to put together what ended up being this inspired document authored by James Madison.

On July 16, 1787, they actually completed a compromise. It was known as the Connecticut Compromise. The Connecticut Compromise is what established a bicameral legislature—two Houses of Congress. That Connecticut Compromise was also called the Great Compromise.

I know that the word ''compromise'' is seen as a pejorative in the eyes of many, but what we have before us is a compromise. It hasn't been easy getting here. When James Madison was asked often about the first branch of government, putting together the process of lawmaking, he said that the process of lawmaking is an ugly, messy, difficult process. Over the last several months, we've seen, as we have been pursuing this day, we've seen an ugly, messy, difficult process.

I am reminded that a couple of summers ago, I was talking with this amazing woman, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. She is the first woman to ever be President of any country on the continent of Africa. She is the President of Liberia. And we were talking about the development of the parliament in Liberia through this great commission called the House Democracy Partnership that

Mr. PRICE and I are privileged to lead. When we talked about the ugly, messy, difficult process of lawmaking, the President looked to me and she said: Ah, DAVID, you've forgotten one thing. Yes, it is an ugly, messy, difficult process, but it works.

So while we have so much time and energy and effort expended on partisan bickering, at the end of the day, this for me is a much, much more enjoyable time, when we are able to come together, tackling the serious problems that we as a Nation face and for the first time ever taking this issue of increasing the debt ceiling and actually dealing with the root cause of it.

I like to say that we don't have a debt ceiling problem; we have a debt problem. We have a $14.3 trillion national debt. We all know that, fingers pointed from both sides of the aisle at the other on a regular basis.

Yet today, today is a time for us to recognize that we have come together to deal with it. And, for the first time in that 75 times since 1962 that the debt ceiling has increased, we're actually going to, with the establishment of this joint select committee, see our colleagues, in a bipartisan way, from the House and Senate come together and recommend $1.5 trillion in proposed cuts. And there are mechanisms put into place, sequestration, which will actually force across-the-board cuts if they don't come up with recommendations.

So we are looking at a very, very good proposal that will help us do that. We are increasing the debt ceiling to pay our past obligations. I don't like the fact that we went through an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending over the past 4 years. Even though I voted against almost all of it, I have to say, those bills have to be paid. And that's why it is we're increasing our debt ceiling.

I want to join in extending congratulations to all those who have been involved in this process in a bipartisan way.

So I will say again, it has, over the past several months, been an ugly, messy, difficult process. But with the vote that we are about to have on this rule—and I look forward to working on the underlying legislation itself, and I'm convinced we will have a strong bipartisan vote for it—we will prove, as President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf reminded me, even though it is an ugly, messy, difficult process, it works.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by a 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 384, if ordered; and a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 184, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 686]

YEAS—242

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

NAYS—184

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

NOT VOTING—6

Andrews
Baca
Cantor
Giffords
Green, Gene
Hinchey

□ 1632

Ms. EDWARDS and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. FORTENBERRY and KINGSTON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

Mr. DREIER. 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 249, nays 178, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 687]

YEAS—249

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

NAYS—178

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

NOT VOTING—5

Baca
Boren
Giffords
Green, Gene
Hinchey

□ 1648

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 304, nays 115, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 688]

YEAS—304

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack

Woolsey	Yoder	Young (FL)
Yarmuth	Young (AK)	Young (IN)

NAYS—115

Adams	Graves (MO)	Pallone
Altmire	Grimm	Pascrell
Andrews	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin	Hanna	Pearce
Bishop (NY)	Harris	Peters
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Heck	Pitts
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Capuano	Himes	Price (NC)
Cardoza	Honda	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Renacci
Chandler	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Jackson Lee (TX)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Sanchez, Loretta
Conaway	Jones	Sarbanes
Costa	Kind	Schakowsky
Costello	Kucinich	Schilling
Courtney	Lance	Schock
Cravaack	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Sires
Davis (KY)	Latham	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Stivers
Dent	Lewis (GA)	Sutton
Dold	LoBiondo	Terry
Donnelly (IN)	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
Duffy	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	Maloney	Tiberi
Eshoo	Markey	Tierney
Farenthold	Matheson	Tipton
Filner	Matsui	Towns
Fitzpatrick	McGovern	Turner
Foxx	McKinley	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Miller (FL)	Visclosky
Fudge	Miller, George	Walden
Garamendi	Moore	Waters
Gardner	Napolitano	Watt
Garrett	Neal	Woodall
Gerlach	Olver	Wu
Gibson		

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—12

Baca	Conyers	Grijalva
Bachmann	Giffords	Hinchey
Bass (CA)	Gohmert	Kinzinger (IL)
Cohen	Green, Gene	McDermott

□ 1700

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 384, I call up the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 384, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 112–190 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

S. 365

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.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Severability.

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. Amendments to the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.
Sec. 106. Senate budget enforcement.

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.
Sec. 302. Enforcement of budget goal.

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.

SEC. 2. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or any application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the application of this Act to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

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, within any category.

''(2) ELIMINATING A BREACH.—Each non-exempt account within a category 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 within that category.

''(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 for that account.

''(5) LOOK-BACK.—If, after June 30, an appropriation for the fiscal year in progress is enacted that causes a breach within a category for that year (after taking into account any sequestration of amounts within that category), the discretionary spending limits for that category 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 within a category for that year (after taking into account any prior sequestration of amounts within that category), 15 days later there shall be a sequestration to eliminate that breach within that category 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 and outlays 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 and outlays for the current year, if any, and the budget year provided by that legislation, and an explanation of any difference between the 2 estimates. If during the preparation of the report OMB determines that there is a significant difference between OMB and CBO, OMB shall consult with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate regarding that difference and that consultation shall include, to the extent practicable, written communication to those committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before the issuance of the report.

''(C) ASSUMPTIONS AND GUIDELINES.—OMB estimates under this paragraph shall be made using current economic and technical assumptions. OMB shall use the OMB estimates transmitted to the Congress under this paragraph. OMB and CBO shall prepare estimates under this paragraph in conformance with scorekeeping guidelines determined after consultation among the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, 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 Congress designates as emergency requirements in statute on an account by account basis and the President subsequently so designates, or

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

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.

''(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, 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 sections 221(i) and 1614(a)(4) of the Social Security Act;

''(II) the term 'redetermination' means redetermination of eligibility under sections 1611(c)(1) and 1614(a)(3)(H) of the Social Security Act; and

''(III) 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 and redeterminations 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, 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.

''(D) DISASTER FUNDING.—

''(i) If, for fiscal years 2012 through 2021, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that Congress designates as being for disaster relief in statute, the adjustment for a fiscal year shall be the total of such appropriations for the fiscal year in discretionary accounts designated as being for disaster relief, but not to exceed the total of—

''(I) the average funding provided for disaster relief over the previous 10 years, excluding the highest and lowest years; and

''(II) the amount, for years when the enacted new discretionary budget authority designated as being for disaster relief for the preceding fiscal year was less than the average as calculated in subclause (I) for that fiscal year, that is the difference between the enacted amount and the allowable adjustment as calculated in such subclause for that fiscal year.

''(ii) OMB shall report to the Committees on Appropriations and Budget in each House the average calculated pursuant to clause (i)(II), not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Budget Control Act of 2011.

''(iii) For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'disaster relief' means activities carried out pursuant to a determination under section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)).

''(iv) Appropriations considered disaster relief under this subparagraph in a fiscal year shall not be eligible for adjustments under subparagraph (A) for the fiscal year.

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

''(1) with respect to fiscal year 2012—

''(A) for the security category, $684,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and

''(B) for the nonsecurity category, $359,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(2) with respect to fiscal year 2013—

''(A) for the security category, $686,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and

''(B) for the nonsecurity category, $361,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

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

''(4) with respect to fiscal year 2015, for the discretionary category, $1,086,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(5) with respect to fiscal year 2016, for the discretionary category, $1,107,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(6) with respect to fiscal year 2017, for the discretionary category, $1,131,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(7) with respect to fiscal year 2018, for the discretionary category, $1,156,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(8) with respect to fiscal year 2019, for the discretionary category, $1,182,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(9) with respect to fiscal year 2020, for the discretionary category, $1,208,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and

''(10) with respect to fiscal year 2021, for the discretionary category, $1,234,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

as adjusted in strict conformance with subsection (b).''.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended as follows:

(1) Strike paragraph (4) and insert the following new paragraph:

''(4)(A) The term 'nonsecurity category' means all discretionary appropriations not included in the security category defined in subparagraph (B).

''(B) The term 'security category' includes discretionary appropriations associated with agency budgets for the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the National Nuclear Security Administration, the intelligence community management account (95–0401–0–1–054), and all budget accounts in budget function 150 (international affairs).

''(C) The term 'discretionary category' includes all discretionary appropriations.''.

(2) In paragraph (8)(C), strike ''the food stamp program'' and insert ''the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program''.

(3) Strike paragraph (14) and insert the following new paragraph:

''(14) The term 'outyear' means a fiscal year one or more years after the budget year.''.

(4) At the end, add the following new paragraphs:

''(20) 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.

''(21) 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) At the end of subsection (e), insert ''This report shall also contain a preview estimate of the adjustment for disaster funding for the upcoming fiscal year.''.

(3) In subsection (f)(2)(A), strike ''2002'' and insert ''2021''; before the concluding period insert '', including a final estimate of the adjustment for disaster funding''.

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), and 254(i) of the Balanced

Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not apply to the Congressional Budget Office.

SEC. 105. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AND IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT OF 1974.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended as follows:

(1) Strike subsection (a) and insert the following:

''(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate may make appropriate budgetary adjustments of new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom in the same amount as required by section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.''.

(2) Strike subsections (b) and (e) and redesignate subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(3) At the end, add the following new subsections:

''(d) EMERGENCIES 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 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 of the House of Representatives 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)(A) 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 paragraph (1), the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall not count the budgetary effects of such provision for purposes of this title and title IV and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

''(B) In the House of Representatives, a proposal to strike a designation under subparagraph (A) shall be excluded from an evaluation of budgetary effects for purposes of this title and title IV and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

''(C) An amendment offered under subparagraph (B) 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.

''(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) 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.''.

(c) 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)''.

SEC. 106. SENATE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 through April 15, 2012, including section 300 of that Act, and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels set in subsection (b)(1) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 and 2013 through 2021.

(2) For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 after April 15, 2012, including section 300 of that Act, and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels set in subsection (b)(2) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2012 and 2014 through 2022.

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.—

(1) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall file—

(A) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(B) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2012 through 2016, and 2012 through 2021 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline adjusted to account for the budgetary effects of this Act and legislation enacted prior to this Act but not included in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(C) aggregate spending levels for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 and aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2012 through 2016, 2012 through 2021 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline adjusted to account for the budgetary effects of this Act and legislation enacted prior to this Act but not included in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline, and the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(D) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2012 through 2016, and 2012 through 2021 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline adjusted to account for the budgetary effects of this Act and legislation enacted prior to this Act but not included in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2011 baseline, for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Not later than April 15, 2012, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall file—

(A) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2012 and 2013 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(B) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2012, 2013, 2013 through 2017, and 2013 through 2022 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2012 baseline for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(C) aggregate spending levels for fiscal years 2012 and 2013 and aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2012, 2013, 2013–2017, and 2013–2022 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2012 baseline and the discretionary spending limits set forth in this Act for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(D) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2012 and 2013, 2013–2017, and 2013–2022 consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's March 2012 baseline budget for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD.—

(1) Effective on the date of enactment of this section, for the purpose of enforcing section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce any balances of direct spending and revenues for any fiscal year to 0 (zero).

(2) Not later than April 15, 2012, for the purpose of enforcing section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget shall reduce any balances of direct spending and revenues for any fiscal year to 0 (zero).

(3) Upon resetting the Senate paygo scorecard pursuant to paragraph (2), the Chairman shall publish a notification of such action in the Congressional Record.

(d) FURTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise any allocations, aggregates, or levels set pursuant to this section to account for any subsequent adjustments to discretionary spending limits made pursuant to this Act.

(2) With respect to any allocations, aggregates, or levels set or adjustments made pursuant to this section, sections 412 through 414 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) shall remain in effect.

(e) EXPIRATION.—

(1) Subsections (a)(1), (b)(1), and (c)(1) shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Subsections (a)(2), (b)(2), and (c)(2) shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE II—VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

SEC. 201. VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

After September 30, 2011, and not later than December 31, 2011, the House of Representatives and Senate, respectively, shall vote on passage of a joint resolution, the title of which is as follows: ''Joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.''.

SEC. 202. CONSIDERATION BY THE OTHER HOUSE.

(a) HOUSE CONSIDERATION.—

(1) REFERRAL.—If the House receives a joint resolution described in section 201 from the Senate, such joint resolution shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. If the committee fails to report the joint resolution within five legislative days, it shall be in order to move that the House discharge the committee from further consideration of the joint resolution. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to discharge the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except twenty minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a motion is adopted, the House shall proceed immediately to consider the joint resolution in accordance with paragraph (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After the joint resolution has been referred to the appropriate calendar or the committee has been discharged (other than by motion) from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the

motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the joint resolution. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(b) SENATE CONSIDERATION.—(1) If the Senate receives a joint resolution described in section 201 from the House of Representatives, such joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate. If such committee has not reported the joint resolution at the close of the fifth session day after its receipt by the Senate, such committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and it shall be placed on the appropriate 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.

(a) IN GENERAL.—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, subject to the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval enacted pursuant to this section, exercise authority to borrow an additional amount equal to—

''(i) $1,200,000,000,000, unless clause (ii) or (iii) applies;

''(ii) $1,500,000,000,000 if the Archivist of the United States has submitted to the States for their ratification a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States pursuant to a joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States'; or

''(iii) if a joint committee bill to achieve an amount greater than $1,200,000,000,000 in deficit reduction as provided in section 401(b)(3)(B)(i)(II) of the Budget Control Act of 2011 is enacted, an amount equal to the amount of that deficit reduction, but not greater than $1,500,000,000,000, unless clause (ii) applies.

''(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 50 calendar days after the date on which Congress receives a certification described in subsection (a)(1) or within 15 calendar days after Congress receives the certification described in subsection (a)(2) (regardless of whether Congress is in session), there is enacted into law a joint resolution disapproving the President's exercise of authority with respect to such additional amount.

''(2) CONTENTS OF JOINT RESOLUTION.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution—

''(A)(i) for the certification described in subsection (a)(1), that is introduced on September 6, 7, 8, or 9, 2011 (or, if the Senate was not in session, the next calendar day on which the Senate is in session); and

''(ii) for the certification described in subsection (a)(2), that is introduced between the date the certification is received and 3 calendar days after that date;

''(B) which does not have a preamble;

''(C) the title of which is only as follows: 'Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code, on _____' (with the blank containing the date of such submission); and

''(D) the matter after the resolving clause of which is only as follows: 'That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 3101A(a) of title 31, United States Code.'.

''(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(1) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification described in subsection (a)(2), the Speaker, if the House would otherwise be adjourned, shall notify the Members of the House that, pursuant to this section, the House shall convene not later than the second calendar day after receipt of such certification.

''(2) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than 5 calendar days after the date of introduction of a joint resolution described in subsection (a). If a committee fails to report the joint resolution within that period, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar.

''(3) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution reports it to the House or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order, not later than the sixth day after introduction of a joint resolution under subsection (a), to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on a joint resolution addressing a particular submission. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

''(4) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

''(d) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN SENATE.—

''(1) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification under subsection (a)(2), if the Senate has adjourned or recessed for more than 2 days, the majority leader of the Senate, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate that, pursuant to this section, the Senate shall convene not later than the second calendar day after receipt of such message.

''(2) PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.—Upon introduction in the Senate, the joint resolution shall be immediately placed on the calendar.

''(3) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time during the period beginning on the day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (a) and, for the certification described in subsection (a)(1), ending on September 14, 2011, and for the certification described in subsection (a)(2), on the 6th day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (a) (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

''(B) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration of the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone,

or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(C) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution, the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall occur immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

''(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

''(e) AMENDMENT NOT IN ORDER.—A joint resolution of disapproval considered pursuant to this section shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(f) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint resolution, one House receives from the other a joint resolution—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint resolution under this section, the joint resolution of the House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

''(3) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the joint resolution in the Senate, the Senate then receives the companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

''(4) CONSIDERATION AFTER PASSAGE.—(A) If Congress passes a joint resolution, the period beginning on the date the President is presented with the joint resolution and ending on the date the President signs, allows to become law without his signature, or vetoes and returns the joint resolution (but excluding days when either House is not in session) shall be disregarded in computing the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1).

''(B) Debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

''(5) VETO OVERRIDE.—If within the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1), Congress overrides a veto of the joint resolution with respect to authority exercised pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the limit on debt provided in section 3101(b) shall not be raised, except for the $400,000,000,000 increase in the limit provided by subsection (a)(1)(A).

''(6) SEQUESTRATION.—(A) If within the 50-calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1), the President signs the joint resolution, the President allows the joint resolution to become law without his signature, or Congress overrides a veto of the joint resolution with respect to authority exercised pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a), there shall be a sequestration to reduce spending by $400,000,000,000. OMB shall implement the sequestration forthwith.

''(B) OMB shall implement each half of such sequestration in accordance with section 255, section 256, and subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 253 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and for the purpose of such implementation the term 'excess deficit' means the amount specified in subparagraph (A).

''(g) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection and subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) (other than paragraph (6)) 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.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3101 the following new item:

''3101A. Presidential modification of the debt ceiling.''.

SEC. 302. ENFORCEMENT OF BUDGET GOAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after section 251 the following new section:

''SEC. 251A. ENFORCEMENT OF BUDGET GOAL.

''Unless a joint committee bill achieving an amount greater than $1,200,000,000,000 in deficit reduction as provided in section 401(b)(3)(B)(i)(II) of the Budget Control Act of 2011 is enacted by January 15, 2012, the discretionary spending limits listed in section 251(c) shall be revised, and discretionary appropriations and direct spending shall be reduced, as follows:

''(1) REVISED SECURITY CATEGORY; REVISED NONSECURITY CATEGORY.— (A) The term 'revised security category' means discretionary appropriations in budget function 050.

''(B) The term 'revised nonsecurity category' means discretionary appropriations other than in budget function 050.

''(2) REVISED DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—The discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 under section 251(c) shall be replaced with the following:

''(A) For fiscal year 2013—

''(i) for the security category, $546,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $501,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(B) For fiscal year 2014—

''(i) for the security category, $556,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $510,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(C) For fiscal year 2015—

''(i) for the security category, $566,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $520,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(D) For fiscal year 2016—

''(i) for the security category, $577,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $530,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(E) For fiscal year 2017—

''(i) for the security category, $590,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $541,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(F) For fiscal year 2018—

''(i) for the security category, $603,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $553,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(G) For fiscal year 2019—

''(i) for the security category, $616,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $566,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(H) For fiscal year 2020—

''(i) for the security category, $630,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $578,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(I) For fiscal year 2021—

''(i) for the security category, $644,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

''(ii) for the nonsecurity category, $590,000,000,000 in budget authority.

''(3) CALCULATION OF TOTAL DEFICIT REDUCTION.—OMB shall calculate the amount of the deficit reduction required by this section for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2021 by—

''(A) starting with $1,200,000,000,000;

''(B) subtracting the amount of deficit reduction achieved by the enactment of a joint committee bill, as provided in section 401(b)(3)(B)(i)(II) of the Budget Control Act of 2011;

''(C) reducing the difference by 18 percent to account for debt service; and

''(D) dividing the result by 9.

''(4) ALLOCATION TO FUNCTIONS.—On January 2, 2013, for fiscal year 2013, and in its sequestration preview report for fiscal years 2014 through 2021 pursuant to section 254(c), OMB shall allocate half of the total reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (3) for that year to discretionary appropriations and direct spending accounts within function 050 (defense function) and half to accounts in all other functions (nondefense functions).

''(5) DEFENSE FUNCTION REDUCTION.—OMB shall calculate the reductions to discretionary appropriations and direct spending for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2021 for defense function spending as follows:

''(A) DISCRETIONARY.—OMB shall calculate the reduction to discretionary appropriations by—

''(i) taking the total reduction for the defense function allocated for that year under paragraph (4);

''(ii) multiplying by the discretionary spending limit for the revised security category for that year; and

''(iii) dividing by the sum of the discretionary spending limit for the security category and OMB's baseline estimate of nonexempt outlays for direct spending programs within the defense function for that year.

''(B) DIRECT SPENDING.—OMB shall calculate the reduction to direct spending by taking the total reduction for the defense function required for that year under paragraph (4) and subtracting the discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to subparagraph (A).

''(6) NONDEFENSE FUNCTION REDUCTION.—OMB shall calculate the reduction to discretionary appropriations and to direct spending for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2021 for programs in nondefense functions as follows:

''(A) DISCRETIONARY.—OMB shall calculate the reduction to discretionary appropriations by—

''(i) taking the total reduction for nondefense functions allocated for that year under paragraph (4);

''(ii) multiplying by the discretionary spending limit for the revised nonsecurity category for that year; and

''(iii) dividing by the sum of the discretionary spending limit for the revised nonsecurity category and OMB's baseline estimate of nonexempt outlays for direct spending programs in nondefense functions for that year.

''(B) DIRECT SPENDING.—OMB shall calculate the reduction to direct spending programs by taking the total reduction for nondefense functions required for that year under paragraph (4) and subtracting the discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to subparagraph (A).

''(7) IMPLEMENTING DISCRETIONARY REDUCTIONS.—

''(A) FISCAL YEAR 2013.—On January 2, 2013, for fiscal year 2013, OMB shall calculate and the President shall order a sequestration, effective upon issuance and under the procedures set forth in section 253(f), to reduce each account within the security category or nonsecurity category by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the baseline level of budgetary resources

in that account at that time by a uniform percentage necessary to achieve—

''(i) for the revised security category, an amount equal to the defense function discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (5); and

''(ii) for the revised nonsecurity category, an amount equal to the nondefense function discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (6).

''(B) FISCAL YEARS 2014-2021.—On the date of the submission of its sequestration preview report for fiscal years 2014 through 2021 pursuant to section 254(c) for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2021, OMB shall reduce the discretionary spending limit—

''(i) for the revised security category by the amount of the defense function discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (5); and

''(ii) for the revised nonsecurity category by the amount of the nondefense function discretionary reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (6).

''(8) IMPLEMENTING DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTIONS.—On the date specified in paragraph (4) during each applicable year, OMB shall prepare and the President shall order a sequestration, effective upon issuance, of nonexempt direct spending to achieve the direct spending reduction calculated pursuant to paragraphs (5) and (6). When implementing the sequestration of direct spending pursuant to this paragraph, OMB shall follow the procedures specified in section 6 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, the exemptions specified in section 255, and the special rules specified in section 256, except that the percentage reduction for the Medicare programs specified in section 256(d) shall not be more than 2 percent for a fiscal year.

''(9) ADJUSTMENT FOR MEDICARE.—If the percentage reduction for the Medicare programs would exceed 2 percent for a fiscal year in the absence of paragraph (8), OMB shall increase the reduction for all other discretionary appropriations and direct spending under paragraph (6) by a uniform percentage to a level sufficient to achieve the reduction required by paragraph (6) in the non-defense function.

''(10) IMPLEMENTATION OF REDUCTIONS.—Any reductions imposed under this section shall be implemented in accordance with section 256(k).

''(11) REPORT.—On the dates specified in paragraph (4), OMB shall submit a report to Congress containing information about the calculations required under this section, the adjusted discretionary spending limits, a listing of the reductions required for each nonexempt direct spending account, and any other data and explanations that enhance public understanding of this title and actions taken under it.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents set forth in section 250(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 251 the following:

''Sec. 251A. Enforcement of budget goal.''.

TITLE IV—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

SEC. 401. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) JOINT COMMITTEE.—The term ''joint committee'' means the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction established under subsection (b)(1).

(2) JOINT 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 at least $1,500,000,000,000 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 paragraph (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 estimate of the Congressional Budget Office 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 of Representatives, and the majority and minority Leaders of each House of Congress.

(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) APPOINTMENT.—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 Act.

(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 Act.

(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 was made. If a member of the joint committee ceases to be a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be, 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 the rules and regulations of the Senate.

(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 is authorized by section 11 of Public Law 79µ09304 (15 U.S.C. 1024 (d)).

(C) QUORUM.—Seven 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 Act, the joint committee shall hold its first meeting.

(ii) AGENDA.—The Co-Chairs of the joint committee 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 as the joint committee considers advisable.

(ii) HEARING PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CO-CHAIRS.—

(I) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The Co-Chairs of the joint committee shall make a public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted, not less than 7 days in advance of such hearing, unless the Co-Chairs determine that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

(II) WRITTEN STATEMENT.—A witness appearing before the joint committee shall file a written statement of proposed testimony at least 2 calendar days before the appearance of the witness, unless the requirement is waived by the Co-Chairs, following their determination that there is good cause for failure to comply with such requirement.

(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 employees of the Senate and following all applicable rules and employment requirements of the Senate.

(2) ETHICAL STANDARDS.—Members on the joint committee who serve in the House of Representatives shall be governed by the ethics rules and requirements of the House. Members of the Senate who serve on the joint committee and staff of the joint committee shall comply with the ethics rules of the Senate.

(d) TERMINATION.—The joint committee shall terminate on January 31, 2012.

SEC. 402. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) INTRODUCTION.—If approved by the majority required by section 401(b)(3)(B)(ii), the proposed legislative language submitted pursuant to section 401(b)(3)(B)(iv) shall be introduced in the Senate (by request) on the next day on which the Senate is in session by the majority leader of the Senate or by a Member of the Senate designated by the majority leader of the Senate and shall be introduced in the House of Representatives (by request) on the next legislative day by the majority leader of the House or by a Member of the House designated by the majority leader of the House.

(b) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which the joint committee bill is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than December 9, 2011. If a committee fails to report the joint committee bill within that period, it shall be in order to move that the House discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. Such a motion shall not be in order after the last committee authorized to consider the bill reports it to the House or after the House has disposed of a motion to discharge the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a motion is adopted, the House shall proceed immediately to consider the joint committee bill in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After the last committee authorized to consider a joint committee bill reports it to the House or has been discharged (other than by motion) from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint committee bill in the House. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to the joint committee bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The joint committee bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint committee bill and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint committee bill to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the joint committee bill. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall not be in order.

(4) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(c) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN THE SENATE.—

(1) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—A joint committee bill introduced in the Senate under subsection (a) shall be jointly referred to the committee or committees of jurisdiction, which committees shall report the bill without any revision and with a favorable recommendation, an unfavorable recommendation, or without recommendation, not later than December 9, 2011. If any committee fails to report the bill within that period, that committee shall be automatically discharged from consideration of the bill, and the bill shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) MOTION TO PROCEED.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order, not later than 2 days of session after the date on which a joint committee bill is reported or discharged from all committees to which it was referred, for the majority leader of the Senate or the majority leader's designee to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill. It shall also be in order for any Member of the Senate to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill at any time after the conclusion of such 2-day period. A motion to proceed is in order even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to. All points of order against the motion to proceed to the joint committee bill are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill is agreed to, the joint committee bill shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—All points of order against the joint committee bill and against consideration of the joint committee bill are waived. Consideration of the joint committee bill and of all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith shall not exceed a total of 30 hours which shall be divided equally between the Majority and Minority Leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate on the joint committee bill is in order, shall require an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn, and is not debatable. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal. All time used for consideration of the joint committee bill, including time used for quorum calls and voting, shall be counted against the total 30 hours of consideration.

(4) NO AMENDMENTS.—An amendment to the joint committee bill, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint committee bill, is not in order.

(5) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to the joint committee bill, the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint committee bill, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(6) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint committee bill shall be decided without debate.

(d) AMENDMENT.—The joint committee bill shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(e) CONSIDERATION BY THE OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint committee bill, one House receives from the other a joint committee bill—

(A) the joint committee bill of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint committee bill had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint committee bill received from the other House shall supplant the joint committee bill of the receiving House.

(2) REVENUE MEASURE.—This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint committee bill received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(f) RULES TO COORDINATE ACTION WITH OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) TREATMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint committee bill under this section, the joint committee bill of the House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

(2) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES IN THE SENATE.—If following passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate, the Senate then receives the joint committee bill from the House of Representatives, the House-passed joint committee bill shall not be debatable. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate shall be considered to be the vote on passage of the joint committee bill received from the House of Representatives.

(3) VETOES.—If the President vetoes the joint committee bill, debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

(g) LOSS OF PRIVILEGE.—The provisions of this section shall cease to apply to the joint committee bill if—

(1) the joint committee fails to vote on the report or proposed legislative language required under section 401(b)(3)(B)(i) not later than November 23, 2011; or

(2) the joint committee bill does not pass both Houses not later than 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 the rules and regulations of the Senate.

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 ''$13,183,000,000''; and

(2) in subclause (III), by striking ''$0'' and inserting ''$7,000,000,000''.

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 1 hour, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this moment we are beginning debate on a measure which I believe will finally send a signal to job creators in this country and in the global marketplace that we are finally, finally getting serious about getting our fiscal house in order.

We know that we are dealing with a very sad 9.2 percent unemployment rate in this country. We know that there are people hurting.

We all have constituents who have lost their homes, people who have lost their jobs, people who have lost their businesses, people are hurting.

It is absolutely imperative that we do everything that we can to get our economy back on track. We have just gotten the report, this downward report of the GDP growth rate down to 1.3 percent. We need to get back to robust, dynamic, strong, gross domestic product growth. We need to get to 4, 5, 6 percent GDP growth.

And, Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons that we have not done that is we have seen this dramatic increase in spending. And over the past half century, on 75 different occasions, 75 different occasions, we have seen our debt ceiling increased without any effort whatsoever to get at the root cause of why it is that we have had to increase the debt ceiling.

I argue, Mr. Speaker, that we don't have a debt ceiling problem; we have a debt problem.

That's why we're here today, and that's why I believe that after months and months and months of partisan bickering, finger-pointing, we have at this moment begun a debate that will allow us in a bipartisan way to increase the debt ceiling, which we all know needs to be done. It simply is meeting the obligation of paying for past spending. Many of us have been opponents of much of that spending, but we recognize that the bill has to be paid.

Speaker BOEHNER, when just days after we took the oath of office in the 112th Congress, received the request from the President of the United States, through his Treasury Secretary, Mr. Geithner, that we increase the debt ceiling. The Speaker said then that he would agree that it's essential for us to increase the debt ceiling but we were not going to proceed with business as usual. We are not going to continue increasing the debt without getting to the root cause of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have got to tell you that through all of the debate that's taken place, we have gotten to the point where we have a measure. It's a bipartisan compromise. It's a bipartisan agreement that I believe will, as I have said, send a signal to those who are seeking to create jobs for our fellow Americans that we now are going to have the kind of fiscal restraint and responsibility from Washington, D.C., the likes of which we haven't seen in a long, long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that I strongly support this measure. As everyone has said, it's far from perfect, but I strongly support it, and I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to join together in support of it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, after a month-long standoff over raising the debt ceiling, Congress is now forced to take action on a bill that by all accounts is deeply flawed. I think everybody today has agreed with that.

Why are we doing a flawed bill? Because we waited until the last minute. Instead of reducing the Nation's debt by closing tax loopholes for oil companies and private jet owners, today's bill instead creates a supercommittee that will decide how to take over a trillion dollars in cuts. And this supercommittee will serve as a mock Congress, leaving 523 Members of Congress sitting on the sidelines while a group of 12 decides the shape of the country for a decade to come.

Paying our debt should be a no brainer. Indeed the debt ceiling itself is an antiquated solution to a problem we no longer face and should be eliminated. It was originally created to pay for World War I, to provide our country with economic stability while at war. Today we are again in the midst of war, but instead of protecting the stability of our economy, some in Congress have decided to question the necessity of paying our bills. As we all know by now, they have taken our economy hostage and demanded draconian cuts in exchange for not leading our Nation into default.

The actions have caused real and significant damage. Roll Call reports that because of the prolonged debt ceiling crisis, the interest rate the United States Government must pay has already increased, which means the interest rates for car loans and home mortgages are also increasing.

The stock market has responded as expected. According to DealBook, as of July 29, big banks and companies withdrew $37.5 billion from money market funds that are described as a key artery for our economy. The Dow Jones Industrial Average lost nearly 5 percent of its value last week, which meant 401(k)s, pension plans, retirement plans of all Americans were put at risk and much of it lost. Baby boomers across the United States watched nervously as all those things were happening.

As I mentioned earlier, this type of crisis has become the new normal in

this Congress. Under the Republican rule, the House of Representatives has repeatedly led our country to the brink of unthinkable situations.

First, the majority led the country to the brink of a government shutdown, threatening the jobs of hundreds of thousands of workers and endangering vital government services relied on by Americans every day. As we speak, the Federal Aviation Administration is shuttered, costing the United States Government hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenue because the majority refuses to pass a clean legislation that does not include measures that threaten rural communities and the future of airline unions.

□ 1710

Now the majority has brought us to the edge of a cliff in order to see how much they can get for not throwing the country into default. In January, Speaker BOEHNER promised the American people the debt ceiling debate would be an example of an ''adult moment'' in Washington. Is this what he had in mind?

Just this morning, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, went on National Public Radio saying his party has ''not threatened to torpedo the economy by defaulting.'' This statement defies reality. We've been brought to this point precisely because the leadership in his party has walked out of negotiations and demanded that they get ideologically driven cuts before they will vote to protect the stability of our economy.

Last, but certainly not least, the crisis of the last few months has come at the expense of addressing the true crisis in our country—the jobs crisis that is facing millions of our fellow citizens. Last month, over 25 million Americans failed to find full-time work. Many have been out of work for so long that their unemployment benefits have expired as their skills erode and they are living on savings or charity from loved ones and friends. In response, we have not introduced a single bill in this House designed to invest significant government resources into creating jobs.

Instead, we have repeatedly proposed cutting funding to investments in green technology and transportation infrastructure, destroying the promise of putting thousands of Americans back to work in the jobs that can't be outsourced overseas. They have refused to extend unemployment benefits for those who can't find jobs and are moving nowhere fast to extend a payroll tax break that has helped create the small number of jobs that we added in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that serious responsibilities are taken here, the responsibilities of leadership, and in doing so, put an end to this self-inflicted crisis and focus on getting Americans back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to my colleague for her great spirit of bipartisanship.

With that, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from Staten Island, New York (Mr. GRIMM).

Mr. GRIMM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise today to ensure that the voices of those that I represent in Staten Island and Brooklyn are heard, and what they have to say is actually quite simple. They expect of us to use common sense to bring solutions to the problems that this Nation faces. And the problem that we face is not a debt ceiling problem; it's a debt problem. And the people in Staten Island and Brooklyn, every day, they go home and they have to figure out how to manage their households. They go to work and they have to figure out how to manage their small businesses, and to do that with common sense. That's what they ask of us.

You cannot spend money you don't have. You cannot continue to rack up debt with no plan to pay it off. Today, this debate is about moving America forward, together, in a bipartisan way, because this is not a Democratic debt or a Republican debt. It's an American debt, which means that Americans must come together to solve the problems.

Today is about solving problems. So I proudly stand here and say that I will support this bill, I will support Speaker BOEHNER, and I will bring solutions to the problem, not just bickering.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts will control the time of the gentlewoman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, we have never cut our way out of an economic recession. We have always grown our way out. But we have never grown our way out by investing less than 15 percent of our GDP in our people's potential. In fact, the last time we cut back in the way we are about to do today was in 1937, and that sent us right back into an economic depression. But this time, we're not going to have World War II to rescue our economy.

It's interesting to note that the Federal investment in homeownership and higher education for our returning GIs and the subsequent infrastructure investments and interstate highway system and the like created a permanent middle class after the war that lasted for two generations. But the middle class has never been more threatened than it is today, and this will condemn those struggling to make it into the middle class to years of struggle without the help that we could, and should be providing them.

And it's not because we're a poor country. Our largest corporations are experiencing record profits. The top 25 hedge fund managers are making more than a billion a year. Our corporations are sitting on more than $2 trillion of cash.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 20 additional seconds.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the point is I understand that this train is leaving the station, but it's going in the wrong direction. We need to be investing in this country, not taking away the resources that will enable it to grow, it is through education, training, research and development and infrastructure investment that has made our country great but this agreement will make us smaller, weaker and far less able to tap our most valuable resource, the potential of all the American people.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to my very good friend from Ashland, Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I have had a chance to watch this floor debate over the last week or so, and to say the least, I think we can say tempers have flared and there's been a lot of rhetoric on both sides. And as we come together today with a proposal that has been negotiated with both sides—with Speaker BOEHNER, the President, and HARRY REID—it's a deal that not everyone is pleased with. It's a deal that doesn't have in everything that I want, and I'm sure that it doesn't have everything in the deal that my friends across the aisle would want. And that's why I think so many of us are hearing from our constituents, a lot on the far right and a lot on the far left, saying, We don't like it.

But the bottom line is I think this is one of the greatest moments of the House where two sides come together and figure out how they are going to find a solution that doesn't work for their parties; it's a solution that works for the American people.

And at this point in our history we owe $14.5 trillion.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DUFFY. It's about time this Congress comes together and figures out a way to live within our means. This bill is going to start that process, though it doesn't go far enough.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I rise in support of this proposal, but as with many of our greatest capers in history, this is an inside job.

I want to offer just in evidence that we had in the words of the Treasury Secretary for Reagan and for Bush an admittance that they were running up deficits, and that that was one of the ways to starve the government. And then we had the Republican Party at the height of its power, the Presidency, the House, the Senate, saying, no, we weren't going to have any tax increases. Even though we were running

up these high deficits, we are going to cut taxes. We're going to hemorrhage trillions of dollars in revenue, and we're going to go into two wars. We're going to put a $7 trillion prescription drug plan on the financial pile of our debt.

Alan Greenspan testified before the Congress in the first weeks of the Bush administration. He said Bush can leave office with our country being entirely debt-free. What happened then was the reverse. He doubled the debt and walked out with 8 million Americans losing their jobs. But as Solomon, in his wisdom, said to those who wanted to cut the baby in half, we choose not to default but to agree to this proposal.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to, as I've said, the next Governor of Indiana, my good friend from Columbus, Indiana (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, this is a challenging time in the life of our country. Our economy is struggling; millions are out of work; and now, with a more than $14 trillion national debt, America is on the verge of having its debts exceed our statutory borrowing limit.

Now, I recognize that if you owe debts, pay debts. Congress has an obligation to defend the full faith and credit of the United States. But this Congress also has an obligation to keep faith with this and future generations of Americans by restoring fiscal responsibility and discipline to our National Treasury.

The bipartisan Budget Control Act that we will consider today will make it possible for the Nation's bills to be paid with no new taxes, dollar-for-dollar cuts in spending for every increase in the debt ceiling, and it will give the American people a fighting chance to consider a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Now, let me be clear. The Budget Control Act is not so much a good deal as it is a good start. I really believe this bipartisan compromise is a modest but meaningful step in the direction of fiscal discipline and reform, and I welcome it.

□ 1720

Now, while this bill doesn't go nearly far enough, it does move us in the right direction. You know, leadership means knowing when to say yes and knowing when to say no. I believe the time has come to get something done so this Congress can move our national government back in the direction of fiscal responsibility and reform, and begin to advance policies that will put Americans back to work.

Last thought. There is a lot of credit taking on a day like today, a lot of bipartisanship, back patting, as we say. But let me say from my heart, this day, where we see the ship of state turning ever so slightly toward that lode star of fiscal responsibility, this day does not belong so much to any one political leader, to any one political party, or to any one branch of government. This day belongs to the American people who have stood, who have clamored, who have come to town halls and who have demanded this government live within its means and said: Enough is enough. This is your day.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, this, of course, is a very important day, a momentous decision, a difficult decision for all of us. I am going to vote for this in the best interest of our country and putting us in the stature where we need to be.

But I do want to point out one area of weakness that we're going to have to look at carefully as we go forward, and that is in the application of this 12-member committee, and especially as it relates to the areas of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

My understanding is, and I think this is understanding that we certainly need to make clear, that Social Security and Medicaid, veterans, Pell Grants, are all protected fully under this bill. But when it comes to Medicare, my understanding is that there will be an opportunity in here where they will look at Medicare on the provider side. The question becomes how can you basically separate benefits of Medicare patients when you have the patient, the doctors, and the hospital, and you can't adequately separate that. So I say, we must be very mindful of the Medicare apparatus here.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I did not come to Washington to dismantle the New Deal or the Great Society, and I did not come to Washington to force more people into poverty. I agree that we need to avoid default and confront our long-term fiscal challenges. That is why on Saturday I voted in support of the Reid proposal which would have reduced our debt by hundreds of billions of dollars.

But the bill before us today is unfair in so many ways. It disproportionately places the burden of dealing with our debt issue on the backs of those who can least afford it, while it spares the wealthiest from contributing anything.

There is something fundamentally wrong when a billionaire hedge fund manager pays a lower tax rate than his secretary; when Big Oil can make tens of billions in profits every quarter, but still get sweetheart deals from the taxpayer; and when we are slashing funding for roads and bridges, but allowing tax breaks for corporate jet owners to continue.

There are no new revenues in the bill before us today, only massive cuts in what is called domestic discretionary spending. But what does that actually mean? It means less investment in our transportation and infrastructure. It means less investment in medical research and education and food security.

To put it simply, it means less jobs and higher unemployment at a time when millions of Americans are struggling to find work. And despite the rhetoric of its supporters, the bill puts Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid on the chopping block.

We all know how we got into this mess: two huge tax cuts, mostly for the wealthy, that weren't paid for; two wars that weren't paid for; and a massive prescription drug bill that wasn't paid for. Now, there are certainly places to cut.

Right now we are borrowing $10 billion every single month—$10 billion every single month—for military operations in Afghanistan to prop up a corrupt and incompetent Karzai regime. But according to the Congressional Budget Office, the spending caps contained in this legislation do not apply to ending that misguided war. That makes no sense to me.

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. This bill goes exactly in the wrong direction.

I have two children who I love more than anything, and I don't want them to grow up in a country where the gap between the very rich and poor grows wider and wider each year. We can do better, Mr. Speaker. We must do better, and we can do so in a way that does not abandon the principles of economic justice and fairness that have made our Nation so great. I will vote ''no'' on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to my good friend and Rules Committee colleague, time and time again he criticizes the tax cuts that have been put into place. They really are the Bush-Obama tax cuts because, as we all know, last December, President Obama signed an extension of those. But I think it is important for us to look at the 2003 revenue flow and look at what happened just a few short years later in 2007.

In 2003, Mr. Speaker, we had $1.782 trillion in revenues to the Federal Treasury. In 2007, after those tax cuts went into place, we had $2.567 trillion in revenues. That was a $785 billion increase, a 44 percent increase in the take that the Federal Government had because of the implementation of those cuts.

It is important to recognize that if we can grow the economy, we can generate an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Bainbridge Township, Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, this moment in time on the floor reminds

me exactly of a period during the 1990s. You know, there is a lot of publicity given to the new freshmen class, and we from the revolutionary class of 1994 are feeling a little neglected these days, but welfare reform was the discussion. We endured overheated rhetoric on this floor about how our proposals were mean to pregnant women and children and old people and young people and poor people until one day the President of the United States, President Clinton, decided that he wasn't going to be the protector of overheated rhetoric, he was going to be the President of the United States, and he signed the welfare reform bill.

I happened to walk on the floor, and you would have thought that my friends who were here on the other side of the aisle at that time that their dogs had all died because they looked so depressed. But the fact of the matter is that President Clinton decided to lead.

Now, I don't know what's going on in all of the other offices, but we've taken a lot of phone calls over the last 4 or 5 weeks. Some people call in and tell me to hold the line; some people call in and tell me I'm an idiot. But the overwhelming sentiment of the calls is: You guys have got to work this out.

So to the President of the United States' credit, President Obama, he had the Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER; the minority leader, Ms. PELOSI; the Vice President; Senator REID; Senator MCCONNELL down to the White House, and they worked this out.

I don't think I'm going to stand here and listen to this continued harangue about how we are being mean to people because I don't think anybody on that side of the aisle believes that President Barack Obama would do the horrible things that the people are indicating he would do. I just don't believe it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I hear a lot about the Bush tax cuts, but if they are so great, where are the jobs? I think it is simply wrong to have the middle class in this country bear the burden of balancing the budget when the Donald Trumps of the world get their tax cuts protected. There is something inherently wrong about that.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very tough place to put America. Not Members of Congress; we are paid to come here and do our job. But it is a very tough place to put America.

So I have a simple state of facts to present today and listen to my other colleagues, which I will, because it is a tough decision to in actuality support legislation that seems to be driven by thoughts that the only way to get something done is to hold a whole country hostage and to hold Congress hostage.

□ 1730

That is simply what we have.

On the brink of August 2, we are now throwing something on the floor that is arguably supposed to be helpful. I am concerned that there are nuances in this legislation that will hurt people we all care about, but it's a tough decision not to say ''yes'' to having America pay her bills. I hope, for once, that once we get past today that we will not in any way yield again to the voices of 87 Members who care nothing about America but who simply care about their way or the highway.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I am upset, and we should not do this anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my views on ''The Budget Control Act of 2011,'' which, is a final hour compromise on raising our debt-ceiling. This plan differs from the previous debt-ceiling bills introduced by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Those measures attempted to resolve our budget ceiling crisis on the backs of seniors, children, and the working poor. Those measures demanded sharp cuts to domestic programs that ask average Americans to make life-altering sacrifices while not asking America's wealthiest individuals and most profitable corporations to contribute their fair share. Today's compromise has arrived just in time to prevent our country from risking the financial collapse of our great nation. Yet, this bill is not perfect

In less than 24 hours our nation's clock would have run out to raise our debt limit. This final hour compromise will allow our nation to continue to operate and prevent our country from failing to meet our financial obligations. I have steadfastly stood before this body demanding a raise to our debt limit. I have spoken on the behalf of the average American by making it clear that we should not wait until the last minute.

As a country, we have been held hostage by a small fringe group of people, who were narrowly elected. In many ways this plan feels like we have been given a ransom note and now at the last minute we have limited choices, none of which are appetizing. I believe this election was not a mandate to overthrow the American government. It was a mandate to find real solutions and not temporary fixes. Waiting to the final hour, waiting to the last minute, has placed our country in a terrible dilemma. We have not been given the adequate amount of time to review this plan. I will do what is right for my constituents. So that we may live to fight another day and let there be no mistake, we will fight another day.

I believe that it is time that we all have come together to find a compromise; however, this bill does not have a perfect solution and there are areas in which I have strong reservation. This is a two phased plan. The first part of the plan includes approximately $1.2 trillion of deficit reduction through the establishment of ten-year discretionary caps. In the first two years, there would be a firewall separating security and non-security spending. Total discretionary spending in Fiscal Year 2012 and 2013 will be limited to $1.o43 trillion and $1.047 trillion, respectively, about $7 billion and $3 billion below Fiscal Year 2011. The security savings would represent roughly $5 billion of the total $10 billion in reductions over this two year period.

The plan provides for debt ceiling increases in two stages. The President may request a $900 billion increase now, of which $400 billion is immediately available. This $900 billion is subject to a resolution of disapproval in both the House and Senate. The disapproval measure would be subject to Presidential Veto. Once the debt comes within $100 billion of the debt ceiling, the President may ask for at least an additional $1.2 trillion, which could rise to $1.5 trillion if a Balanced Budget Amendment is sent to the states or the Joint Committee process described below enacts more than $1.5 trillion in savings. This increase is also subject to a resolution of disapproval.

I must emphasize that I particularly have strong concerns about the formation of a Joint Committee. As I believe we should not hand over the power of these decisions of this magnitude to a handful of Members of Congress. A Joint Committee that will be given the duty of finding ways to achieve $1.5 trillion in deficit reduction. I hope there will be structure and reason when these decisions are made, but again this is just a hope.

We should have been able as a body to come to this decision, and because we are at the last minute, this measure is a stop gap way to find further consensus. This Committee will be a joint, bipartisan committee, made up of 12 members, with 6 from each Chamber of Congress, equally divided between Democrats and Republicans.

This Committee has been charged with finding major cuts in a short time frame with little oversight. There is the challenge where will they find $1.5 trillion in future deficit before we cut our turkeys on Thanksgiving.

I will continue to sound the alarm if programs that impact the lives and welfare of the poorest among us are cut by drastic amounts. If the Committee is successful and achieves cuts of at least $1.5 trillion, then the debt ceiling will be raised by $1.5 trillion. If the committee's bill is enacted and produces between $1.2 trillion and $1.5 trillion, the debt ceiling limit will be raised dollar for dollar. This plan at the very least attempting to do something that I have been calling for from the very beginning, for now, protects Social Security and Medicaid, but leaves Medicare and other programs that serve the most in need amongst us.

Another portion of the agreement will provide additional time for Congress to conduct its due diligence prior to considering an amendment to the Constitution. As unlike other bills that have come before this body this plan is not contingent upon the passage of the balanced budget amendment. The amendment can now be properly considered and a vote on the measure will occur by the end of the year, which will allot about four months of additional review.

In the end, it appears that cooler heads have appeared and instead of political rhetoric we have come together to protect our nation. We must continue to work together to save the American people and do what's right for our nation. Instead of injecting ideological spending cuts 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.

Before us is an example of acting in unison to resolve our conflicts. This is the reason the American people placed us in these positions

to ensure that we act in their best interest. They have been calling for a resolution and what is before us today represents a long and at times lively debate on how best to serve the citizens of this fine country. Today, we are working under one flag and one nation; we are working in unison to ensure that every American can benefit from this debt-limit increase.

There are times in which we are 50 states, and times when we exist as a single, united, Nation. One single state did not defend the Nation after the attacks on Pearl Harbor. One state, on its own, did not end segregation and establish Civil Rights. There are times when the stakes are too high, when we simply must unite as states and act as one. We must continue to work under one flag and one Nation to protect our economy and to our people.

We should not have waited until the final hour to come to this conclusion. I along with many colleagues demanded that we protect the interest of our Nation. Namely, reading the President to utilize his rights under the Constitution to raise the debt limit through executive order if Congress remained grid locked.

We need to change the tone here in Congress. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said it best when he stated 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 plan before the House today offers the compromise that the American people want, demand and need.

I will continue to fight to for Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and other programs that protect the interests of the American people. In my lifetime, I have never seen such a concerted effort to ransom the American economy in order to extort the American public. Finally, we arrive at a conclusion that will not result in the poorest among us bearing the majority of the costs.

I support this bill and future efforts to increase the debt limit and to resolve our differences over budgetary revenue and spending issues. I will only support bills that increase jobs for average Americans. We must work together to ensure 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.

My home state of Texas ranks 43rd in education, and last (50th) in the Nation in people over 25 who only have a high school education. This bill will protect the hopes and dreams of people who are striving to improve those numbers. I have fought wholeheartedly to safeguard Pell grants and I will continue this fight. Some groups have estimated there will be a shortfall of more than $1 billion in fiscal year 2012, but again with the last minute nature of this bill, this remains unclear. There is yet another attack on students by eliminating Direct Loan Repayment incentives on all loans disbursed on or after July 1, 2012. The elimination of both of these provisions will increase the cost of loan repayment and thus the cost of college attendance. The in-school interest exemption for neither graduate nor professional students and the prohibition of financial incentives to students who repay their loans on a timely basis. We should not increase the cost of education for students.

The founders of our Nation understood the importance of advancing our Nation. For decades, we have provided free education to all minor residence of the United States from kindergarten through high school. After, having provided free education to all students until the 12th grade I recognize that financial disparities prevent many aspiring students from attaining a higher education.

I believe that the plan is a temporary solution to a long term problem. It removes, for the moment, the entire burden of resolving our debt crisis off the backs of seniors, the middle class and our Nation's most vulnerable citizens. The bill will not immediately result in dramatic reductions in safety net programs for vulnerable Americans, such as food stamps and unemployment and disability insurance. Any major cuts to these programs would be and should be unacceptable, and each is avoidable if corporations and the wealthy are required to shoulder their fair share of this burden.

There has been a theme this Congress of focusing on cutting both programs that benefit the public good and programs that provide assistance to those who are most in need, while ignoring the need to focus on job creation and economic recovery. This bill places us between a rock and a hard place as we fight to get back on the right track. We should be focused on paying our Nation's bills and resolving our differences.

I represent the 18th Congressional District in Houston, Texas. In my District, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. We cannot make draconian cuts to vital social services at a time when the Census Bureau places the number of Americans living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years.

Finally, we must come to a place where as a body we recognize that cuts to social programs do not reflect that we are still in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis. There continues to be persistent unemployment. When any measure comes before this body, the first questions that must be asked is who will it help and who will it hurt.

A raise in the debt-ceiling must include assistance to small businesses which are the true job creators in our country. It must include Pell Grants that will aid students who will join the workforce of the future, by receiving an advanced education today. Just 6 months ago there were members of the Republican Party who would not sit down with us to discuss these matters and now here we are in the final hour. I have worked diligently to ensure that something was done to protect our Nation.

I ask my colleagues to look at the facts and consider what will happen to the hard-working Americans who rely on these benefits. Think of programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Access Program, SNAP, that fed 3.9 million residents of Texas in April 2011, or the Women, Infants, and Children, WIC, Program that provides nutritious food to more than 990,000 mothers and children in my home state.

These programs are needed across our nation. 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. In 2009, there were 43.6 million Americans living in poverty nationwide. 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. Further, 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.

Childhood hunger continues to be a real and persistent problem in the Houston/Harris County area. The number of people participating in the Food Stamp Program in Texas has increased by 82 percent since 2000. However, only 60 percent of those eligible for food stamps in Texas participate in the program.

In Harris County, only 75 percent of children approved to receive free lunch participated, and only 39 percent of children approved to receive free breakfast took advantage of the benefit. Participation numbers are similarly low for those students approved to receive reduced-price lunch and breakfast. During summer months, participation in these federal nutrition programs drops significantly. In Texas the summer participation rate was only 8.1 percent of low income children.

In 2008, when the recession first hit, 22.9 percent of Texas children were living in poverty, the fifth worst rate in the Nation. As a result of the economic downturn that began in late 2008 in Texas, and parents losing their jobs, the child poverty rate increased to 24.4 percent in 2009. That is 163,000 more children falling into poverty, or 1.6 million Texas children overall.

Many people assume that Texas was not hit as hard by the recession as other states because our unemployment rate is still below the national average. While our unemployment rate is low compared to the U.S. (8.2 versus 9.8 percent, respectively, in November 2010), it is still nearly double where it stood in November 2007 (4.4 percent). In fact, Texas' unemployment rate has been around 8 percent for the last 16 months, which is extremely high given Texas' recent history.

Nearly one in three Texas children has no parent with a full-time, year-round job, making them particularly vulnerable.

When a household falls into poverty, children are exposed to increased parental distress, inadequate childcare arrangements, and poor nutrition. In past recessions, it took many years for employment and incomes to rebound, and low-income families rebound more slowly than others.

Public benefits such as health care or nutrition assistance help families bridge the gaps in difficult economic times and are critical in reducing the effects of a recession. Cutting these supports will hurt child and family well-being and damage the Texas economy by taking money out of the private economy for critical local businesses such as grocery stores and medical providers.

Programs like Women, Infants and Children, WIC, are targeted to help low-income pregnant women, new mothers, infants, and young children to eat well and stay healthy. These programs ensure that poverty will not be a reason that a baby does not receive adequate nutrition. WIC provides nutrition education, nutritious foods, referrals to health and human services, breastfeeding support, and immunizations (at some clinics).

More than 802,000 Texas children ages 0–4 (40 percent) received support through WIC.

When you look at infants alone, 67 percent received WIC supplements, compared to only 35 percent of children aged 1–4.

The program has grown by more than 176,000 kids between 2000 and 2009, with an increase of 66,000 children from 2007 to 2009 alone.

The dramatic rise in applications for SNAP initially overwhelmed the already beleaguered state workers who enroll families in these federal benefits. In November of 2009, 43 percent of SNAP applications were not being processed within the federally mandated 30-day time period, leaving hundreds of thousands of families each month waiting for food assistance.

More than 2.8 million Texas children participate in the school lunch program, and close to half of them also receive breakfast. More than $1.3 billion of federal funding is used to support these programs during the school year. Many counties in Texas also run summer nutrition programs so that kids who depend on school lunches have access to good nutrition when school is closed for the summer.

During the recession, more families needed greater assistance with basic expenses. SNAP (formerly Food Stamps) provided benefits to over 3 million Texans, more than half of which are children (ages 0–17).

In January 2011, more than 2 million Texas children received assistance from SNAP, an increase of nearly 700,000 kids since January 2008. Furthermore, because of added funds from the ARRA, monthly benefits rose 13.6 percent, giving added assistance to families at a time when they needed it most.

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.

Texas has the unfortunate distinction of leading the Nation as the highest percentage of residents uninsured. More than 5.8 million Texans—including 1.5 million children—lack health insurance. Texas' uninsured rates, 1.5 to 2 times the national average, create significant problems in the financing and delivery of health care to all Texans. One in every four Texans lacks health insurance coverage, and that number is one in every three in large cities like Houston and Dallas. According to the Gallup poll, an average of 26.8 percent of Texas residents was uninsured.

Currently, one in four residents within the state of Texas is uninsured and would be in financial stress in case of a major medical emergency. The percentage of uninsured is extremely high and has become one of the greatest challenges faced by the Texas Department of Insurance and Department of Health.

Here's an idea that wouldn't cost Texas a dime but would save millions of dollars every year: Remove all barriers restraining nurses from practicing to the full extent of their education and training. No state needs primary care providers more than Texas, which has a severe shortage. Texas ranks last in access to health care and in the percentage of residents without health insurance. Of Texas' 254 counties, 188 are designated by the Federal Government as having acute shortages of primary care physicians. Of that number, 16 counties have one and 23 have zero. If every nurse practitioner and family doctor were deployed, we still couldn't meet the need. Texans are desperate for health care.

I have worked tirelessly with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to gain bipartisan support for successful passage of an amendment to the landmark healthcare reform bill that made sure no hospital is forced to shut its doors or turn away Medicare or Medicaid patients. Existing physician-owned hospitals employ approximately 51,700 individuals, have over 27,000 physicians on staff, pay approximately $2,421,579,312 in payroll taxes and $512,889,516 in other federal taxes, and have approximately $1.9 billion in trade payables. With approximately 50 physician-owned hospitals, Texas leads the Nation in the number of physician-owned hospitals. The Texas economy could lose more than $2.3 billion and more than 22,000 jobs without these important hospitals.

American families spend almost twice as much on health care—through premiums, paycheck deductions and out-of-pocket expenses—as families in any other country. In exchange, we receive quality specialty care in many areas. Yet on the whole, Americans do not get much better care than countries that spend far less. Americans do not live as long as people in Canada, Japan, and most of Western Europe. This should clearly indicate that health care reform was needed. The landmark bill signed by President Obama will provide coverage to millions of people who currently lack it.

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 ever consider fighting to 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.

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

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

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

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade. Congress last came together and raised the debt ceiling in February 2010. Today, the debt ceiling currently stands at $14.3 trillion dollars. In reality, that limit has already been eclipsed, but due to accounting procedures by Treasury Secretary Geithner, the debt limit can be artificially avoided until August 2.

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.

If we allow the United States to default 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 in the 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.

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 opponents 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 allow America 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.

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 chose to use this as an opportunity to hold the American people hostage to their extreme agenda.

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

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

If Congress cannot find a resolution then Congress will open the possibility that the President may invoke the Fourteenth Amendment to United States Constitution, Section Four, which states "the validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be questioned." The argument must be made that if Congress will not resolve our nation's pending default then the President to protect the interests of our nation must act. We should act, however, so the vulnerable are protected.

The President would have to consider his powers under the Fourteenth Amendment which may grant him the authority to raise the debt ceiling, through executive order if Congress fails to act by the August 2, 2011 deadline. If the President has to use his presidential authority, he should to avoid a collapse—but Republicans should cease the hostage-taking—and adults have to stand up for America and vote to pay America's bills.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents in their home districts who need the protection of an America that pays the bills. I urge my Republican 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".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise all Members to respect the gavel.

The gentlewoman from Texas was out of order.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from Hopkinsville, Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. I rise in support of this legislation, and I think that President Obama and the leaders in the House and the Senate should be given a warm congratulations on being able to come to some agreement to prevent America from defaulting on its debt.

We all know that this is not a perfect piece of legislation, but one of the real positives of this legislation is the joint commission that's going to be established by six Members from the House and six Members from the Senate who will come up with recommendations to reduce Federal spending. We do know that exempt from that is Social Security, veterans' benefits as well as Medicaid, for those who really need health care the most.

Yet I've heard a lot of discussion today about "this is not about jobs"; so I would just point out that getting our financial house in order is very important. If you've read any newspaper recently, you will find out that, in this administration, the excess of regulations coming out, particularly from the EPA, have been a real hindrance to job creation in America as well as the uncertainty of the health care bill that was adopted last year.

So this is an important first step in getting our financial house in order. Next, we need to start working on removing uncertainty on the regulatory side of the government. So I would urge everyone to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have missed, in my opinion, a wonderful opportunity, an opportunity to make a grand bargain, as the Speaker wanted to do, as Leader PELOSI wanted to do, as Leader REID wanted to do, as the President wanted to do, and as the Vice President wanted to do.

For months now, the world has looked to America and has asked whether we are still a Nation that pays its bills or whether, thanks to the ideological intransigents of a few, we would do the unthinkable and default on our obligations. We are a more responsible and honorable Nation than that. We are only at this point because the far right wing, for the first time in American history, has chosen to hold our economy hostage in order to enact a radical ideological agenda far out of step for the majority of Americans. If nothing else, these months have shown the American people who puts our country's welfare first and who would rather have ideological purity at all costs.

I am voting for this bill, not because I like this bill, although it does do some things that I think need to be done, but because we need to bring down the deficit; we need to address the debt; we need to return to fiscal responsibility. Default for the United States of America is not an option. This would affect all of the people I represent and all of the people of this country if we defaulted.

At the very least, this bill averts this outcome by paying our bills through 2013, which will bring certainty to a struggling economy that badly needs it. This bill cuts spending by $1.2 trillion, and also establishes a process to arrive at additional spending cuts.

The second set of deficit reductions will be entrusted to a bipartisan committee. Hopefully, that committee will accurately reflect the priorities of this Nation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. We are here because we missed, as I said, a great opportunity, a chance to pass now a truly balanced agreement that relies on both spending cuts and revenue. We're not there, but I have said many times during the course of this debate that to govern is

to compromise, not to sell out. Some people think on this floor that voting for a compromise is somehow a sellout. We cannot run America on that theory, and that is not what democracy is all about.

I urge my colleagues to ensure that America, in fact, pays its bills.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield? I will yield my friend additional time if he would like.

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would just like to compliment him on pointing to compromise. I don't know if he heard, but I closed the rule debate in my closing remarks by talking about the Connecticut compromise, which established a bicameral legislature on July 16, 1787. It was called the Great Compromise. My friend is absolutely right. We're at that point today in dealing with an issue, not of that magnitude, but clearly of a very important one.

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield an additional 45 seconds to my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Ladies and gentlemen, I have said numerous times during the course of this debate about whether America was going to pay its bills and that we need to vote, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans: Americans concerned about the fiscal posture of their country, concerned about the confidence that people around the world have in the American dollar, which is, after all, the standard of the world. That is what I think this vote is about.

It should not be about partisan politics, and very frankly, it should not be about ideological extremes. It ought to be about responsibility. It ought to be about understanding that our oath of office is to preserve and protect the United States of America.

This bill does that. Vote ''yes.''

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

I feel very honored to follow my good friend and classmate, the distinguished Democratic whip, as we talk about this compromise and where we are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, saving Social Security and Medicare is a priority that I believe both political parties share. Contrary to much of what has been put out there, this is something that is addressed in this measure. We are going to be able to save Social Security and Medicare—again, working together in a bipartisan way.

Creating jobs, Democrats and Republicans alike talk about that. How is it that we're going to be able to do that? Getting our fiscal house in order is a very, very important step in our quest to ensure that the people who are hurting and looking for jobs will have an opportunity to get them.

We are sending a positive signal to the global market that we are the world's economic, military and geopolitical leader. By increasing the debt ceiling, we are sending a positive signal that we are going to continue meeting our obligations and our responsibility but, at the same time, dramatically reducing spending.

The problem that has gotten us to this point is what we're doing for the first time ever. After 75 times of increasing the debt ceiling, we are finally getting to the root cause. The problem, as has been said over and over again, is our debt, and we're going to turn the corner on that in a thoughtful and balanced way.

I want to compliment the President of the United States. I want to compliment the two leaders of the United States Senate, HARRY REID and MITCH MCCONNELL. I want to congratulate Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, who has done an absolutely phenomenal job in ensuring that we wouldn't continue business as usual. I also want to congratulate Minority Leader PELOSI for her effort that she has put in to getting us to the point where we are today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes Members from the Committee on Ways and Means: the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), chairman; and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), ranking minority member.

□ 1740

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress does not act—and act now—America will default. That would wreak havoc on our economy and make it harder for Americans to find and keep a job in an already weak economy. Default cannot be an option, and I am pleased that the bill before us ensures that will not occur.

Just as a default would threaten the economic health of this country, so would increasing taxes. Raising taxes on families and job creators would hinder investment, increase the cost of doing business, and result in even less hiring and fewer jobs. That is the wrong direction when we are struggling with an unemployment rate of 9.2 percent and 14 million Americans looking for work. The good news is that the legislation before us recognizes these basic facts. It avoids a default, it makes sure the government pays our bills, and it does not increase taxes.

And though some have argued that the new Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction could pave the way for tax increases, that is not going to happen. The committee's structure, the baseline it will work off of, and the fact that Republicans are in the majority in the House virtually guarantees that tax rates will not go up.

Furthermore, this legislation finally forces Washington to make serious changes to the way it spends taxpayer dollars. There are real budget reforms, there is a path to a balanced budget amendment, and there are automatic spending cuts if Congress does not rein in spending on its own.

I applaud the efforts of all of those who helped craft this agreement, especially Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR.

I urge my colleagues to recognize this opportunity to fix what is broken in Washington and use this occasion to significantly cut runaway spending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, a most distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee for a long time, Mr. CHARLES RANGEL of New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, while I stand on this floor as an American and a person that loves this Congress so much, I'm embarrassed also as a Member that a President of the United States would have his domestic and foreign policy actually held hostage, because with him and only him and no other President have we decided that we would almost put in jeopardy the faith and the fiscal responsibility of this country paying its debts.

You know, a lot of people have said that we got to a $14.4 trillion debt because we got drunk and spent money like a drunken sailor. If that is so, the people having the hangover certainly aren't the wealthy people in this country. And this decision was decided without any consideration of the people that are longing for jobs in our great country. If the Republicans had to hold the President hostage, I wish that they would have held him hostage on the questions that my constituents wake up in the morning and ask, not whether or not the debt ceiling has risen, but how can I get a job? How can I really get back my dignity? How can I put food on the table? These are issues that you certainly don't resolve by cutting spending, causing people to lose their jobs and to lose their hope.

So, indeed, I'm glad that we are not going to default, but in the days ahead we ought to be spending some time talking about what most Americans want, and that is a fair tax system—while the wealthy have gained so much during this spree that we've had—and not allow a hangover to be with the people that are jobless.

We still have time to close this responsibility that we have, to close the debt that we have, not by laying off people, not by just cutting programs during a recession, but by thinking about how we can train people, how we can research, and how we can get our people back to work.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, $14.4 trillion; $1.6 trillion every year added onto that national debt.

The people in November, 2010, spoke loudly. We are listening. It is time that we in this Chamber accept the fact that D.C. has to and will change because the American people have spoken loudly. They want us to get our fiscal house in order. They want us to bring certainty to the American market so that we can invest in this great country again and put people back to work, not only for this generation, but for generations to come.

I rise in support of this legislation. It is not the cure-all, it is not the one battle that will win this war on our national debt, but it opens us up on a path to where we need to be firmly dedicated and disciplined to carry on this battle and the battles to come.

So I ask all my colleagues, let us govern responsibly, let us avoid default, but continue on this battle—and continue on we will, as a new class, as a freshman Member of this great Chamber.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this agreement, but this is a lousy way to run our great country or to rebuild a world-class economy. I support it because the alternative is unacceptable, defaulting on our Nation's obligations for the first time in our Nation's history. Doing so would be the greatest unforced error ever committed in the history of our country. And it's all political.

The performance of this Congress the last couple of months has a lot to be desired. And if King Solomon were alive today, I think his metaphorical solution to all this would be to kill both women and spare the child. But if we are to achieve true fiscal solvency for our country, there are three things I think that need to happen:

We need to invest in our future, grow the economy. You do that by investing in education and job training and scientific research. And the infrastructure upgrade our Nation needs in broadband expansion, that's not happening right now, and it won't, I fear, under this agreement.

We need to also look for smart savings in the budget, starting with changing the way we pay for health care in this country so it's based on the value and no longer the volume of care that's given. By getting rid of outdated weapons programs the Pentagon keeps telling Congress to stop appropriating money for, because they're not asking for it, and they don't need it. It's ending taxpayer subsidies going to large agribusiness with mailing addresses in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, not even to working families.

And finally, we need tax reform, to simplify a code that has acted like an anchor on economic growth and job creation, but that is fair, asking the most wealthy to contribute their fair share as well.

I support the agreement, and I encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I have voted twice to raise the debt ceiling. In May, I voted with about 90 other people for a clear debt ceiling raise. I voted this past weekend for Leader REID's program, which had cuts.

But I can't vote for this program because the first series of cuts we know, the second series of cuts we don't know. I fear it's a Trojan horse. And if you look inside that Trojan horse it's Scylla and Charybdis inside, the whirlpools and the shoals. And that's an odyssey and journey that this country should not have to traverse.

This country has been taken to this point by a group of ideologues that don't like government, want to reduce it, are reducing it, want to hurt employment figures to hurt the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to hurt him.

Justice Louis Brandeis said, ''The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding.'' Justice Brandeis is with us today.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it's important we know, as we try to change this government, that we're actually making changes in the direction it's going.

Without the Budget Control Act, our government will be over 23 percent of the size of our economy by the end of this decade. The Budget Control Act changes that. By the end of the decade, it will be about 21.5 percent of the size of our economy. It is comparable, coming close to the shrinkage of the economy under President Reagan in his 8 years in the White House.

The truth of the matter is this doesn't go far enough for conservatives. You can't cut far enough or soon enough for Members of Congress like myself because we just believe this country is so deep, so dangerously deep in debt.

□ 1750

But with this vote today, tonight we cut out the same amount of spending the President put in this government in that ill-fated failed stimulus bill. And later this year, we get a chance to vote another cut in this government equivalent to the size of ObamaCare. So we start with two strong cuts reversing and shrinking the size of government.

In this bill, we achieve two-thirds of the discretionary cuts included in the Ryan Budget, in the Path to Prosperity that the Republican House Members believe in. Now, a few months ago, if someone said the Senate passed a budget and they've agreed to two-thirds of your cuts in discretionary spending, we would have celebrated. We're not celebrating today because we know there's so much more work to be done.

But we know also that this cuts spending today. It puts controls on future Congresses in the way they spend. That's important. And it holds Congress and the White House both accountable for getting the size of this government back in control without increasing taxes on families like you, on our job creators back home along Main Street, and it does so today.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I support this bill as a first step, anxious to get to more spending and savings and getting this wasteful, bloated government down to size. And I know, too, any vote, my principle is tax cuts and spending cuts. If I can change the direction of this country with bigger spending cuts, my vote will be a ''yes.''

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. The Republicans in this House have taken this Nation to a dangerous and unnecessary brink. I definitely do not want our Nation to default on its full faith and credit, but I also don't want our Nation to default on our solemn obligations as a Nation, as a community to all of our citizens. That's why we need a balanced approach to keep us on an even keel as we move ahead. This means savings and revenues.

So as I vote today as the ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee, I will keep in mind how we must not let down our citizens who need programs.

One example is unemployment insurance. It's set to expire at the end of this year as millions desperately look for work. And I just now have received a report that this year's extension and the next year's extension would cost $45 billion. We need to get those resources. If we're not on a balanced path, we will not be able to address critical needs of our fellow and sister citizens such as unemployment insurance. We need balance to be true to ourselves.

I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility, or Debt Commission, we received testimony from experts in economic policy research; and they said that when debt loads of a country reach above or at 90 percent of their

economy or GDP, that results in the reduction in economic growth in that country by about 1 percentage point. And using the administration's economic model, that 1 percentage point increase in our GDP or decrease in our GDP costs about a million jobs. That's why this debate is so important. It is so important to get us on a path to fiscal responsibility, to begin to bring down our national debt.

The plan before us today does that. It does that with spending reductions. It does it with the sort of structural reforms in terms of spending caps that are there. But it also does it with an automatic reduction in spending if, for some reason, this select committee set up in this bill fails to come to some sort of agreement on how to reduce spending. That automatic reduction, I think, is an important backstop so the select committee will take its work seriously and do everything to come to a bipartisan solution.

Also, there is a path forward on a balanced budget amendment in this legislation that is absolutely critical I think for not just today, because we know it is impossible to bind future Congresses, but to put in place a structure and a mechanism well into the future so that we don't find ourselves continuing to deal with the fundamentals of this problem. We begin to deal with the problem; we make progress on the problem; and that progress will mean job creation, and that's something we're all looking forward to.

I thank the Speaker and urge a ''yes'' vote on the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes members from the Committee on the Budget: the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), chairman; and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), ranking minority member.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3½ minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. I tell you, I would love for people to be able to come to Oklahoma City anytime they have the opportunity to do that.

But to be able to talk to the great folks in my district, I can tell you the one thing that comes up again and again is they are really frustrated and they are looking for things to really be able to change here in Washington. They see how broken our system is. They see the way that we interact. They are really legitimately frustrated, and I can tell you they have lost trust in what we're doing and how we're doing it.

We, quite frankly, as the Federal Government, are trying to do too many things, and we can't afford all of the things that we're doing.

So in some very simple way, this whole process has united the Nation to be able to look simply at $14.3 trillion in debt and to say, as a Nation, we have a problem. That is a good first step.

Now, the conversation that's been happening around Congress over the past several months now is now dealing with how do we resolve the problem and what is the core of the problem. Is the problem the debt ceiling vote? Is the problem tomorrow? Or is the problem $14 trillion in debt?

And I feel like sometimes we have been trying to either figure out how to get past tomorrow or how to get past solving this issue of $14.3 trillion in debt. That has created 7 months of debate and 7 months of conversation that I fear has made an unrealistic expectation of how much we can really do in one piece of legislation.

Quite frankly, no piece of legislation can solve $14.3 trillion in debt all in one moment. No piece of legislation can be a perfect solution. There is no perfect ideal piece of legislation that's going to solve it all. Are there major issues that I think that are in every piece of legislation? I'm sure there are in every one of them. But in this one, I would look at it and say it is not perfect, but it takes us down that first step to start getting out of this.

If there is a perception that we can solve it all in one piece, I think everyone has underestimated the size and the scope of what it really means to deal with this large of a debt and this large of a deficit. It is a single step on a very long journey.

Does it solve all of the problems? No. Does it cure cancer? No. Does it get us out of all of the wars? No. Does it locate Amelia Earhart's body? No. Does it find us the Ark of the Covenant? No.

It doesn't solve everything we would like to do with it, but it does begin to put a framework around the Federal Government for the next 10 years to set spending caps in place to say we're going to stop the growth of government. We've grown very quickly very fast. We've got to first stop that growth of government and put some boundaries around it. That's a good first step on that.

□ 1800

It puts a square focus on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which 80 percent of the American people say they want some version of the balanced budget amendment. Quite frankly, this creates a moment for Republicans and Democrats to be able to have an honest conversation about what should that text be for a balanced budget amendment? How can we work together? The Constitution is not owned by one party but is owned by the people of the United States of America, so that is both parties coming together to have a very frank conversation about if we're going to have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, how do we get that done? What is the text of that? And how do we do what is best for our Nation?

But the key thing of this piece of legislation today is focused on not just getting us past tomorrow but starting us down a process, that single first step of starting us down a process that in the days ahead our children will not live in the shadow of this kind of debt, of this kind of deficit, and we as a Nation can get back to doing the things we love to do rather than worrying about what creditor we're going to pay and which one we're not.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we should never have gotten to the point where our troops in Afghanistan had to ask whether they were going to be paid. That's a scandal. And it's scandalous that our Republican colleagues would threaten for the first time in American history to torpedo America's creditworthiness and American jobs unless they succeeded in enacting a budget plan to end the Medicare guarantee, slash Medicaid, and slash critical investments in education and our future.

That was the plan. They wanted to do that now, and they wanted to have this whole debate again 6 months from now. Why? Not to reduce the deficit. If the goal was to reduce the deficit, why refuse to end taxpayer subsidies for the oil companies? If reducing the deficit was the purpose, why refuse to end special breaks for corporate jets and the folks at the very high end of the income scale? That wasn't the plan. The plan was to use this moment to threaten the economy, to try and slash the social safety net and those critical investments in education and innovation in our future.

And guess what: They failed. They failed to do that. They failed to end the Medicare guarantee. They failed to slash Medicaid. They failed to slash education. In this measure, we succeeded in protecting Medicare and Social Security beneficiaries. We succeeded in protecting seniors in nursing homes, individuals with disabilities and poor kids who depend on Medicaid for their health care. And we succeeded in providing room for critical investments in education and America's future.

Don't get me wrong, Mr. Speaker, there's much in this plan I don't like. We did not succeed in shutting down special interest tax loopholes that add hundreds of billions of dollars to our deficits. Our Republican colleagues refused to cut those subsidies for big oil companies. They refused to cut the others. And now we're going to have a great debate. We're going to have a great debate about how to grow the economy and reduce our long-term deficit. It will be a debate about our national priorities. I hope we will support the balanced approach that the President has called for, one that refuses to

put greater burdens on Medicare beneficiaries in order to provide greater tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans.

In the coming months, our Republican colleagues will be given the following test: Will they choose to protect special interest tax breaks over investments necessary to keep our Nation strong and secure? Will they finally demonstrate a willingness to pay for our national defense rather than put it on the credit card? Mr. Speaker, let's get on with that big national debate, and let's finally focus on jobs and getting the economy going as we reduce our long-term deficit.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Wisconsin, a member of the Budget Committee, Ms. MOORE.

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So many of my colleagues have said that it was necessary to storm the White House and take the country hostage in the name of their grandchildren, so I wanted to go on record talking about what I want for my grandchildren.

I want Head Start for my grandchildren. I want WIC programs and early childhood education programs for my grandchildren. I want my kids to go to a school where they can participate in the science fair. I want immunizations for them. I want research done for food safety to make sure that the chicken nuggets are safe. I want clean air and clean water for them. I want jobs where they invent things, like new energy sources. And, yes, I want them to be contributing citizens and pay taxes. And I want a safety net for them in case they are disabled, and when they become elderly, and if they get cold in the cold winters of Wisconsin, that they'll have some energy assistance.

I want my grandchildren to have the American Dream.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding and also for his very bold and effective leadership.

I rise in strong opposition to this unbalanced debt ceiling bill. This is an unbalanced approach. We all know that. We've heard that. Furthermore, this debt ceiling bill should have never been an option in terms of having to come to this floor to debate this and to do this. Like we have done for Democratic and Republican Presidents in the past, we should have lifted the debt ceiling.

Rightfully so, many of us are concerned about these discretionary cuts. What are these cuts going to do as it relates to our senior citizens, low income individuals and the poor? This debt ceiling bill does nothing to address the real crises in our country, the lack of jobs and economic growth. At a time when investments are needed to jump-start our economy and put people back to work, this deal and its cuts-only approach, which it is, it's the wrong approach. It's an outrage that as we stand here today that we could not raise the debt ceiling by voting for that.

I intend to vote ''no'' on the bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey, who's been a fighter in this battle, Mr. ANDREWS.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, what brings us together is a need to create jobs for the American people, and I think people would agree there's three things we have to do to create jobs:

The first is not fall off a cliff and have a default on our national obligations. This bill accomplishes that.

The second thing is to make sure we have an interest rate environment so that our businesses and entrepreneurs can create jobs, so they have some predictability. By making a 25 to 30 percent down payment on reducing our deficit in a fair and equitable way, this bill does that.

Finally, I think most of us agree that we need investments in our education, research and development, infrastructure, other activities to create jobs in our private sector for our people. By making sure that at least in the first 2 years of this agreement that the reductions in those areas are either nonexistent or moderate, I think that we give ourselves the freedom so our appropriators can put valuable investments forward in that way. This is a well-reasoned bipartisan agreement to create jobs for the American people. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, we should never have reached this point in our country. We should never have reached the point when our troops wondered whether they were going to get paid or individuals on Social Security wondered whether they were going to see their earned benefits. That should never have happened.

This is the first time in history, the first time in history, that we've seen Members of this Congress threaten to close down the American economy unless they got their particular budget plan through, one that ends the Medicare guarantee, slashes Medicaid and would deeply cut our investments in education and innovation. We protected those investments in this bill. The plan did not work. It didn't work now, and the plan to do it again 6 months from now didn't work.

□ 1810

So now we will have that great debate over our priorities. We are looking forward to it. Let's get on to talking about jobs and the economy.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished Democratic leader, who has been a fighter for America's priorities, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And every chance I get, I want to salute him for his tremendous leadership as the top Democrat on the Budget Committee, for the work he did with Mr. CLYBURN in the bipartisan talks, as they strove to have what the American people want: a balanced, bipartisan, fair agreement to lift the debt ceiling and take America forward.

Unfortunately, that did not happen. What did happen, and it brings to mind the existential question, why are we here? And I would divide, as we say in legislation, I would divide that question into why are we here, and why are we here today? We are here because all of us in this body care about our country, have decided that public service is a noble pursuit, and that we have come here to make the future better for future generations. That is what our Founding Fathers visualized for America, that every generation would take responsibility to make the future better for the next.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, our Founders, in addition to writing our founding documents, the Declaration, the great Declaration, which embodies fairness in it and equality, then the Constitution, they declared independence, they fought the greatest naval power in the world, they won, they wrote the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, making us the freest, greatest Nation in the world, founded on a principle of respect that all people are created equal. That had never been done in the history of the world.

And when they did that, as I have told you before, because I love it so much, they also created the Great Seal of the United States. And that Great Seal of the United States has on it ''Novus Ordo Seclorum,'' a new order for the centuries, for the ages, forever.

So confident were our Founders in their idea about generational responsibility, one to the next, that they were confident that our country, that what they were putting forth, would exist for the ages. For the ages. That was the challenge they gave us. That is the responsibility that we have. And for a couple of hundred years or more, that has always been the case.

Every generation has always believed that it would make the future better

for the next, for their children and for their grandchildren. We are here today because we believe that, and we believe that the public policy that we put forth, the legislation we put forth, should result in public policy that makes the future better for our children and our grandchildren. That we are committed to their education, the economic security of our families, the dignified retirement of our seniors, including my being a senior, and also safety and security of our neighborhoods and of our country, and that we would do it in a fiscally sound way that did not give our kids any bills, public or personal.

So if we believe all of that, and that's why we are here in Congress, it's hard to believe that we are putting our best foot forward with the legislation that comes before us today. I am not happy with it, but I am proud of some of the accomplishments contained in it. And that's why I am voting for it.

That takes me to the second question: Why are we here today? Why are we here today, within 24 hours of our Nation going into default, after months of conversation about how we would address the debt ceiling? Not to have future spending, but to pay our past obligations. And I won't go into it again, how we got here. But I will say that time is one of the most important commodities any of us have, the most precious, the most finite. And during that period of time, when our country could have been more productive, more optimistic, more confident in the tradition of our Founders, instead, a cloud of doubt was placed on it because of the delay, the delay, the delay in lifting the debt ceiling.

As my distinguished colleague Mr. VAN HOLLEN said, this has never happened before. We have never, never tied the hands of a President of the United States. We never placed any doubt in the public markets as to whether this would happen. We never had people around the boardroom tables all wondering if we even knew the consequences of our inaction. But I am concerned about the boardroom table. I am more concerned also about the kitchen table.

Because this delay and uncertainty has a tremendous impact on America's families as they sit around the table and talk about how they're going to make ends meet, how they're going to pay their bills. Is Social Security going to be intact for them? Will their checks arrive this week or next week, whenever they're due? Is Medicare and Medicaid something that they can count on?

Well, after months and months and months to reach an agreement that could have been reached a long time ago—it is not so great it took so long to achieve; it could have been accomplished months ago, and at least had the merit of instilling confidence earlier, sooner, rather than at the latest possible moment. So we must make sure that we are, as we say why are we here today, that we are not here some other day to go through these motions.

That's another reason why I am supporting this bill, because the President was successful in impressing upon the Congress that we needed the full time, the 18 months so that we can have Americans' kitchen table—people sitting around that table and sitting around the boardroom table would all know that you can rely on the United States of America to meet its obligations. Okay?

Another reason to support this bill, even though there are plenty of reasons not to, is that it stops cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. This is the most important assignment given to the Democratic leadership going to the table: Make sure there are no cuts in benefits in Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. That was achieved.

Another issue of importance to us is that as we protect and defend our country, we also measure our strength in the health, education, and well-being of the American people. And so we have a 50–50 split between our expenditures for defense and our expenditures for strength defined in other ways for our country.

So these are some reasons. While those who may have the luxury of not wanting to vote for the bill, I feel a responsibility to do so. We cannot, because of certain objections in the bill—and one of the main ones is that there is not one red cent coming from America's wealthiest families, the most successful people, and God bless them for their success, and I know that they are willing to do more, but not one red cent coming to help reduce the deficit while we are willing to cut Title I education for the poorest children in America. And that's too bad for those children. It's terrible for our country.

So, again, you can make a list of things in the bill that we do not like and things that are not in the bill, like revenue, but I urge my colleagues to think about our seniors and to think about the 18 months and what that means in terms of confidence in our society and what it means also to have the 50–50 in terms of defining the strength of America.

We cannot, despite our reluctance to vote for this bill for some of us, allow America's seniors and veterans, who are depending on receiving their check from the government or their security over time—we cannot allow our seniors and veterans to be caught in the collateral damage of the assault on the middle class that is being waged in this Congress.

□ 1820

This is one manifestation of making it harder for the future, for the great middle class which is, and those who aspire to it, which is the backbone of our democracy. So if we are going to honor the vows of our Founders and carry on the great legacy and tradition of their optimism, their determination, their hope for the future that we would last for ages, we would last for ages as a democracy, not an ever broadening disparity of income and equity in our country that undermines that democracy.

So, please, my colleagues, if you are on the fence about this—I certainly am and have been, even though I worked very hard to support the President in preserving what I said about no cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, about the 18 months and about the 50/50 split—please think of what could happen if we defaulted. Please, please, please come down in favor of, again, preventing the collateral damage from reaching our seniors and our veterans.

I urge you to consider voting ''yes,'' but I completely respect the hesitation that Members have about this.

Again, I want to commend our distinguished colleagues, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CLYBURN, the President of the United States, and, really, those who tried to work in a bipartisan way to try to accomplish something.

Now, I hear that our Republican colleagues have said they got 98 percent of what they want in the bill. I hope that their votes will reflect that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the House Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, the American people want more jobs and they want less debt. The American people are telling Washington, you have got to quit spending money you don't have. You have got to quit borrowing 42 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese, and then send the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

Our crisis today is not the debt ceiling, it is our debt, and it is a spending-driven debt. That is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say that this bill solves our problem. It doesn't. It's a solid first step. Nobody, nobody on our side of the aisle wants to increase this debt ceiling. It's not in our DNA.

But we do believe that ultimately you ought to stay current on your bills, and you have got to quit spending money you don't have. And in this bill, although the sums are very, very small, when we pass this bill, if the President signs it into law, it will be the first time in my lifetime, the first time in my lifetime that for 2 years in a row we have actually cut discretionary spending in Washington, D.C., and made a very slight directional change in the right direction.

The numbers are small, the directional change is huge, but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the seeds of the ultimate solution are planted in this bill, and that is the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The American people aren't looking for a

balanced approach; they are looking for a balanced budget. To have it work, it needs to be enshrined in our Constitution.

This bill will assure, for the first time in 15 years, both the House and the Senate vote on a balanced budget. Those are the seeds of the solution to save this country for the next generation.

I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just start by saying this, Mr. Speaker, from this debate it's very clear that we have a difference of opinions. We have different philosophies on how to address these issues, but we are coming up to a deadline that we all must recognize: default.

So what this has done is it has brought our two parties together. So I would just like to take a second to reflect for a moment that we have a bipartisan compromise here. That doesn't happen all that often around here; so I think that's worth noting. That's a good thing.

First off, as my colleague from Texas has just said, this is a down payment on the problem. It's a good step in the right direction, and it is a huge cultural change to this institution.

Both parties got us in this mess. Both parties are going to have to work together to get us out of this mess, and the real problem, I would add, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we spend way more money than we take in. We have to address that.

To my friends on the left, I think they would like to take comfort in the fact the way these spending cuts are designed and the way the sequester is designed.

To my friends on the right, we are cutting spending. We have been trying to get discretionary caps in law for years. I have been here 13 years trying for it every year, this is the first time.

When we ran Congress the last time we were in the majority we couldn't even get it with the Republican Congress. Now we are getting discretionary caps. That's a big achievement.

Number two, we used to just rubber stamp these debt limit increases. We used to sneak these debt limit increases in budget resolutions. Now it's out here in plain sight.

And what are we doing? We are actually cutting spending while we do this. That's cultural. That's significant. That's a big step in the right direction. We are getting two-thirds of the cuts we wanted in our budget, and, as far as I am concerned, 66 percent in the right direction is a whole lot better than going in the wrong direction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we should never have reached this point. Under Democratic and Republican presidents alike, Congress has always fulfilled its responsibility to pay our nation's bills when they come due. We have disagreed vehemently about matters of fiscal policy, but we have always recognized that the full faith and credit of the United States should remain above the partisan fray.

Until now, that is. Make no mistake, this is a manufactured crisis. For the last several weeks, Republicans have held our nation's economy hostage to their narrow and extreme ideological agenda, demanding a ransom of devastating cuts to critical domestic programs while protecting tax breaks for oil companies and other special interests. No matter that Social Security benefits, military pay, and the credit rating of our country have all been hanging in the balance—apparently, economic calamity is a small price to pay for ideological purity.

I voted months ago for a clean debt ceiling increase. I voted days ago for an alternative, bipartisan Senate plan to increase the debt ceiling and cut spending in carefully targeted ways. That the House and Senate are just now considering legislation to stave off default is a tremendous failure by House Republicans, who could not bring the most extreme elements of their caucus to a more balanced legislative solution.

The result is an agreement which could have been worse but is still not good enough. From the beginning, I have said that any serious approach to deficit reduction must do two things: protect the fragile recovery, because the best cure for a budget deficit is a growing economy, and take a balanced approach to finding savings by putting all types of spending and revenues on the table. This agreement meets neither of these tests.

The President deserves credit for negotiating a package that rejects some of the worst Republican demands. It immediately moves us past this artificially created crisis by extending the debt limit through 2013, and it protects Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid against cuts from Republicans who have signaled a willingness to savage these middle class benefits as a part of deficit reduction. I am also encouraged that defense spending has finally been subjected to the same pressures as the rest of the budget.

However, these positive aspects offer limited consolation. Instead of charting a responsible path to deficit reduction while continuing to invest in economic recovery, the bill imposes severe spending caps that will become even more severe if the deficit commission created by the bill fails to achieve consensus. Instead of taking a balanced approach that includes new sources of revenue, such as an end to special-interest tax breaks, the bill asks the elderly and working-class Americans to bear the brunt of the sacrifice. Why are we not asking the wealthiest Americans to make the same sacrifices other Americans have already been asked to make?

Finally, I also vote no because I refuse to legitimize the demands of ideologues who have recklessly held the national economy hostage to their extreme agenda. Governance by brinksmanship is not worthy of being called governance. The American people deserve better than a House of Representatives that forces the entire country to lurch from one artificially created crisis to the next. We are United States Congress, not the Tea Party's Congress, and it's time we started acting like it.''

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the Budget Control Act Agreement (S. 365) is a terrible bill that I strongly oppose. This legislation is the product of the most disturbing political process I have witnessed during my time in Congress. For the first time ever, one of America's political parties showed themselves willing to throw the nation into default on our debt obligations for the sake of politics. By holding an increase in the debt ceiling hostage as a negotiating strategy, the Tea Party Republican majority in the U.S. House of Representatives imperiled millions of jobs, businesses, and the economic well-being of every American. A nonpartisan publication, the National Journal, declared that America has ''entered a new era of government at gunpoint.''

I find myself agreeing with Wall Street Journal editors who criticized the House majority's conduct during this process by saying, ''Republicans are not looking like adults to whom voters can entrust the government.''

The legislation that House Republicans are forcing on the country will slash trillions of dollars of investments at exactly the moment when more investment is needed to prevent our economy from sliding back into recession. Education, infrastructure, health research, public safety, clean energy and every other middle class priority will see cuts as a result of this bill.

An editorial in today's New York Times argues this deal will ''hinder an economic recovery.'' At a time when 14 million Americans are unemployed and economic growth has slowed to a crawl, why is Congress passing legislation that will ''hinder an economic recovery?'' Tying massive cuts to a debt ceiling increase is completely unnecessary, totally counterproductive, and it will make America's job crisis even worse. And, with this bill, the Republicans are tossing the heavy burden of deficit reduction onto America's middle class without asking even one penny from the nation's wealthiest individuals and corporations.

While I cannot support this agreement, President Obama and Democratic leaders deserve tremendous credit for their perseverance and determination in solving this manufactured debt crisis. Their efforts succeeded in protecting the economy from the unthinkable consequences of default and shielded Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid from Republican cuts.

President Obama was forced to negotiate this agreement with radical Republicans who proved all to willing to send the economy into default. He was in a nearly impossible position. One would expect irrational, dangerous, and irresponsible negotiating tactics from North Korea's Kim Jong-il, but not from the Republican congressional leaders. President Obama did what the nation required in order to avert economic disaster.

Still, I cannot support this legislation. This is a bad bill on many levels, most of all because it forces a broken bargain that avoids economic collapse at the cost of an even slower and more painful economic recovery. It may even return the nation to recession.

This is bill is bad for America and I strongly oppose it.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following:

''BIG DEAL'' IS FOUNDATION FOR ''LONG-TERM AUSTERITY''

WHY I VOTED ''NO'' ON THE BUDGET DEAL

(Statement By Congressman Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.)

As a result of the ''Big Deal'' that House Speaker John Boehner, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid and Senate Minority

Leader Mitch McConnell negotiated—and approved by the House and Senate—welcome to ''Austere America.'' The era of austerity has begun!

Democrats were faced with two draconian choices: (1) vote ''against'' the package and the result would be a job killing default according to House Speaker Boehner; or (2) vote ''for'' the package and, from my perspective, the result will be a job killing austerity.

The budget negotiators absolutely concluded a ''Big Deal.'' It's a ''game changer.'' The United States is about to become the austere Japan of the 1990s and the austere Great Britain of 2011. Budget deficits and debt will go up—not down. Unemployment will go up—not down. Suffering by the American people will go up—not down. Economic growth will remain stagnant or slow at best and will not address the need for jobs for the unemployed. In short, I predict the result of this agreement will be the opposite of the current spin.

While all Democrats agree that reducing the deficits and taming the debt is something that must be dealt with in the future, the immediate issue is not ''deficit reductions'' but ''job reductions'' (i.e., creating enough jobs for 17 million unemployed Americans). Reducing federal spending in a weak economy is the exact opposite of what is needed now.

Republicans and conservative Democrats preposterously argue ''tax and budget cuts will equal more jobs and more tax revenues''—the ''Laugher'' Curve. The biggest tax cuts in history in 2001 and 2003 resulted in the loss of 600,000 private jobs over eight years. To stimulate the economy, the Congress passed and the President signed a $757 billion stimulus package that kept us out of another Great Depression, but it was unable to rescue unemployed workers from the current Great Recession. The Republican argument reminds me of the man whose house caught on fire and when he couldn't put it out with a garden hose he concluded, ''Water doesn't put out fire.'' Water does put out fire, but you have to have enough of it to fit the size of the fire, and you have to put it in the right place.

Some argue—because of the possibility of default—the President and Democrats had no alternative. I disagree. First, even the threat of using Section 4 of the 14th Amendment by the President (which he took off the table) would have strengthened his negotiating hand. Second, he could have fought for an alternative strategy of invest, grow and build which would have put Democrats on our turf and on the offense instead of on the Republicans turf and on the defense—and such a plan would create jobs, reduce deficits and debt.

The most vulnerable Americans will again suffer the most under this agreement. This is a very bad and sad day for America.

TREAT PRESIDENT OBAMA LIKE ALL OTHER PRESIDENTS!

RAISE THE DEBT CEILING WITHOUT CONDITIONS

(Statement by Congressman Jesse L. Jackson, Jr. (D–IL–2))

According to the Congressional Research Service, since March of 1962 a ''clean'' debt ceiling bill has been passed by Congress 74 times—including 18 times under President Ronald Reagan and 7 times under President George W. Bush; and raising the debt ceiling has never been used by a political party to ''stickup,'' ''shake-down'' or ''hold hostage'' the President of the United States, the American people and the world economy for narrow domestic political gain.

President Obama should be treated like all other Presidents! Republicans didn't like President Bill Clinton either—because of his political ideology—but they never hijacked the economy over passing a clean debt ceiling bill. So don't change anything just because Barack Obama is the President and Republicans don't like his ideology! Raise the debt ceiling without conditions! Pass a ''clean'' debt ceiling bill! Treating President Obama differently than all past Presidents reflects an ''institutional bias'' against the Southside of Chicago!

Rep. Joe Wilson reflected the same institutional bias when, in an unprecedented manner, he called President Obama a ''liar'' in the middle of his State of the Union address. Speaker John Boehner reflected a similar institutional bias when he said he and the President had the same responsibility—equating his job as Speaker of the House (a legislative function) with the job of the President of the United States (an executive function). Doubting the birthplace of Barack Obama, doubting his Christian faith and experience, calling him a Muslim and a socialist reflects this same institutional bias. The Republican's proposed Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA) reflects a similar institutional bias—the only other place where there's a BBA is in the Constitution of the Confederate States of America. With a BBA, the Southside of Chicago can never be made equal to the Northside of Chicago.

What are the alternatives for President Obama? First, he can either sign or veto whatever bill Congress passes and sends up to him—assuming Congress is able to pass something. Or, second, since no other President has been treated like he is being treated, he may have to use something no other President has had to use—i.e., Section 4 of the 14th Amendment. Section 4 of the 14th Amendment was included because the Union did not want to pay the past war debt of the seceded Confederate states. Therefore it is appropriate that in the year of the sesquicentennial start of the Civil War that he use a tool given to him at the conclusion of the Civil War (1868) to save Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the U.S. and the world economy.

The previous administration started two wars. We have men and women who are presently fighting on foreign battlefields and we should not abandon them. This government has an obligation to them and their families to pay them for risking their lives and protecting the country. This President should exercise the 14th Amendment's extraordinary authority in defense of these men and woman at war.

Use of the 14th Amendment is appropriate and justified when the current advocates of states' rights are again asserting themselves. As Section 4 of the 14th Amendment was being debated, Sen. Benjamin Wade (R–OH) argued that ''it puts the debt incurred in the Civil War on our part under the guardianship of the Constitution of the United States, so that a Congress cannot repudiate it. I believe that to do this will give great confidence to capitalists and will be of incalculable pecuniary benefit to the United States, for I have no doubt that every man who has property in the public funds will feel safer when he sees that the national debt is withdrawn from the power of a Congress to repudiate it and placed under the guardianship of the Constitution than he would feel if it were left at loose ends and subject to the varying majorities which may arise in Congress.'' President Obama should not allow the ''current majority'' in the House and the filibuster prone minority of Republicans in the Senate to hold the economy hostage.

So in the spirit of Senator Benjamin Wade (R–OH), Representative Thaddeus Stevens (R–PA) and Senator Charles Sumner (R–MA), President Barack Obama should use Section 4 of the 14th Amendment to protect the full faith and credit of the United States and avoid an economic catastrophe that will damage the United States and the world economy.

Mr. Speaker, I have given several Special Order speeches about my view of the Constitution, making the argument for why I think it should be amended to include certain basic rights that the American people currently lack. These include the right to a high-quality education, the right to health care, and equal rights for women. This afternoon, my special order time will be used to discuss the Continuing Resolution for FY 2011, the Republican Proposed FY 2012 Budget, and the Balanced Budget Amendment or what I've taken to calling the ''ImBalanced Budget Amendment''.

Not too long ago, the House passed H.R. 1, a continuing resolution that would have forced middle and working class Americans to carry the heavy burden or spending cuts. My colleagues across the aisle simplified the impacts of this measure by describing it as ''tightening our belts''. They seem to be oblivious to the fact that these cuts went deep for those Americans who could least afford them.

H.R. 1 ''tightened our belts'', slashing programs like Community Health Centers, specifically designed to provide access to basic health and dental services to underserved communities that may not otherwise be able to get the care they need.

HR. 1 ''tightened our belts'' through cuts to the National Institutes of Health, setting back development of cancer treatments and cures for other diseases, the impact of which we will feel for years to come, as medical professionals are forced to shut down promising research projects.

HR. 1 ''tightened our belts'' by hacking away at training for Health Professions, reducing this funding by more than 23%. Cuts to Title VII and VIII programs that help to train primary health professionals for underserved areas, would limit the access of low income individuals to quality doctors, nurses and physicians assistants in their areas.

H.R. 1 ''tightened our belts'' by severing Title X family planning programs. In doing so, we stepped back in time, preventing life saving care from being offered to our nation's women, specifically women who wouldn't otherwise have access to this kind of care.

The programs I've listed so far provide health services to our nation, and especially our most underprivileged populations. H.R. 1 also 2 tightened our belts with cuts to job training programs, Head Start and after-school programs, Pell Grants, Hope VI Housing programs, and high speed rail.

These programs were systematically sent to the guillotine. The people that they serve are not the millionaires, to whom we generously extended tax cuts. They are not the corporations who eagerly navigate tax loopholes, every year, costing our nation billions in revenue. They are the everyday, hard working, middle class, public school educated, check book balancing, minimum wage earning, mothers and fathers and grandparents that elected each of us, hoping we'd find a way to decrease unemployment, and bring America back from the brink.

Mr. Speaker, thankfully, our colleagues across the Capitol thought we went a few notches too tight in our belt with H.R. 1. As the Senate refused to take up these cuts,

much of our future long term budget discussions to reduce our deficit and get America back on track remain in limbo.

Recently this discussion had reached a fever pitch.

After multiple short term extensions of the FY 2011 Appropriations legislation, the negotiations between Speaker BOEHNER, Leader REID and the President had broken down many times throughout the week.

We were faced with the threat of the first government shutdown since 1996. Agencies were planning which workers to furlough, National Parks and Museums were prepared to shut their doors for the weekend, and the brave women and men in the active-duty of our Armed forces were prepared to continue to work without pay.

Then, at the eleventh hour, there was a breakthrough. The five and a half month Continuing Resolution, agreed to by the leadership of House and Senate, included a total of $39 billion worth of cuts.

But these cuts that were agreed to late into Friday, have real consequences. There are significant cuts to programs like WIC, the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women Infants and Children, Community Health Centers, the Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program, international disaster assistance and Head Start.

After the President and Congressional leadership agreed to giving $800 billion in tax cuts to America's top wage earners last December, we turned around and cut programs that working families and seniors depend on. It just doesn't make sense, Mr. Speaker.

Again, while I was relieved that the federal government did not shut down, I am deeply disappointed in the process that has brought us to this ''compromise'', if you can even call it that.

Like the negotiations that held up tax cuts for the middle class at the end of last year to hold out for tax cuts for the wealthy, our leadership has again demonstrated that they are willing to hold up programs that provide for the most vulnerable Americans. And this Congress is only just beginning.

As for the next fiscal year's budget, there are a variety of solutions that have been presented, some with potential to succeed, others destined to fail. Among the proposals lie Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN's recent offering. Looking at the facts, his proposal will reduce our nation's deficit, but leaves us asking the question, at what cost?

First and foremost, Mr. RYAN intends to place the burden of ending our nation's debt on the citizens least capable of caring for themselves, those most reliant on the help of others: our seniors.

The Budget Committee's proposal would end the Medicare our senior citizens have come to know and rely on, replacing it with what can only be described as a coupon—a voucher that, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, would leave our eldest Americans shouldering 68% of their healthcare costs in the next 20 years.

Who else pays the cost of balancing our budget within the Ryan proposal? The burden falls next to working American families. The Ryan proposal will lower the tax rates for individuals with the highest income as well as corporations, relying on raising taxes for the average American to pay for it.

If it sounds familiar, it's because this is the same standby, trickle down, failure that we have placed our faith in for the past decade.

Despite what Majority Leader CANTOR says, during an economic downturn, decreasing the deficit does not create jobs. Also, cutting taxes does not create jobs. Both Presidents Bush and Obama have cut taxes so much that if ERIC CANTOR's theory were correct, we should have zero unemployment, which we DO NOT HAVE. This is what the Ryan plan aims to do.

For ten years our economy has stagnated. The gap between the median wage and average wage is growing, because the highest earners are the only ones receiving wage increases.

Unfortunately, balancing our nation's budget on the backs of the middle class does NOT end there.

Where else will the burden of balancing the budget fall under the Ryan plan? Education. Cuts to K–12 education are just the starting point in disadvantaging the future of America. The proposal also makes significant cuts to Pell Grants. These cuts will prevent the educated generation of young Americans our country needs to compete in a global economy.

The proposed cuts to Pell Grants would return the maximum award allowable to prestimulus levels, impacting millions of young Americans depending on financial assistance to attend college.

This will stretch the time it will take for them to earn their degrees and enter the workforce.

Finally, Ryan's budget continues to provide tax loopholes to big oil companies, and cuts all federal support for clean energy, short sighting our economic investments in the future of energy.

Mr. Speaker, I am not promoting constant federal debt. I am not advocating against hoping or trying for a balanced budget. But when you look through the history of our nation, we see that when Americans were in the most need, during war or recession, during the Great Depression, we focused on solving those problems, not just reducing our debt.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently engaged in two wars and fighting our way out of the worst recession of the modern era. The Ryan budget is a new attempt at an age old ploy to mandate a balanced budget for the Federal Government.

Ending our Nation's deficit and returning our country to prosperity, should of course be the goal. But we must also ask the question, at what cost? Where do our priorities lie?

The Ryan proposal, like the myriad constitutional amendments before it, attempts to balance our budget on the backs of those Americans who can least bear the burden.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in heavy-hearted support of S. 365, an imperfect, bipartisan compromise to raise the debt ceiling and rein in federal spending. House and Senate leaders have been bickering for months over this issue, and we have waited until the 59th minute of the 11th hour to reach an agreement. If we do not raise the debt ceiling by tomorrow, our economy will be deeply shaken, resulting not only in massive losses to Wall Street, but also in increased costs and interest rates for American families. With the severe threat of default upon us, it is time to come together for our Nation's best interests.

This is not the bill I would have written, and I do not know a single Member of Congress who believes this bill is perfect. I agreed with President Obama's sentiments today when he said that ''as with any compromise, the outcome is far from satisfying.'' However, as a Member of Congress, there are times when you must hold your nose and vote for a compromise that, while imperfect, is necessary. I believe this is one of those times. The grave threat of default is far too near and too serious not to vote for this agreement.

I am happy to see that this compromise provides long-term economic certainty, raising the debt ceiling until 2013. This will give our markets, investors, and economic partners abroad confidence in the U.S. economy and our ability to pay our bills. It also takes a bold step toward fiscal responsibility, resulting in over $2.1 trillion in deficit reduction, as recently scored by the Congressional Budget Office. I believe it is important to seriously address our national debt so as not to burden future generations.

The bill will immediately enact strict ten-year spending caps on both defense and non-defense programs, resulting in $917 billion in savings. It also creates a bipartisan congressional committee which will identify an additional $1.5 trillion in deficit reduction by November 23, 2011, including from entitlement and tax reform. Both the House and Senate will hold an up or down vote on the committee's proposal.

I believe this compromise cuts too far into many important government programs and that these spending reductions will not be easy to swallow. Discretionary spending will be brought to its lowest levels since the Eisenhower Administration. I am reassured, however, that cuts will not be made to Social Security, Medicaid, unemployment insurance, programs for low-income families, Pell Grants for low-income college students, or civilian and military retirement programs.

I am greatly disappointed that this compromise does not immediately include revenue increases for the wealthiest Americans, and I believe it places the brunt of the burden of deficit reduction on low-income and middle-class families. I am optimistic, however, that the future plan set forth by the bipartisan congressional committee on deficit reduction will include such revenue increases. Instead of protecting tax breaks for Big Oil, corporations that ship jobs overseas, and the very richest among us, these groups should share in the sacrifice.

We could each sit here refusing to support a bill that does not mirror our individual priorities, allowing the U.S. to default on its loans and permitting an economic catastrophe. Or we could come together and support a compromise that, while imperfect, gets the job done. We were elected to be mature civic leaders who could put public interests before self interests. I urge my colleagues to serve that purpose by supporting this bill.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the default debate is, at its heart, a debate between two visions for America. One side envisions rebuilding our country, investing in jobs and education and infrastructure, and rising from the Great Recession as a stronger and more resilient Nation. The other side accepts a pessimistic vision of a weakened America with a shrunken government—a Nation hampered by deep cuts to the safety net and hobbled by a refusal to invest in our future.

I have no doubt that, in a fair debate, a hopeful vision for America would win out. But the default debate has not been held on fair terms. The Tea Party and their enablers have held America hostage. They have insisted

that, unless Congress enacted their radical, ideological agenda, they would force an unprecedented default on America's obligations and thus trigger an economic collapse.

From the beginning of this debate, I rejected the notion that America's creditworthiness should be used as a bargaining chip. Yet I was willing to support a balanced, fair deal if that was what was required to prevent a default. Unfortunately, today's deal is not balanced. It is not fair. Most of all, it is not right.

The House has voted for vast cuts in government services that ordinary Americans depend on: student loans, unemployment insurance, food safety inspections, highway safety programs, and more. These cuts will force layoffs among teachers, public safety officers, construction workers, and more. These laid-off workers will, in turn, be forced to pare back their spending at their local grocery stores, drug stores, and small businesses, forcing still more layoffs—a vicious circle that threatens to destabilize our fragile economy. We saw in last week's economic reports that job growth has been choked back by cuts in state and local governments. This deal does not help the situation. It hurts the economy.

The deal lays the groundwork for another $1.5 trillion in cuts to come, to be negotiated behind closed doors by an unelected supercommittee. Given that the first round of cuts will have decimated discretionary programs, these later cuts will very likely focus on Social Security and Medicare. The citizens who will be hurt most are those who have the least voice in our democracy. After all, when a handful of politicians gather in the proverbial smoke-filled room, the interests of ordinary Americans are nearly always left out.

Yet although most Americans will sacrifice greatly, the most privileged among us will be immune. Favored corporate interests, millionaires, and billionaires will continue to receive special tax breaks as far as the eye can see. That is not the sort of fair, balanced deal that Americans asked for and expected.

As poor as this deal is on its merits, I am even more troubled by the precedent it sets. The Tea Party and their enablers have, by taking the American economy hostage, transformed a routine budgetary authorization into the most dramatic reshaping of government in decades. Today's deal establishes that government by hostage negotiation is a legitimate, effective way to achieve one's political ends. I am frightened by what this means for the future of our democracy.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan, bicameral Budget Control Act.

While imperfect, this is an historic agreement. With this compromise, we are taking another step in the long and difficult, yet vital, process of forcing our government to live within its means.

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.

To sustain the operations of the government, we borrow over 42-cents of every federal dollar we spend. As a result, our national debt has now increased to 100% of the size of our economy today, up from just 42% in 1980.

The implications for future generations of Americans of this dangerous spending spree are obvious. Enough is enough!

While far from perfect, this realistic approach finally begins to turn back the tide of federal red ink in several important ways: (1) it cuts spending by $917 billion and does not raise taxes that would fuel additional spending; (2) it creates a process that keeps our underlying fiscal policy problems front-and-center for the foreseeable future.

The bill we have before us today would extend the debt limit in two phases and avoid a default on the obligations of the United States. The first phase would provide for $917 billion in discretionary spending cuts and an immediate increase of up to $900 billion in the debt limit.

The legislation would allow for a subsequent debt limit increase of up to $1.5 trillion only if a bipartisan, bicameral committee provides, and the full Congress approves by an ''up or down'' vote, additional spending cuts in excess of the requested debt limit increase, or a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution is passed by Congress and sent to the states for ratification by the end of the year.

Is this bill perfect. Absolutely not.

Granted, some well-meaning Americans have opposed the Budget Control Act because they think it does not cut enough. I would remind my Colleagues that the Committee on Appropriations has already started making tough decisions on spending. In this year's appropriations bills, we have sheared billions of dollars and imposed strict spending reductions and will complete our work and pass responsible, sustainable, and timely funding legislation.

I completely agree that the Budget Control Act is far from sufficient to solve our underlying budget problems. In that respect, it is a step in the right direction, nothing more.

I, too, wanted deeper spending cuts and greater deficit and debt reduction. However, given the stubborn insistence of the President and his Congressional allies on new taxes and still more spending, I cannot see how we achieve greater savings at this time.

I also fear that we may come to regret proposed cuts to our national security infrastructure. Our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines are already stressed and strained by ten years of multiple deployments. Future reductions in end strength and operations and maintenance will undoubtedly lead to the ''hollow force'' that our experienced military leaders have warned us to avoid.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to put progress before partisanship and support this measure.

My constituents in New Jersey want our government to live within its means. But they also continue to ask ''where are the jobs?'' So, they want Congress to make economic growth and private-sector job creation its top priority.

This is about our country, our way of life and restoring confidence in the American Dream. Let's get on with it.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this so-called debt limit compromise, S. 365. A compromise is when the two sides each make concessions. This bill fails to meet that definition because all concessions come from Democrats. This debt ceiling legislation protects special interests at the expense of America's working families, children, senior citizens, people who've lost their jobs, and people with disabilities.

It punts the difficult decisions to a ''super committee'' of twelve Members of Congress who will be tasked with finding another $1.5 trillion in savings. Those twelve people will have the power to cut Social Security benefits, turn Medicare into a voucher, and gut the Medicaid program into oblivion. The rest of Congress will have only the right to vote yes or no on the entire proposal. Unlike the vast majority of legislation, no amendments will be allowed.

If the super committee fails, there will be automatic cuts to Medicare and additional draconian cuts on top of the draconian cuts that will be made when this bill is signed into law.

Default is a dangerous proposition. But there is only one reason that our country has been pushed to the brink of default: the Republican Tea Party fringe. We are in the midst of a completely manufactured crisis that was orchestrated by this extreme faction of the Republican Party. They are a minority in Congress and in our nation, yet they are holding our nation's economy hostage because Republican leadership continues to pander to them at the detriment of our country and its future.

Democrats and Republicans alike have lifted the debt ceiling some 75 times in our history. Paying our bills is a necessary part of responsible governing.

This year, I've voted twice to raise the debt limit ceiling. I first did so on May 31, 2011 when Republicans brought a clean debt ceiling bill to the floor. Because of uniform Republican opposition, that vote failed.

I next voted this past Saturday to raise the debt ceiling in conjunction with significant spending cuts when the House considered Senator REID's compromise package. It was far from perfect, but it was much more balanced than the package before us today.

Today, the radical wing of the Republican Party has forced a no-win situation. Vote yes on today's ''debt-limit compromise,'' and we limit our ability to grow our economy, create jobs, and protect the most vulnerable members of our society. Vote no and we risk an unprecedented default that would further deteriorate our sputtering economy.

We should never have gotten to this point and it is up to those who got us into this mess to get the votes to end this crisis. However I will not allow my vehement opposition to this deal to put our country into default. If my vote is needed to prevent default, I will hold my nose and change my vote to yes. I will do that because governing requires tough choices. If Tea Party Republicans refuse to govern, it is up to the rest of us to do so for them.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, although I have voted seven times in the past under President Bush to raise the debt ceiling, all of those votes in the past were clean debt ceiling bills, unlike the bill before the House today, which imposes $1 trillion in spending cuts on the working people and the poor, and decimates our social safety net.

In this round of debt ceiling discussions, the Tea Party Republicans have tied the President's hands to couple a raise in the debt ceiling with billions of billions of dollars in cuts to our nation's safety net programs, bringing cuts across the board to WIC (Women, Infant and Children), programs to protect our nation's senior citizens, Pell Grants, education programs, community health care, and numerous other federal programs that assist middle and working class Americans. It is also important to take note of what isn't in this agreement:

funding directed towards job creation. Indisputably, job production is essential to lifting our nation out of the economic downturn since consumer spending is the key driver of our economy.

Just last December, the Republicans forced a vote on extending the Bush Tax Cuts for millionaires and billionaires, adding $70 billion to our nation's deficit. And this suicidal economic plan came right after eight years of horribly reckless spending and excessive tax cuts for the rich under President Bush and the Republican Congress, who left America trillions of dollars in debt. What was particularly troubling about this situation is that President Clinton had left the White House not only with a balanced budget but with a surplus!

Yet the Republican Party has remained steadfast in implementing Reverse Robin Hood economic policies: cutting programs and services for the working and middle class, while maintaining tax cuts for the millionaires, billionaires and the Big Oil companies like EXXON Mobil, who just reported last week that their second quarter profits rose 41%!

Indeed, the Republican Party has shown they will stop at nothing to pursue deficit reduction exclusively through deep spending cuts to critical social services, while taking our nation to the brink of economic default. And again, while cutting this safety net, they have successfully fought to preserve tax breaks for Big Oil (even though the big five oil companies earned nearly $1 trillion in profits during the last decade), corporations that ship American jobs overseas, and tax breaks for the wealthiest .5% of Americans, while leaving what's left over in available resources to be divided among the rest of us.

Beyond a doubt, job production is essential to lifting our nation out of the dire economic situation we're in, and one way to create jobs is through transportation and infrastructure investment: in fact, for every $1 billion in transportation funding, approximately 34,000 jobs are created. Yet the Republican leadership remains inflexible, unwilling to compromise on even reauthorizing the FAA. And what has this led to?

Four thousand Americans throughout the nation who are paid out of the FAA trust fund that will not be paid, and nearly 90,000 others are affected by the cancellation of airport construction projects: and for my state of Florida, this includes over 3,000 airport construction jobs lost, and 27 FAA employee jobs, 19 of them at Orlando International Airport, 3 in Miami, 4 in Melbourne and 1 in Hilliard.

Just like the Republican Party's lack of leadership over the debt ceiling debate, they absolutely refuse to compromise to extend funding for the FAA. So yes, this is yet another example of the Republican Party being entirely ill prepared and completely irresponsible in their attempt to act as House leaders.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this vote is a close call.

Like the vast majority of our colleagues, I do not want to see the federal government fail to meet its obligations. And if the government cannot borrow, the fact that President Obama would decide which bills to pay with the money that is available is not reassuring. He could well refuse to pay Social Security benefits in order to build the maximum amount of political pressure for his agenda.

But I am equally disturbed by the prospect of continuing to spend and borrow as usual. The United States simply cannot continue down this path of fiscal irresponsibility and meet our duty to our children and to future generations. We must cut some spending now, and we must change the system that allows or even encourages such fiscal recklessness.

This bill cuts some spending, although not nearly as much as I would like. The spending it cuts directly is discretionary spending, which is the easiest to cut because it is subject to the annual appropriations process. The bill does not touch mandatory spending, which is well over half of the budget. That is a lost opportunity.

The special congressional committee could recommend changes in mandatory spending and hopefully an overhaul of our tax code, which is a drag on our economy and a burden to all taxpayers. The recommendations of that committee will receive a vote in the House and Senate before the end of the year. That is a potential opportunity.

Significantly, the bill does cut a dollar of spending for every dollar of additional borrowing authority. No more money can be added to the debt without an equivalent or greater cut in spending. That is an important first for our country and an important precedent to set.

The bill also requires a vote on a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution. It will be the first such vote in the Senate in 15 years. There is, of course, no guarantee that it will pass, but there is a real opportunity for the American people to let their Senators and Representatives know how they feel. If the polls are correct that over 70% of the people support a Balanced Budget Amendment and if they let Congress know of their support, it should pass.

I am concerned about the way this measure treats defense. The Department of Defense, like any large organization, can be more efficient. Our national security would be devastated, however, if the sequestration cuts were allowed to occur. Every member of the House and Senate, as well as the President, must ensure that they do not.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is always the question that must be asked when making a difficult decision on how to vote on a bill: If this bill does not pass, what happens then? There is much about this bill with which I am not satisfied, but I have absolutely no doubt that if this bill is rejected, the next one will be worse. The next bill may come after Social Security checks are not received or after the markets plummet, but there would be another bill, and it will not have the cuts or reforms that are in this one. And it would most likely make even greater cuts to defense.

The bottom line is that this bill is one step in the right direction. I would rather take two, or three, or five steps, but I cannot reject a bill that cuts spending as much as it increases borrowing and that provides the opportunity for greater cuts as well as for real reforms in budgeting and spending. There is much more work ahead, and I will keep pushing for more steps in the direction of fiscal responsibility in the weeks and months to come.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, the House passed unprecedented legislation tonight.

We passed a bill that put unprecedented limits on our President to act to protect our nation, to invest in our futures and to safeguard our poor and our vulnerable.

I opposed this bill because it fails to take a balanced approach to how we set our nation's priorities.

This bill totally fails to address the urgent and most pressing crisis in the country: the lack of jobs and economic growth. At a time when investments are needed to jump start our economy and put people back to work, I believe this deal and its cuts-only approach is the wrong approach.

Should we, as Members of Congress, closely guard our nation's tax dollars and work hard to cut waste and to make sure that every program that we fund is necessary and helps the most Americans possible?

Of course we should and I believe that we all work hard to do so.

But, let me be clear, what we have is a revenue problem.

We would not have needed to raise the debt ceiling if Republican's did not ram the Bush tax cuts down the throats of the American People.

Let me be very clear.

Tax cuts do not pay for themselves and they do not create jobs.

The Bush tax cuts created the deficits that my Republican colleagues decry and there were no new private industry jobs created during the entire Bush Administration.

Let me be crystal clear.

The Democratic Clinton Administration had higher tax rates and created millions more jobs than the Bush Republicans and we had a robust and growing economy. The Democratic Clinton Administration left George Bush a revenue surplus, which he promptly squandered and drove the economy into a ditch, twice.

We have a revenue problem.

When we do not ask the super rich and the corporations who make billions of dollars in profits off of the engine of the American economy, we will not have the funds to keep that engine running.

We must have the revenue to invest in our schools and high tech industries; we must have the funds to rebuild our nation's manufacturing base that Republicans shipped overseas, we must have the revenues to take care of our seniors and provide world class healthcare for every American, we must have the critical revenue to keep the United States the strongest, smartest and most democratic nation on earth.

We have a money problem, but it is not about how this body budgets for our nation.

The money problem is the one that plagues our politics. There is too much influence of the rich on our politics.

Despite the catastrophic failures of Republican financial policies, we are still the strongest and wealthiest nation in the world and our Treasury's debt is still the world's safest investment and continues to sell at historically low rates.

But this bill that tied our budget to the passing of debt ceiling is a huge step in the wrong direction for our nation.

Is it critical for us to prevent an unprecedented default? Of course it is.

Is it just as critical to make sure that we can meet our nation's obligations to our seniors, our children and our poor? Of course it is.

But this back room deal-making on preventing a national default is not a way forward for our nation.

We must not be making critical decisions about who and what we are as a nation while

we are held hostage to the debt ceiling and the extortionist threats of the extreme Tea Party wing of the Republican party.

This should not be the process by which we decide how we budget and set our nation's priorities into the future.

The debt ceiling plan is deeply flawed. The only thing it succeeds in doing is enacting a short-term reprieve from a catastrophic default on our debts.

It fails in almost every other way.

It fails because it is not a balanced approach that insures that we have the resources necessary to protect our most vulnerable seniors, children, the disabled and the poor.

It fails because it opens the door to deep cuts to Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

If fails because it does not make sure that we actually reduce the deficit.

Making cuts in federal spending during the middle of the worst economic downturn in a generation will only make the economy worse and will reduce future revenue and end up increasing long-term deficits.

This is not a sound way to reduce our deficits or our debt. The only way to reduce our deficits long-term is to invest in a strong and growing economy that creates millions of new jobs just like we did during the Clinton Administration.

The only sound long-term deficit plan is a strong jobs plan that puts Americans back to work in jobs that pay a livable wages and provide American benefits.

Finally, it fails because it undermines that proper functioning of the American democracy and restricts our ability to react to future crises and economic downturns.

Tying the hands of future Congresses is not the way to strengthen the United States. This bill will severely limit what we can do as a nation.

The Tea Party Republican's vision of America is one with a powerless government that cannot stand up to the big banks, big oil and multinational corporations that want to keep shipping U.S. jobs overseas. The Republican's vision of America is one where you are completely on your own, without access to health care, Social Security, or unemployment protections. The Republican's vision of America is one without any safeguards for clean air, clean water or access to safe and clean food and drugs.

I don't believe that this is a vision that the American people believe in.

I believe in a strong America with a functioning democracy that is able invest in the future of our nation and create jobs to grow our economy.

That is why I join my colleagues here today—because the Congressional Black Caucus is focused on helping the American people get jobs by hitting the streets during August. Across the country, from Cleveland, Miami, Atlanta, Detroit and L.A., the Congressional Black Caucus is doing both town halls and job fairs.

The Congressional Black Caucus knows that people need jobs and so the CBC is bringing employers that have jobs together with people that need jobs.

Also, the CBC is bringing in experts to run job training sessions including how to write a resume, how to interview, and how to network to improve your chances on getting a job.

We will be working hard in Washington to create jobs for the people, but we must do more which is why we have put together these events.

The town hall will give Members of the CBC a chance to interact directly with those people struggling to get a job, so that we can bring their words, their frustrations, and their worries to Washington to share with our colleagues and be the voice of our nation's most vulnerable population here in the halls of Congress.

Our nation's average unemployment rate is 9.2 percent, but for African Americans it is 16.2 percent and for Latinos it is 11.6 percent.

Worse than this drastic gap between the national average and the unemployment rate between people of color, a recent Pew Research Center study shows the drastic impact that the economic downturn has had on minority communities, pushing the wealth gap to record high numbers.

Unfortunately, the daunting statistics speak for themselves—the median wealth of white households is 20 times that of Black households and 18 times that of Hispanic households.

When I was a Member of the Financial Services Committee, my colleagues and I warned about the dangers that deregulating financial services would pose on minority communities.

I am sad to say that our fears were well founded. Unscrupulous banks and completely unregulated mortgage brokers targeted vulnerable minority communities with predatory loans and often engaged in outright fraud.

We must commit to strengthening the safeguards in place that protect consumers from unfair and predatory practices that strip our communities of what little wealth they have.

It is clear that this 'recession' has been nothing short of a depression for communities of color with disproportionate loss of wealth, housing, increased unemployment and poverty rates that are on the rise.

It is time we begin to allow our economy to grow and invest in the needs of our nation's most vulnerable communities. We do this by creating jobs for the people.

The House Republicans have been in charge for well over 200 days now and have yet to bring a single jobs bill to the Floor for a vote.

I have urged Speaker BOEHNER for months to bring H.R. 589 The Emergency Unemployment Compensation Expansion Act to the Floor for a vote.

This bill is important because those people who have been unemployed for over 99 weeks can no longer receive unemployment benefits—how are they surviving?

H.R. 589 would give 14 more weeks of benefits to those who have reached the end of their rope and are still struggling to find work.

This will stimulate our economy—they will immediately spend this money to buy the necessities of life that you and I take for granted, like food, water, shelter, and maybe some form of medical attention.

But these 99ers are not the only people facing hardship across the country. Americans want to work and Americans need to work, and Congress needs to create jobs, and since Congress is moving slow, the Congressional Black Caucus is hitting the streets in cities across the nation, bringing employers that have jobs together with people who need jobs.

I am pleased to be a part of the Congressional Black Caucus For the People Jobs Initiative, and I applaud the hard work of the CBC Members and staff, including staff across the country, who are making these events happen.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 365, the Budget Control Act of 2011. It defers decisions we should make today until tomorrow. It is abjectly inadequate. It eliminates dollars from our economic infrastructure at a time when our economy is again faltering. It provides continued funding for two wars leaving the defense industrial complex untouched. It is unjust to the next generation by not taking action now to ensure the long term continued solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

When President Bill Clinton left office in January 2001, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projected that we would pay off our national debt by Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 and that by 2011, the Federal Government would have a $2.3 trillion surplus. Today, we have a projected FY 2011 deficit of nearly $1.5 trillion and a massive $14.3 trillion national debt. Something happened and our nation has not faced a national debt of this magnitude since 1950.

Unmistakably, the economic recession played a role in leading us to our current predicament but I want to emphasize that this unprecedented and vast expansion in our debt has largely been the result of a series of decisions made by this body. A study conducted by the Pew Charitable Trusts, an independent, non-profit organization, concluded that new legislation enacted since January 2001 has been responsible for over two-thirds of the growth in our debt. The majority of the contributing legislation was enacted by President Bush, including his tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 and the war in Iraq, measures which I vehemently opposed.

As many are well aware, our debt has now grown so large that we must raise the current $14.3 trillion debt limit by tomorrow, in order to avoid defaulting on our loans. Failure to do so would be irresponsible, calling into question the full faith and credit of the United States government unduly harming every American. Should the limit not be raised, the government would have to stop, limit, or delay payments on a broad range of legal obligations, including Social Security and Medicare benefits, military salaries, interest on the national debt, and many other commitments. Further, financial firms estimate that default could cause interest rates on Treasury bonds to rise .006–.01% causing the cost of owning a home, filling a gas tank, sending children to college and buying a car to become even more expensive, squeezing already tight family budgets.

The need to address this crisis also brings with it an opportunity to make serious, long-lasting policy changes, providing a comprehensive solution that will put our country on the road to a strong, fiscally-sustainable economic future. However, there is no simple or painless solution to our current predicament. For example, if we eliminated the entire federal government this fiscal year—no federal courts or prisons, no border security, no care for veterans, no White House, no Congress, nothing—and only kept the Department of Defense, entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and interest on the national debt, and did not touch taxes, our deficit for FY 2011 would still be $817 billion.

We must make substantive and balanced decisions taking our cue from recent history.

When our budget was balanced in 1969 and for four years from 1998 to 2001, tax revenues and federal spending represented around 20 percent of our gross domestic product (GDP), the overall size of the economy. Today, revenues are around 14.8 percent and spending is nearly 24.7 of GDP. These two extremes cannot continue if we are to balance the budget and provide for a sound economy for future generations.

That is why any serious proposal to reduce the deficit must be comprehensive, and address all spending programs, including domestic discretionary spending, defense spending, as well as entitlement spending, such as Social Security and Medicare, and the other half of the equation, taxes and the inequalities in the tax code.

We have already begun to take steps to reduce domestic discretionary spending. For example, as Ranking Member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, I worked long and hard with my Chairman, RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, to reduce spending in the FY 2012 Energy and Water Appropriations Act by $2.826 billion below the FY 2010 funding level. Our subcommittee looked at each program and made a myriad of decisions, some to increase spending and some to reduce it, given the purpose and value of each program. Previously, I supported the Department of Defense and Full Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011, which reduced spending by $38 billion below the previous year's budget.

Our fiscal crisis, however, cannot be solved by only addressing the discretionary spending. We must also make thoughtful decisions about our entitlement programs, such as Social Security and Medicare, not only to rein in their growth but also to preserve their solvency for future generations.

There are many options that would extend the long term solvency of the Social Security program past 2036, its current estimated solvency date. For example, raising the so-called ''tax cap'' on employees would extend the solvency of the program past 2057. For 2011, Social Security taxable earnings are limited to $106,800. I do not believe that the Social Security tax rate should be raised. However, as a wage tax, I believe the Social Security tax should be paid on all wages. This would create a more equitable system without changing any benefits. If the tax is good enough for every dollar earned by someone waiting tables at a local diner or working in the mill then it is good enough for every dollar earned by someone working on Wall Street.

Similar changes can be made to Medicare to ensure its long-term solvency and its existence for future generations. For example, the Secretary of Health and Human Services is prohibited by law from negotiating drug prices on behalf of Medicare Part D beneficiaries. I believe that this law should be repealed, as it would save the federal government an estimated $156 billion over ten years and lower drug costs for seniors.

Which brings me to the most contentious side of the equation, taxes. Let me first remind my colleagues that currently, tax revenues are around 14.8 percent of GDP, the lowest it has been since 1950. But what makes our current tax code so abhorrent is not the fact that it is unsustainable, but the fact that it is disparately unequal. For example, from 2008 to 2010, 12 corporations, including Wells Fargo and General Electric, made a combined $171 billion in profits, but paid no federal corporate tax as a result of a convoluted tax code, while my constituents were paying their income taxes. Further, last year the top 25 hedge fund managers alone had combined incomes of $22 billion yet they paid a lower tax rate than a fire fighter from Crown Point, Indiana. Where is the outrage that over a tax code that allows Wall Street to pay a lower tax rate than a person risking his or her life for our safety?

At a time when our country faces its biggest financial crisis in decades, it is reprehensible that our tax code allows companies, including some of the most profitable in the nation, are able to exploit loopholes and credits in the tax code to eliminate their tax liabilities. Currently, the U.S. tax code contains over 200 tax loopholes or credits amounting to approximately $1.2 trillion in forgone revenue each year. These loopholes have the same effect on the federal budget as spending programs without being subject to the same public debate and annual evaluation as part of the appropriations process. If we are to address our growing national debt, this spending through the tax code must be reined in. All Americans and American companies should make a contribution to our shared society.

We owe it to the next generation to solve this crisis, and swiftly. As our nation remains consumed by the ongoing deficit discussion, this body continues to avoid taking action on its most basic duties. For example, funding for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) expired in 2007. Since then, this body has temporarily extended the Administration's authorization 20 times. Earlier this year, both the House and the Senate finally passed separate FAA reauthorization legislation. Over 100 days have passed and we have yet to take action to resolve differences between the two versions and last week, funding for the FAA expired, causing 4,000 employees to be sent home without pay, 219 construction projects to be halted and $200 million to be lost in tax revenue. I fear that this measure, which even if enacted today will mandate votes down the road and prolong our single-minded focus on the debt ceiling. I urge my colleagues to work together to compromise budget options so that we can continue the work we were sent here to do.

The key to confronting our fiscal challenge must be balancing cuts in spending and raising revenue while making the necessary investments in our nation's infrastructure and future. The road to fiscal solvency will be difficult, and tough decisions will need to be made. These decisions are not made in this bill and I am opposed to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 384, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question being ordered, the Chair notes the absence of a quorum in accord with clause 7(c) of rule XX and chooses to entertain the motion for a call of the House pursuant to clause 7(b) of rule XX.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 689]

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers

McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

□ 1851

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 419 Members have recorded their presence.

A quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 269, noes 161, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 690]

AYES—269

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Giffords
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stivers
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—161

Ackerman
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Baldwin
Becerra
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cravaack
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Filner
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Hahn
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
King (IA)
Kingston
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Roby
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Serrano
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder

NOT VOTING—3

Baca
Hinchey
Moore

□ 1909

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 690, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall 690 due to the fact that I had reconstructive ankle surgery this morning. I needed to be put under general anesthesia for the procedure. Had I been able to attend today's floor proceedings, I would have voted "yes" on S. 365, the Budget Control Act of 2011.

FAREWELL TO PAGES

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, we don't very often get these opportunities. The kids who are at the back that you can't see because you're standing in front of them, this is the first time that we have ever had pages here not in two small groups but one summer group. These pages are going home this week, and they have had a chance to be here to see history in the making on several different fronts.

The Page Board consists of Representative FOXX of North Carolina, Representative DEGETTE, and Representative KILDEE, and me.

I yield to the gentlelady from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank all of the wonderful pages who are in the back of the room. You have really seen history the last 6 weeks in this Congress, and we are so honored and proud to have all of you here with us.

And this may not be my place, but we all want to welcome back our wonderful colleague Congresswoman GIFFORDS here.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to all the pages for what they have done here in the 112th Congress.

To become a page, Mr. Speaker, these young people have proven themselves to be academically qualified.

As we all know, the job of a congressional page is not an easy one. Along with being away from home, the pages must possess the maturity to balance competing demands for their time and their energy.

You pages have witnessed the House debate issues of war and peace, hunger and poverty, justice and civil rights. You have lived through history.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members of the House Page Board who provided such fantastic service to this institution. The chairman, Congressman ROB BISHOP; the vice chairman, Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE; Congresswoman VIRGINIA FOXX; Clerk of the House, Karen Haas; Sergeant at Arms; Bill Livingood; and Ms. Lynn Silversmith Klein.

I want to thank them for the service on the House Page Board, and I thank the departing pages. And you've seen a wonderful bit of history take place today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the official RECORD the page summer class.

I ask this body to please recognize the pages for the services they have rendered.

2011 SUMMER PAGE CLASS

Alexa Abbott, MI, Garrett Adair, CA, Eric Applegate, IN, Sara Ballou, NY, Caitlin Belcher, WV, Eyvana Bengochea, FL, Michael Berkowitz, FL, Cameron Bias, VA, Elizabeth Birkman, TX, Grant Bradley, MI, Sophia Bucci, MA, Jasmine Sky Burnett, GA, Clark Cali, CA, Thomas Cirone, NJ, Briyana Coleman, VA, David Crane, NJ, Christina Cuellar, TX, Collin Czilli, IN, Leesa Danzek, CA, Mary DeStefano, OH, Hannah Eaton, KY, Sydney Everett, MO, Zachariah Frederic Ewen, VA, Christina Fischer, VA, Jordan Fox, IL, BreAnna Fraser, NV, Joseph Geiger III, PA, Taylor Gillespie, NY, Meredith Godfrey, VA, Jessica Going, CA, Kevin Goshorn, NY, Austin Heckemeyer, MO, Peyton Hilford, FL, Savana Hodge, TN, Elijah Jatovsky, CA, Reid Jeffries, OH, Heber ''Nathan'' Johnson, UT, Mary Gray Johnson, VA, Charlotte Kanyuh, WI, Caleb Markward, OH, Erik Martin, MD, Jake Mattox, OK, Claiborne McCrery, LA, Brian McKeon, OR, Grant McKown, GA, Grace Mehta, CA, Adam Mittman, NY, Thomas Moakley, MA, James Park, FL, Elisabeth Parker, SC, Jenna Pickering, AL, Caroline Schube, OH, Arthur Sellers, AL, Paarth Shah, NY, Abigail Shriver, MD, Nicholas Pritzker, CA, Michael-Joseph Richardson, OH, Amelia Santiago, TX, Michelle Sauer, TX, Samantha Smith, MI, Stetson Spencer, AR, Michael Stocker, PA, Benjamin Strawbridge, MA, Samantha Swartz, IL, Genevieve Gray Taylor, NV, Ashley Tomasello, MI, Matthew Ullman, NY, Andrea Walton, IN, Grayson Westmoreland, TN, Sarai Whittington, NC, and Victoria Wilbur, IL.

WELCOMING BACK REPRESENTATIVE GABRIELLE GIFFORDS

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

Ms. PELOSI. I too want to join our colleagues in recognizing the contribution of the pages to the conduct of the House of Representatives. I thank them, and they have, as Mr. KILDEE said and others have mentioned, borne witness to many important historical occasions here.

But I can't think of any that is more special and means so much to our country than to witness the return of our colleague who is the personification of courage, of sincerity, of admiration throughout the country. Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS brings us here.

Her presence today will make sure that we honor the obligations of our great country; it is important and symbolic. Her presence here in the Chamber as well as her service throughout her entire service in Congress brings honor to this Chamber.

We are all privileged to call her ''colleague''; some of us are very privileged to call her ''friend.'' Throughout America, there isn't a name that stirs more love, more admiration, more respect, more wishing for our daughters to be like her than the name of Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS.

Thank you, GABBY.

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 365

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 70

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of S. 365, the Secretary of the Senate shall amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to provide for budget control.''.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2480) to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 23, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 691]

YEAS—382

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott

McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—23

Amash
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Chaffetz
Flake
Garrett
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Harris
Hartzler
Huelskamp
Hurt
Kingston
Lummis
McCotter
Paul
Pearce
Schilling
Stutzman
Tipton
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—27

Baca
Calvert
Carter
Cohen
Davis (CA)
Diaz-Balart
Gallegly
Giffords
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Hayworth
Hinchey
Keating
Latham
Long
Marchant
Meeks
Moran
Pingree (ME)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rush
Schweikert
Sullivan
Terry
Waters

□ 1933

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent earlier today due to a prior commitment scheduled before we knew the House would be in session. On the votes I missed, on H.R. 2715, to provide greater authority and discretion to the CPSC in enforcement of product safety laws, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

On H.R. 398, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll during national and active duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, I would have voted ''yes.''

On H.R. 1933, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify requirements, I would have voted ''yes.'' While I do recognize the shortage of nurses in our country, I would hope that we should focus on providing more incentives to students here to become nurses.

On the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule for S. 365, I would have voted ''no.''

On H. Res. 384, the rule providing for consideration of S. 365, I would have voted ''no.''

On the Journal vote, I would have voted ''yes.''

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Chairman.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize for special-order speeches without prejudice to the possibility of further legislative business.

GABBY'S BACK

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this was a good day. And one of the reasons it's a good day is because GABBY GIFFORDS is back.

Mr. Speaker, she is one of the best things in this Congress. To me, she came back tonight, cast her vote, the first vote since she was attacked. And she is a perfect example of bipartisanship. I have had the privilege to work with her on the issue of border security. And while she was in the hospital recovering in my hometown of Houston, Texas, her staff in Arizona hosted me so I could go down to the border and see firsthand the problems of border security in Arizona.

I think she is a model for the attitude that we should all have. She is tenacious and she is relentless in her love for America and her desire to do what's right and represent the people in Arizona that elected her here.

So welcome back, GABBY GIFFORDS. You were missed, and we're glad you're back.

And that's just the way it is.

URGING CLEMENCY FOR JONATHAN POLLARD

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year a group of Members sent a letter to President Obama urging him to grant clemency at this point and commute the sentence for Jonathan Pollard.

Jonathan Pollard spied on the United States on behalf of Israel. He should not have done that, and he was punished. But the punishment for that espionage has gone on longer than anything comparable.

I believe that there is a personal argument for the clemency, and there is also the fact that American-Israeli relations are always important, and are particularly important now. We are asking the Israelis to take some steps towards a negotiated peace that may or may not be possible for them to take. Knowing that America recognizes the strength of that friendship is a very important factor in our persuading them of that.

And I believe that in addition to the arguments based on the excessive length of the sentence, I think, the fact that Mr. Pollard has served for so long, clearly the deterrent effect is there, we are not asking that he be pardoned, we are not condoning his crime, we are saying that in addition to the personal argument, it would be a sign of U.S.-Israeli relations that I think would help strengthen the climate for peace. I will be submitting a copy of the letter at a later time that we sent to the President for inclusion.

RECOGNIZING PAST AND PRESENT JUDICIARY OF COMMONWEALTH OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the many individuals who founded, developed and stewarded the judicial system in the Northern Mariana Islands, where American jurisprudence was rooted in the liberation of our islands in 1944.

The World War II-era naval military government established a three-tiered

organization of Exceptional Military Courts. The later-established Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands judiciary was also a three-tiered court system.

When the Commonwealth was formed in 1978, a Commonwealth Trial Court, later renamed the Commonwealth Superior Court, was established. During the trial court's infancy, the Federal district court for the Northern Mariana Islands retained limited original and appellate jurisdiction over local matters.

In 1989, a Commonwealth Supreme Court with local appellate jurisdiction was created. Finally, in 2004, Ninth Circuit appellate jurisdiction over Commonwealth Supreme Court decisions ended, and those decisions are now appealable only to the United States Supreme Court.

The history of our court system is colorful and is as unique as our islands and our people. Please join me in paying tribute to the many judges and justices who have served our islands with distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the many individuals who founded, developed, and stewarded the judicial system in the Northern Mariana Islands. American jurisprudence in the Northern Marianas is rooted in the American invasion and liberation of the islands in 1944.

The earliest American laws in this World War II period were proclamations from the Naval Military Government, which exercised control over the islands for three years following the initial invasion. A three-tiered organization of Exceptional Military Courts was established by Admiral Chester Nimitz. Under this system, Summary Provost Courts, with one military officer sitting as judge, were established as courts of limited jurisdiction to hear cases for which the punishment was less than one year in prison or a fine of less than two thousand dollars. Superior Provost Courts—comprised of one or more military officers—were convened on an ad hoc basis to consider cases in which the potential punishment ranged to ten years in prison. The Military Commission was the highest court of the land, and could hear cases of any nature. This tribunal was convened by the Military Governor and the three military officers who comprised the Commission could mete out any punishment up to, and including, a death sentence—although any execution could not be carried out without the confirmation of the Secretary of the Navy. The Naval Military Government did not establish any military courts with jurisdiction over civil matters—during this period, local disputes that were not informally resolved among the native islanders were resolved with the assistance of a military officer acting as a ''higher authority,'' but not sitting as a court. Records indicate that a Village Magistrate Court may have been established in 1947, shortly before the advent of the United Nations' Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in July of that year.

The judiciary established in the Trust Territory, as in Naval Military Government days, was a three-tiered system of community courts, district courts, and a High Court. Community court judges, appointed by the district administrator, could hear civil matters in which the amount in dispute did not exceed one hundred dollars and criminal matters in which the punishment did not exceed six months in jail, a one hundred dollar fine, or both. District courts had jurisdiction over civil matters in which the amount in dispute did not exceed one thousand dollars and criminal matters in which the punishment did not exceed two years in jail, a two thousand dollar fine, or both. District courts were staffed by a presiding judge and one or more associate judges, appointed by the High Commissioner, and also had appellate jurisdiction over community court actions. The High Court, which consisted of a chief justice and a number of associate justices and temporary judges, had appellate review over district court decisions and also had general jurisdiction over all civil and criminal cases in the Trust Territory.

Upon the formation of the Commonwealth in 1978, a Commonwealth Trial Court was established by our local legislature pursuant to the Commonwealth Constitution. The first judge of the court was confirmed in February 1979, and was joined by additional judges over the following few years. During the trial court's infancy, the federal district court for the Northern Marianas retained jurisdiction over civil cases involving amounts in controversy over five thousand dollars, criminal cases in which the potential penalty exceeded five years' imprisonment, and all jury trials. The district court also maintained appellate jurisdiction over Commonwealth Trial Court decisions.

In 1989, a public law renamed the Commonwealth Trial Court as the Commonwealth Superior Court, and established a Commonwealth Supreme Court with local appellate jurisdiction.

Perhaps the most significant event in the history of the Commonwealth judiciary occurred in 1997, when voters in the Commonwealth approved a House Legislative Initiative which established the Commonwealth Supreme and Superior Courts as constitutional entities under a unified judiciary system.

In May 2004, the Commonwealth court system achieved status akin to that of all other state judiciaries, when Ninth Circuit appellate jurisdiction over Commonwealth Supreme Court decisions ended. Now, Commonwealth Supreme Court decisions are final unless the United States Supreme Court grants certiorari review.

Recently, our community celebrated the culmination of a multiyear project with the publication of The Northern Mariana Islands Judiciary: A Historical Overview, authored by past and present members of our judiciary, law clerks, and others, and which provides a comprehensive view of the evolution of law and legal systems in the Commonwealth from 1521 to the present. The book was published by the Northern Marianas Judiciary Historical Society, and was funded by a National Endowment for the Humanities grant administered by the NMI Council for the Humanities.

The Commonwealth judiciary has evolved from its original roots in military necessity to a full-fledged branch of government, coequal with the local executive and legislative branches. Today, there are three Supreme Court justices and five Superior Court judges, the majority of whom were born and raised in our community. And, in addition, there is a United States District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands to which the President has nominated and the U.S. Senate has confirmed a native of the Northern Mariana Islands. The history of our court system is colorful and as unique as our islands and our people.

I ask you to join me in paying tribute to the many judges and justices who have served our islands with distinction over the course of nearly 70 years since the Battle of Saipan.

Current Commonwealth Supreme Court justices: Miguel S. Demapan, Chief Justice; Alexandro C. Castro, Associate Justice; and John A. Manglona, Associate Justice.

Current Commonwealth Superior Court judges: Robert C. Naraja, Presiding Judge; David A. Wiseman, Associate Judge; Ramona V. Manglona, Associate Judge; Kenneth L. Govendo, Associate Judge; and Perry B. Inos, Associate Judge.

Former Commonwealth Supreme Court justices: Jose S. Dela Cruz, Chief Justice; Marty W.K. Taylor, Chief Justice; Pedro M. Atalig, Associate Justice; Jesus C. Borja, Associate Justice; and Ramon G. Villagomez, Associate Justice.

Former Commonwealth Superior Court judges: Edward Manibusan, Presiding Judge; Timothy H. Bellas, Associate Judge; Virginia S. Sablan-Onerheim, Associate Judge; and Juan T. Lizama, Associate Judge.

Former Commonwealth Trial Court judges: Robert E. Moore, Associate Judge; Robert A. Hefner, Presiding Judge; and Herbert D. Soll, Associate Judge.

Current and former pro tem justices: Arthur R. Barcinas, Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court; Timothy H. Bellas, former Associate Judge, CNMI Superior Court; Richard H. Benson, former Associate Justice, Federated States of Micronesia Supreme Court; Michael J. Bordallo, Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court; Jesus C. Borja, former Associate Justice, CNMI Supreme Court; F. Philip Carbullido, Chief Justice, Guam Supreme Court; Benjamin J.F. Cruz, former Chief Justice, Guam Supreme Court; Alberto C. Lamorena III, Presiding Judge, Guam Superior Court; Edward Manibusan, former Presiding Judge, CNMI Superior Court; Joaquin V.E. Manibusan, Jr., former Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court; Katherine A. Maraman, Associate Justice, Guam Supreme Court; Virginia S. Sablan-Onerheim, former Associate Judge, CNMI Superior Court; Vernon P. Perez, Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court; Kathleen M. Salii, Associate Justice, Republic of Palau Supreme Court; Peter C. Siguenza, Jr., former Chief Justice, Guam Supreme Court; Herbert D. Soil, former Associate Judge, CNMI Trial Court; Anita A. Sukola, Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court; Robert J. Torres, Jr., Associate Justice, Guam Supreme Court; Frances M. Tydingco-Gatewood, former Associate Justice, Guam Supreme Court; and Steven S. Unpingco, Associate Judge, Guam Superior Court.

Former special judges: Pedro M. Atalig, Timothy H. Bellas, Benjamin J.F. Cruz, Larry L. Hillblom, Edward C. King, Rexford C. Kosack, Alberto C. Lamorena III, Juan T. Lizama, Jane E. Mack, Vicente T. Salas, Michael A. White, and David A. Wiseman.

Former Mariana Islands District Court and Community Courts justices and judges: in Saipan, Juan M. Ada, Ignacio V. Benavente, Olympio T. Borja, Francisco R. Cruz, Vicente E.D. Deleon Guerrero, Elias P. Sablan, Felipe A. Salas, and Jose A. Sonoda; in Rota, Andres C. Atalig, Jose A. Calvo, Fortunato T. Manglona, Santiago M. Manglona, Thomas C.

Mendiola, and Melchor S. Mendiola; and in Tinian, Joaquin C. Aldan, Freddy V. Hofschneider, Sr., and Henry V. Hofschneider.

Former Trust Territory High Court judges and justices: Edward P. Furber, Chief Justice and Temporary Judge; Robert K. Shoecraft, Chief Justice; Harold W. Burnett, Chief Justice and Associate Judge; Alex R. Munson, Chief Justice; James R. Nichols, Associate Judge; Pleaz William Mobley, Associate Judge; Philip R. Toomin, Associate Judge; Arthur J. McCormick, Associate Judge; Paul F. Kinnare, Associate Judge; Joseph W. Goss, Associate Judge and Temporary Judge; D. Kelley Turner, Associate Judge; Arvin H. Brown, Jr., Associate Judge; Robert A. Hefner, Associate Judge; Donald C. Williams, Associate Judge; Mamoru Nakamura, Associate Judge; Ernest F. Gianotti, Associate Judge; and Richard I. Miyamoto, Associate Judge.

Former Trust Territory High Court temporary judges: Richard H. Benson, Robert Clifton, E. Avery Crary, P. Drucker, Christobal C. Duenas, Eugene R. Gilmartin, Anthony M. Kennedy, Alex Kozinski, Alfred Laureta, Jose C. Manibusan, Carl A. Muecke, Joaquin C. Perez, Paul D. Shriver, J.M. Spivey, and Dickran M. Tevrizian.

Current and former U.S. District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands judges: Ramona Villagomez Manglona, Chief Judge; Alex R. Munson, former Chief Judge; Alfred Laureta, former Chief Judge.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this moment to just thank God that GABBY GIFFORDS has returned to this floor. You know, it so happens that just a few feet from here was the last time I had seen GABBY, when she left the floor prior to this tragic attack on her.

It just occurs to me that once in a while in this life we find an example where tragedy is transcended by the human spirit and triumph and the grace of God, and this is one of those days. I just congratulate her with everything in me that she has come back. She has the prayers of the entire delegation, and I know the entire Congress, as she goes forward to complete recovery.

We are all very, very grateful today. This is a wonderful celebration for every Member of this Congress. It is a celebration for just the cause of this Republic, because we believe that everyone has the right to have the freedom of speech and to peaceably assemble, and this is what she was doing when she was attacked. For her to come back this way as she has is a triumph of the first magnitude, and we are all so very, very proud of her, and welcome her back with all of our hearts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have another subject tonight that I want to talk about, and that is the recent challenges that we have faced over the debt limit raising and the effort on the part of many of us to place a balanced budget into the bill that went across to the Senate that would have required a balanced budget to be in our Constitution, because, Mr. Speaker, some of us believe that it is the only way that we are going to finally, in this country, deal with the challenges of deficit spending and with the burgeoning debt that threatens to crush this country in a way that no military power has ever been able to do.

□ 1940

Mr. Speaker, some of us have talked about this difficult problem for a very long time, and it seems that over and over again history repeats itself, and we never really deal with it like we should.

But this time, Mr. Speaker, we have placed something before the American people that I think they are going to hang on to, and I believe that there is great hope in the coming months that we will continue to strive for this balanced budget amendment, and I hope that the people of America are paying attention because we cannot repeal the laws of mathematics. This challenge will damage this country in the most profound way if we don't deal with it while we can.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this: That all financial budgets will eventually balance, that's a fact. No individual, no family, no business, and no government can indefinitely continue to spend more money than they take in without someone having to make up the difference, Mr. Speaker, and that includes the budget of the United States Government.

Neither Mr. Obama nor congressional Democrats can repeal this law of mathematics. The Federal budget of the United States Government will eventually balance, as all of them do, whether it's a person or a government or a business, when they continue to spend money that they don't have, someone, sooner or later, has to make up the difference. The question with our Federal budget is whether the White House and those of us in this body will balance this budget ourselves by wise policy or national bankruptcy and financial ruin will do it for us.

From the day Barack Obama has walked into the White House he has, with breathtaking arrogance, Mr. Speaker, absolutely ignored economic and financial reality. It took America the first 216 years of its existence to accumulate the debt that Barack Obama has accumulated in the short 2½-year span of his presidency.

During this short time in office he has increased our Federal debt by nearly $4 trillion, Mr. Speaker. And just to put that nearly $4 trillion in new debt in perspective, let me just put it this way. If all of a sudden a wave of responsibility swept through this Chamber and we stopped all deficit spending and began to pay installments of $1 million per day to pay down the nearly $4 trillion debt that Barack Obama has created in just 2½ years, it would take us more than 10,000 years to pay off just Mr. Obama's accumulated debt in 2½ years. It would take us more than 10,000 years, Mr. Speaker, to do that if we paid it off in a million dollars a day, and that's if we don't have to pay one dime in interest in the process.

But you see, Mr. Speaker, we are not paying Mr. Obama's debt down at $1 million per day; we are going deeper into debt, more than 4,000 times that much every day, and that's under Mr. Obama's own projected deficit and deficit projections. And then when speaking of the effort to reduce the deficit, the President has the hubris to tell conservative Republicans to take a balanced approach and to eat our peas.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there's anything more catastrophically out of balance in our Federal budget it is the arrogance to competency ratio of this White House. We have watched as President Obama ran up a trillion-dollar deficit for the first time in history and then broke that record the very next year, and then say that we would have, according to his own projections, a trillion dollar-plus deficit for ''years to come.''

We have watched as the Obama administration promised that if we would just allow them to spend $800 million on their stimulus package, the economy would rebound and unemployment would never reach 8 percent. Well, of course, that didn't happen, and then we watched this administration bring us ObamaCare, or the health care takeover by government.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me just suggest to you that at the time of that debate there was a lot of discussion over what private employers would do to their own insurance plans in the face of this government takeover of health care. Some people thought well, 5 percent, maybe 10 percent of the health care plans in the private sector would be dropped by corporations, would be dropped by employers.

But, Mr. Speaker, that projection is a little bit further off than we thought. The polled people that have answered the question of whether or not they would drop their health care plans, being employers, they have said that as many as half of them would do that now. Mr. Speaker, the reason I mention that is because if that's true, the cost of doing that, the cost of absorbing that to the Federal Government will be another $2 trillion on top of the trillion dollars that was already in the bill. So ObamaCare itself could cost us $3 trillion and, Mr. Speaker, that's just in the next 10 years.

So I would just say to you, Mr. Speaker, this administration has really done for deficits and debt what Stonehenge did for rocks. There is no one that has pressed this deficit spending more than the Obama administration. Mr. Speaker, the people have awakened, and they are tired of Mr. Obama telling them that 2 plus 2 equals 13.

So as we now find ourselves raising this debt ceiling yet again, in the process, some of us as conservative Republicans wanted so badly to give the American people and the States of this Nation the historic opportunity to adopt a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution to put this country back on the track of fiscal sanity once again.

So we placed a balanced budget amendment requirement in two separate pieces of legislation and passed them through this body and sent them over to the Senate only to have Mr. Obama and Senate Democrats refuse to even allow them to come up for a vote, either one of them. They simply refused to vote on it.

In both instances, Mr. Speaker, President Obama's contributions to the process were threats to veto both plans sight unseen.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could just get this one question answered, if nothing else that they would answer, I just wish the administration would answer this one question: What is it, what is it that the President and Democrats find so radical about a balanced budget amendment?

This is something that 49 States have and every family in America has to have sooner or later, a simple balanced budget amendment that says we cannot go into debt in an infinite way that threatens not only our children's future—you know, we used to talk about how this threatened our children's future, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you, being the father of two little twins that are going to have their third birthday before long, that has great pull in my soul, that I don't want to see this crushing debt placed on their shoulders.

But I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that now we are starting to face a challenge that is going to come in this generation and this time, and it may not be so far off. Greece has set an example for the world as to what can happen when people simply don't pay attention to their fiscal challenges.

But the failure of both, and the failure of cooperation and the failure of leadership from Democrats on this issue, has been baffling to me, Mr. Speaker. Unbelievably, it has been 822 days since Senate Democrats proposed, not passed, but merely even proposed a budget. An individual practicing such irresponsibility, living without a budget while paying for everything with borrowed money, would meet certain financial ruin. Why do we believe our Nation will fare any better under the same preposterous policy?

Now Mr. Obama and the Democrats have falsely said that the balanced budget amendment is a Republican plan to destroy Social Security and Medicare. What a false, terrible, despicable thing to say. The truth is the balanced budget amendment is the only honest chance of reforming and saving those programs and our country from bankruptcy and economic failure in the future, Mr. Speaker.

And throughout this process, Mr. Obama and the liberal media have sought to force tax increases upon the people and the job creators of this Nation by suggesting that Republicans were not willing to address the revenue side of this equation. That isn't true either, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1950

Just because Republicans are not willing to increase job-killing tax rates in this country doesn't mean we don't understand the revenue side of this equation. We just know that increasing the rate of taxes will decrease the productivity of this Nation and we will ultimately decrease the revenue that comes into this government.

It is the economic equivalent of putting dirt in ice cream. It is a disastrous recipe to embrace in the name of balance. But I hear it over and over again—balance, balance. There is nothing more balanced, Mr. Speaker, than a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution.

History and experience has demonstrated time and again that the best way to increase the amount of revenue coming in to this government is to get out of the way and let the people and the private sector increase the number of quality jobs for the American people. This has always resulted in the increased productivity and the broadening of the tax base in this amazing Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need higher taxes, we need more jobs and more taxpayers. Mr. Obama and the Democrats have constantly said that we need to take, again, this ''balanced'' approach, which is a code for increased taxes. But, Mr. Speaker, again, the truly balanced approach to this problem is a balanced budget to the Constitution, and by passing a balanced budget amendment we can restore hope and confidence in capital markets inside the United States and all over the world because they will see that in the long run America is going to make it.

It may take the States 6 or 7 years to fully ratify this Constitutional amendment to balance the budget. But we owe it to the States and to the people to give them this chance to save their Nation. In the meantime, we can work here to expand the economy and balance this budget so when the amendment finally is ratified, we will all be ready to go forward as a nation to embrace greater days than we have ever seen. And we have a rare opportunity, Mr. Speaker, that may never come again of doing something truly historic that will save this Nation and its people from economic ruin.

This battle is not over. The American people are beginning to realize that they are already paying a very high price for electing Barack Obama to the presidency. If they make the profound error of reelecting him in the next election, our families and all Americans will face an economic, a constitutional and a national security crisis that will dwarf the challenges that we face in these moments. If Democrats and the President are not willing to give the people this chance by helping Republicans pass a balanced budget amendment in the Congress, the resulting consequences will be theirs alone, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the people will hold them accountable for whatever financial disaster may follow.

Now long ago, Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson said, ''I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government; I mean an additional article taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing.''

He said that right after the Constitution itself had been finished. He just wanted one more amendment. And, unfortunately, as you know, he turned out to be right. But his contemporaries failed to listen to him about the balanced budget amendment.

I will just say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for those of us in these moments to listen to his words. I believe the American people are listening today, and I believe that they call upon their leaders now to do something truly historic and pass a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution in the days ahead. And God help us to do it, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that I know that this has been a challenging week, and I believe our leadership on the Republican side of this House has done everything possible to try to work with the President and to work with the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. And they have had an extremely significant challenge. We sent twice to the other body bills that would have raised the debt limit but in the process also have required a balanced budget amendment to be inserted into the Constitution, or at least sent to the people so that they could decide. But this is the one thing that they took from us in the process. And, Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that we had a golden opportunity to truly change the way that America goes forward, and we failed that opportunity. But I would also say that I think there is still hope to do it in the next few months. Part of the equation that we have under this legislation is to require a balanced budget amendment vote in both this Chamber, in the House of Representatives, and in the U.S. Senate. And I hope so much that we do that while we can and that the people of this country will let their Representatives and Senators know that they are tired of this deficit spending and tired of this fiscal irresponsibility and saying, in our lifetime, we will have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and we will make sure that our children can walk in the light of freedom and economic hope as we have. I hope that happens, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I would yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my good friend for yielding and for taking time on this truly historic day, an opportunity for this Nation to begin—just begin—to move things in the right direction from a fiscal standpoint here in our great country.

The debate over the last, oh, 3 to 4 months has been very loud, sometimes it has been acrimonious. There are many people across this great country who just are confounded by the laborious nature with which it takes to make any changes here in Washington at all, and I share that frustration and share that anger and share that concern because we've been moving in the wrong direction for a long, long time as it relates to spending at the Federal level.

And so, as the gentleman from Arizona so appropriately said, what we need to do is decrease spending in the short term, we need to put some controls on spending in the mid term, but in the long term, as we have discovered and as the American people know so well, it's going to take structural, fundamental change of the way that Washington does business in order to get our fiscal house in order and get us on that path to a balanced budget and pay off our debt.

And the best way that I believe that that can occur is through a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. And I don't say that lightly, understanding that there have been really very few times in which the Constitution has been amended. But I believe now in my fourth term that having recognized early on in my Congressional career that all of the inertia here in Washington is to spend money, everything, it all points towards spending money. The budget process that we go through, the folks through the Congressional Budget Office that try their best to do the work but the rules under which they determine whether or not something costs the Federal Government and this Nation something or whether it saves are so distorted that you can't get to the right answer. One cannot get to the right answer without structural change. And that's where the balanced budget amendment comes in.

Today, what we did in the Budget Control Act is not all that any of us would have liked. In fact, the numbers are relatively paltry when you look at them compared to how much money this government spends. But what is true about this act is that it will allow us in this House of Representatives and in the Senate right down the hallway to say to the American people, we hear you, we want this government to be held accountable, and the best way to do that is by passing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

And so my friend from Arizona comes down this evening to highlight that wonderful change that we have the prospect for making in this Congress. This isn't 4 years down the road, 5 years down the road, this is in this Congress right now. And I know that if he could, he would urge the folks listening to this and Members of Congress to encourage all of their constituents and all the people across this land who so firmly believe, as I do, and as I know Mr. FRANKS does, that we need to put some controls, significant controls on how Washington spends money and that the balanced budget amendment is the best way to do that.

I know that what you would do, what he would do, is to urge all Members to communicate to their constituents and to every single American to call their Representatives, to call their United States Senators and say, some time, because of the bill that we just passed, some time between October 1 of this year and December 31 of this year, every single American will have the opportunity to communicate to their Representative and their United States State Senator the urging that they would to encourage them to support a balanced budget amendment.

□ 2000

That's when this vote is going to occur. It's not going to occur tomorrow or in the month of August or September. But what the bill provides is for the wonderful enthusiasm and the heartfelt patriotism and concern that the American people feel about this great country.

Now is the time to communicate to their Representatives, to support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If we are able to get this to happen, if we are able to make this become an amendment to the Constitution, frankly, the problem itself will begin to take care of itself because the rules will begin to say we cannot spend more than we take in. Just like every family in this country does and every business in this country must do, and that is to say we cannot spend more than we take in.

I just had to come down and commend my good friend from Arizona, in a time when there is a lot of calamity around this town, to take the time to say this must be highlighted on this day because this is the beginning of the next 61 days that the American people must act to let their Representatives know, support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman so much. Mr. PRICE is the chairman of our Policy Committee, and no one has written more cogently and with more commitment on the balanced budget amendment than this man. I am so grateful that he is here and has been such a voice on this.

I ask the gentleman, do you think the American people know that we passed two pieces of legislation over to the Senate with requirements for a balanced budget amendment, and the first thing they did, the Democrat leader there, just took those out or simply refused to vote on them? Do you think they know that?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I don't believe so, because I think if the American people knew that, they would be loudly protesting the lack of leadership and responsibility that the Senate has taken its job. That's the importance of this vote today, because the majority leader in the United States Senate cannot turn this vote away. This vote will happen. It will happen sometime between October 1 and December 31 of this year. Not next year or 2013 or 2014—this year.

We have the opportunity to be able to send to the States a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in this calendar year, and I'm so proud of the work that the gentleman from Arizona has done, and our colleagues have done, to highlight this issue and ensure that it was included in this piece of legislation. And I look forward to a very positive vote come October, November, or December of this year. But it won't happen without the engagement of the American people.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman so much.

Let me yield to the gentleman from South Carolina. I am glad that you came to the floor, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I want to thank my colleague from Arizona for taking on this very important issue. What a great evening to talk about America living within its means. We are $14.3 trillion in debt, and we're spending $1.5 trillion more than we are bringing in as a Nation. The piece of legislation that we passed this evening and is now residing over in the Senate includes what I think is the most important language within that legislation, and that is a vote on a balanced budget amendment.

I was a small business owner for 16 years. When I did my budget every year, I had to think about what my revenues were for the past year and what my revenues were going to be for the coming year, and I had to set a budget based on that. I couldn't just hope that there was a money tree out in the backyard and continue spending money that I didn't have.

Americans have been engaged in this process of the debt ceiling debate, and we are urging them to get involved in this process of a balanced budget amendment. Once that requirement and that amendment does pass both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, it will be sent to the States to be ratified. At that point in time, Americans from all across the land will be able to rally their State legislatures, their general assemblies, to take up and ratify this important amendment to the United States Constitution.

Many of my constituents—the gentleman from Arizona doesn't know this. Many of my constituents know that I carry a United States Constitution with me in my pocket. In fact, I read from that very podium in the well. On the second day as a Member of this 112th Congress, I read from the United

States Constitution, something I don't take lightly. But in order for this government to survive, and survive fiscally, is to get our fiscal house in order. And the secret to doing that is really to pass a balanced budget amendment, to require Washington to live within its means the way families and small businesses and large businesses have to do all across this great land.

You know, when I was a small business owner, occasionally I had to go borrow money. But I had to put a plan together for that banker on how I was going to pay that back. Hopefully, we have begun to do that through this week of debate. But a balanced budget amendment, a requirement for the United States Government to balance its checkbook. The most, I guess, simplest thing that American families and small businesses do is sit down with that checkbook register and make sure that they haven't spent too much money, to make sure that they live within their means.

So we have got that opportunity. I am proud that this was included. I am proud that I stand with 87 members of our freshman class that really helped, I think, leadership see that this was a vital component to this piece of legislation. I commend the House leadership for including it. I commend the House leadership for making sure that its inclusion in this bill that we sent over to the Senate this evening was there.

So I want to urge the American people to get behind this, to contact your Senators, contact your House Members. As we heard recently from the gentleman from the Atlanta area of Georgia say, this vote will take place sometime between October and the end of the year. So during that process and leading up to that process, contact your Senators and contact your House Members and say: Government should have to live the way I operate my household, the way my wife and I have to sit down at our kitchen table and balance our budget. Balance Washington's budget. Let's get our spending under control. The time is now.

I brought my little boy, Parker Duncan, who is 10 years old. He is sitting on the House floor with me today because I teach them, my children, the value of not spending more than you bring in. And they say: Dad, can we have that baseball? Can we have that item? I say: Son, we don't have the money in our budget this week or this month to purchase that. But let me make plans so that we can purchase that in the future.

We live within our means. Am I perfect? No. I have debt, but we have a plan to pay back that debt.

The future of our children and our grandchildren is at stake. America knows. America got engaged in this, they got engaged in the last election cycle, and they know that Washington cannot keep spending more than it has.

So I commend my colleague from Arizona for taking on this very, very important issue to make Washington live within its means, to live within its means, not to spend money that it doesn't have. Let's rein in our fiscal house. Let's get our house in order, and let's create a way to start paying back that enormous debt. We can do that with a balanced budget amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and to not refer to guests on the floor of the House.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the Speaker, and I understand that the gentleman from Illinois would like me to yield to him for a question.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me for a question, but first, I just want to indicate to Mr. DUNCAN's son that we're going to do everything we can to get him a baseball even if his dad is a little slow this month.

My question is about the balanced budget amendment, if the gentleman from Arizona would share with us how that would work. I have heard a number of Members come down and talk about the idea that we are going to vote on it, that it needs to happen. But at least as I understand it, the interpreter of the Constitution, obviously, would be the Federal courts in that if Congress were unable to achieve a balanced budget in any fiscal year, a lawsuit could be brought under the balanced budget amendment that would throw the process into the Federal judiciary, allowing Federal judges then to determine what constitutes balance or imbalance.

If the gentleman would take some time to share with us how, from his perspective, that would work.

□ 2010

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman, and I'll take a shot at that.

First of all, as the gentleman knows, there are many different kinds of balanced budget amendments that have been proposed. One of the commonalities of most of those is that they require that our projected spending meet our projected revenues, what we believe is going to be our receipts for the coming year. Now, it is true, as in all areas of the Constitution, that the Federal courts have exhibited great arrogance in coming into the area of legislation and trying to legislate from the bench by dealing with these issues under the pretense of considering the constitutionality of these issues. The good news with a balanced budget amendment is that there would be obvious language there that the courts would have before them that simply says that the Congress is required by the Constitution to balance our budget so that we don't deficit-spend.

It is true that we are required in this body to have equal protection, for instance. We can't say that this one group deserves one protection and that this one group doesn't. Every once in a while, the Supreme Court injects themselves into that debate like they did in Roe vs. Wade, let's say. They simply said, when it comes to protecting the unborn, that they weren't persons under the Constitution and that we not only didn't have to protect them but that we couldn't protect them. That was arrogance beyond words. This is every time across the history of humanity. When the German High Tribunal injected itself even into the tragedy of the German system, they said that the German was ''untermenschen,'' subhuman, and they took away their personhood; and the tragedy that followed is still one of the darkest stains that I know of on the human soul.

So, yes, it is possible that the courts could try to intervene in this process and try to distort it, but ultimately, the ''balanced budget amendment'' concept is very simple. It would say, like Thomas Jefferson said, that the Federal Government simply would take from them the power of borrowing.

Now, there was a balanced budget amendment that came before this floor about 15 years ago, and it received over 300 votes on the floor, many of them Democrat votes. I don't know how the gentleman from Illinois voted on that. That's not a question. I don't know. Yet that particular balanced budget amendment simply said that you could not deficit-spend without a super majority of votes that declared that there was either an emergency in dealing with our national security or that there was an act of war on the table to where we were having to do things to make sure that we protected the national security of this country, which is priority one.

I'll let the gentleman ask me one more question, and then I'm going to yield to these other folks. I would just say this: Oftentimes, my friends on the Democrat side of the aisle say that a balanced budget amendment will require us to cut Medicare and cut Social Security and all of these things, and that presupposes that a balanced budget amendment will bring in less revenue to this government because of its constraints. First of all, when we deficit-spend, we're really just throwing the log up the trail. We're really not doing anyone any good in the long run because these programs become unsustainable over time.

Here's the thing that I wish I could express and wish that my Democrat friends would do their own research on and ascertain whether they think it's true empirically in history, which is: When we have a balanced budget amendment, when people believe that they can project forward and know that this government is going to be secure, when they believe that we're not going to deficit-spend and take a lot of the capital out of the private markets and that we're not going to put burdens on the interest rates, one thing happens very clearly—it drags more people off the sidelines; it drags more entrepreneurs into the system; it causes

more people to put their capital at risk; it causes more people to put their lives and endeavors into an enterprise that results in productivity.

The fundamentals of all economy is productivity, productivity, productivity, productivity. When we produce as a Nation, we raise the number of taxpayers, not the rate of taxes. We raise the number of taxpayers, and money from all corners comes into the coffers. That has happened many times. Even when we decrease taxes, that happens.

So I am convinced that a balanced budget amendment is the surest way, not only to have the additional moneys necessary to make sure that we have all of the constitutional mandated and allowed activities of this Federal Government to do, including that it gives us more money for things like Medicare and that it gives us more money for things like Social Security, but to also put us on a fiscal path to security so that those programs won't eventually come into question and even bankruptcy.

With that, I'd let the gentleman ask one more question.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for allowing me to ask him one final question.

Is there any concern that a balanced budget amendment would be legalizing the legislative process and politicizing the judiciary?

What I mean by that is all Federal judges are, obviously, appointed by the President of the United States, and they go through a process in the Senate. Is there any concern that those Federal judges could be queried over what programs they support and what programs they don't support, and therefore, it would stand as a basis for their own, if you will, politicizing of the judicial process, which presently is not involved in the political process? Then, if you don't mind sharing with us, what are the ramifications?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

There are always these times when Democrats and Republicans can find common ground, and I think this is one of those moments when I take the gentleman's point and believe that he has a very good point.

The truth is, as of late, in the last several decades, the courts have politicized, and they have brought into sort of the legalization process a lot of the activities that belong in this Chamber. I am convinced that, yes, there is every possibility that they may try to do that with a balanced budget amendment of the Constitution or with any other element of the Constitution because that's where things are headed.

The answer to that is not to say, well then, we're just going to give up the Constitution to the judges. The answer is for us to fight back and say that they are not going to politicize our Constitution, that they are there to apply the Constitution as written, not to have a Constitutional Convention every time they sit down to a case where they rewrite the Constitution like they did with Roe vs. Wade, like they did with the Kelo case. The judges simply should interpret the law as written and not try to do our job as legislators.

It is a serious problem, I would say to the gentleman, that concerns me greatly, but I will say this: We are seeing judges do these things anyway in States. Apart from a balanced budget amendment, they're saying, You're not equally applying your appropriations in a particular area, and we hereby order you to appropriate funds to this or that particular issue or cause or department. So I say to the gentleman that there is nothing that frightens me more than turning this entire Constitution, this entire Republic, over to an unelected judicial oligarchy. It's the most dangerous thing that we face because it abrogates the Constitution. I would say this President has put people in the courts who have no fealty or no respect for the Constitution whatsoever.

I just had a case that I've been fighting for 14 years, and it went before the courts. It should have been a 9–0 case, but it was 5–4 because these four justices were willing to say that every dollar in your pocket before you filled out a tax return was public money. Now, there was nothing constitutionally accurate about that, but they were willing to do it.

So the gentleman is correct in being afraid of judicial activism and of the judiciary injecting itself into the Constitution, but they've done that with all amendments. At least with a constitutionally balanced budget amendment, we'll have the words clearly that we have at least the ability to fight back and to say to the judges that they have no right to abrogate these words.

I hope that that makes a difference.

With that, I thank the gentleman for his questions, and I would yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma such time as he may consume.

Mr. LANKFORD. Thank you. I'm honored to get a chance to join in this conversation, which is really a conversation about a topic that's a very big deal to a lot of people.

I was 18 years old, and I remember sitting down with my mom, working through how to be able to fill out the register on a checkbook and how to be able to balance it because I'm getting ready to leave for college, and it becomes an essential characteristic of people to be able to handle their finances when they walk away to school. I can remember well sitting there and walking through money in/money out, all of that process.

It's such a simple process for us, so simple that, when I talk to people back home in my district in Oklahoma—Republicans or Democrats—and I say, ''What is your opinion on a balanced budget amendment?'' it's that this is not at partisan issue. Just flat out, when we get away from programs, when we get away from all the ideas and say, ''Should we balance our budget every year? Should we live in balance?'' I run into people who say, ''Yes, we need to balance our budget.'' When we get into conversations about the language, about exclusions, about all those things, those are legitimate conversations that I think we should have with the American people; but in reality, they come back to the same thing, that we should balance our budget.

Now, I've seen statistics. As high as 80 percent of the American people are interested in having a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and I think there are multiple reasons for that. Some of them are fiscal. If I went to the American people and I said, ''I could provide to the American people in our budget for social programs, for tasks, for agencies, for all of our entitlement programs $220 billion more a year immediately into our Federal budget,'' everyone would say, ''Great. How do we do that?''

□ 2020

I would say, we catch up on our budget and stop paying interest. Currently, we're paying $220 billion a year just in interest payments. Can you imagine what we could do with $220 billion more in our budget if we didn't have such a large debt that we're having to maintain with so much interest?

The other side of that is, this debt is not forever. I interact with people all the time, and they will say words like sustainable, the debt is not sustainable, the debt is not sustainable. When I ask people, what does that mean to you to say the debt is not sustainable, very often they will just hesitate, and they will say, I think it just means we can't do this forever. And I would smile and say, I completely agree, we can't just keep borrowing this forever.

But let me tell you what it means to me in this. At any given time in the world, there is only so much money at that exact moment—now, we know that wealth shrinks and grows over time as investment happens, but at any one instant in the world there is only so much money. And of that money that's there, there is only so much that is actually invested, whether that be in business or in bonds or in whatever it may be. You take that investment pie worldwide, and you've got a portion of it that's going to growing businesses, starting new businesses, investing in markets, and then you've got another group of sovereign debt that is actually paying for countries and their debt. There is only so much money that can be invested in a moment. And at some point we start, as a country, taking on more and more money, which we're pulling out of the markets, and we're actually slowing down our economy by requiring more and more money to come to us to pay for our debt. So at some point we've got to stand up as a Nation and say, if we continue taking on this debt, we are purposefully killing the worldwide economy because

we're taking money out of circulation, investment and pulling it into us. Forty-nine States have some sort of structure for a balanced budget. We should do that as a Federal Government. It is a commonsense thing.

Now, again, we can come back and talk about what the language is. I'm a firm believer that no party owns the United States Constitution; that is by the American people. So it should be Republicans and Democrats together, sitting down in a commonsense way, both the House and the Senate, and saying we agree, we need to get around this, this is out of hand. So let's start working on the language on it together.

So that becomes a key issue, but it sets up a couple of things that I think are really important. Number one is, it actually sets up deadlines. I have noticed as a freshman in this town that there are very few deadlines that ever occur here. Even when there is a budget requirement that the House and the Senate both have to do a budget each year, we just reject that and don't do it, and we'll do continuing resolutions and things. We don't like doing deadlines because it requires difficult decisions. A balanced budget amendment to the Constitution creates a moment that we have to actually focus in on the fiscal house and force us into those tough decisions.

It also creates a parameter that protects future generations. I am a firm believer that the reason we still have the freedom of religion in the United States is because it is in the United States Constitution. The reason we still have freedom of speech is because it is in the United States Constitution. And we all know that so many people in politics do not like what's written about them in the press, and many times in politics they push back on the press and try to limit the press. But we still have a free press because that is guaranteed in the United States Constitution. If we added in a balanced budget requirement for the Federal Government, it would give to our posterity, for centuries to come, the gift of a parent in the legislative room to say we are going to have a balanced budget, we are going to honor this. And that $220 billion a year that we've been throwing around and wasting on our interest would actually come back to reinvest into our economy. It's the right thing for us to do. It will require difficult decisions, I'm very aware, but it is absolutely the right thing to do.

I am so grateful for the gentleman from Arizona for leading a conversation on the House floor on this very important topic, because in the months to come we're encouraging all of America, around kitchen tables, around the workplace, playing around and watching football—which I'm very grateful is coming in the next couple of weeks to finally start football season again—around these gatherings of people to start having the conversation, do you think our Nation should have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution? Let's initiate a conversation—I think I know where the American people already are, but let's give it a shot and find out for sure where their legislators are and so we can get that back out to the States and say, where are you, and where are we as a Nation?

And so I appreciate so much the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. And I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say, in listening to the gentleman from Oklahoma's comments, that he is one great encouragement to many of us because he is living proof that the cavalry has arrived, and he is an example of why this debate has changed. I am very grateful for his presence in the United States Congress, and I hope he is here a very long time.

With that, I would seek to yield to the gentleman from Iowa for such time as he might consume, and I might ask the Speaker what the time remaining is at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. So I'm hoping I can yield to the gentleman 8 minutes, or something along those lines.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for leading on this Special Order, and all my colleagues that have come to the floor to raise the issue of the balanced budget amendment.

I wanted to just point a few things out as to where this sits. Now, the chairman of the Constitution Committee standing before me, Mr. FRANKS, has presided over the shaping of a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. And I certainly favor the one that was authored by BOB GOODLATTE and marked up in our full Judiciary Committee. It took three full days, and those days spanned over a couple weeks' period of time trying to find the time to get this to work out.

And I want to express, Mr. Speaker, that a balanced budget amendment that is written by someone who doesn't believe in a balanced budget amendment probably isn't going to yield the result that we all want from that amendment. And the worst case scenario would be the drafting and the passage of a balanced budget amendment that would be the constitutional equivalent of PAYGO. You could draft a balanced budget amendment that would say, Thou shalt balance the budget, and not put provisions in there, such as a cap on GDP, or a supermajority required to raise taxes, or a supermajority required to raise the debt limit, or of course the cap, as I said. And if it were just the barest of bones, the bare minimum of a definition of a balanced budget amendment, then that could be a balanced budget amendment that would allow a majority vote of the House of Representatives and a majority vote of the Senate to waive the balanced budget amendment. That would be the amendment equivalent of PAYGO, pay-as-you-go, waive it or raise taxes in order to calculate that you balanced it. So I would caution that we need to do a prudent job of promoting a balanced budget amendment, continually defining that balanced budget amendment to be something that gives us fiscal responsibility.

I will go more deeply into this perhaps in a half hour or so, but I wanted to also add that this legislation that has passed through the House of Representatives today—and I'm as joyous and delighted that GABBY GIFFORDS was able to cast a vote on this bill today, as perhaps almost anybody in this place, save the folks that are closer friends and relations of hers, but what a day, what a day for this Congress to feel that emotion of her coming in this room and putting that vote up on the board and to hear that cheer go up when that light turned green. We are on opposite sides of the issue, but as I said, it is a deep feeling of just great pleasure and gratitude and thanks that she can come into this place and do that.

But here's the point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, and that is that, if we do nothing, if we had not addressed this debt ceiling and dialed this spending curve down, in 10 years from now—this is what the lack of a balanced budget amendment will do: In 10 years from now, our national debt, our debt that we addressed today that's about $14.3 trillion, would be $28 trillion in 10 years if we just go along business as usual and the projections of the March baseline are projected out for a decade as we do; $28 trillion in debt. If we accept the—I'll call it the Boehner proposal that passed the House here today, because the numbers in it actually reflect the first Boehner bill of last Friday. Then this bill that passed the House today, our national debt is still, if this bill effectively turns this spending increase down in the way it's supposed to, and the deficit down, we're going to be looking at $26 trillion in our debt anyway in 10 years by 2021, $26 trillion.

So we've gone from, when we got up this morning, projections of $28 trillion in debt in 2021, in 10 years from now, dialed it down to $26 trillion. If we just held the line on the Ryan budget, we would have dialed it down to $23 trillion, and I'm not satisfied with that. When I see a budget that came out that balances in 26 years—now we've backed up some on that—I think we need to be stronger, not weaker. I think we need to step up and advocate and take these next few months and do all we can to sell America on the idea, selling the people that don't believe we should ever live under a balanced budget that we must do so.

And as I sat for those 3 days in the Judiciary Committee while we debated and marked up this balanced budget amendment that does these things that

I said—a three-fifths supermajority to waive the balance, or three-fifths to raise the debt ceiling, or two-thirds to exceed the 18 percent GDP cap, or two-thirds to increase taxes, all of those things—and it requires the President also to offer a balanced budget and allows a balanced budget requirement to be waived if we declare war or a national emergency that is significant—those things, if we don't do those things, then we end up with perpetual debt.

□ 2030

And the people on the other side of the aisle that debated against a balanced budget amendment completely convinced me that they never want to live under a balanced budget amendment unless it is a confiscation of all of the wealth of this land and put it back through the money machine here in Washington. It would suppress the economy, it would starve and eventually kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

So $28 trillion is projected. That's the projected national debt in 10 years. The bill that passed today takes it down to $26 trillion. Ryan took it to 23, so we lost a little bit of leverage here today.

But the people on the other side, and the President has convinced me also, he never wants to live under a balanced budget and certainly doesn't want to have a Constitution that would order that that be so.

So what do the American people have to say about people who are committed to deficit spending in perpetuity, what do they think happens, where do they think America goes if we take our hands off of the ''whoa back'' on the reins and the spending goes on and we borrow the money to fill all of the wants of the American people for now. And what happens to our children and grandchildren when they have to service that debt or when the roof caves in when no one will loan us money anymore and we became mega Greece?

This has been an intense debate here all around this country. It came to a certain head today. It is a long ways from over. This is a start. It's not the end. It is just a start.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa. He happens to be one of my most beloved friends in this institution, and he is a true statesman. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I think it's important for us to examine that word ''statesman.'' It's often said that a politician looks to the next election whereas a statesman looks to the next generation. I so believe that that's important in this place.

We need to realize that, as the older men around here, as it were, that we need to plant shade trees under whose shade we will never sit ourselves. We need to do those things for the next generations that will really make the difference.

I want to, if I could, relate the timeless words of one of our Founding Fathers Samuel Adams. He said, ''Let us contemplate our forefathers and our posterity, and resolve to maintain the rights bequeathed to us from the former for the sake of the latter. The necessity of these times, more than ever, calls for our utmost circumspection, deliberation, fortitude and perseverance.''

I think so much that those words are true, Mr. Speaker, because I truly believe that right now we are about planting trees under whose shade we will never sit ourselves.

But I truly believe that if we work hard in these next few months to pass this balanced budget amendment, that we will do great things for this country and for its people because oftentimes I find people see the balanced budget amendment as a way to constrain our ability to meet the needs of government.

Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget amendment will do several things. First of all, it will not only help government meet certain needs, it will help a lot of people no longer need government because it will expand this economy, it will help people gain jobs, it will help people become taxpayers, and as I said in my earlier comments, we don't need more tax increases, we need more taxpayers, and nothing will help this government in terms of the revenue it needs more than that.

But ultimately, a balanced budget amendment will also cause a debate in this country as to what is government's role and what is the private sector's role because oftentimes the difference between this country and many other countries is that our Constitution changed down government, and our Constitution tries to magnify the individual. And, Mr. Speaker, I just think sometimes we forget what it's all about.

I know there is a lot of sincere people on both sides of the issue. But I would just say tonight that we have a chance to move forward from this debate and realize that our eyes are open now, that we see the problem. And sometimes there is a moment in the life of every problem, Mr. Speaker, when it is big enough to be seen and still small enough to be solved. And I'm afraid that that window is closing upon all of us right now and that we have an opportunity to sow the seeds of ultimate success by putting a balanced budget amendment in our Constitution by putting it out to the States.

We can't pass a balanced budget amendment ourselves. What we can do is we can put it out to the States and say you decide. Let the people of this country decide whether we need a balanced budget amendment or not. If we will do our part, they will do theirs.

You know Fred Bastiat said many, many years ago, government is that great fiction through which everyone endeavors to live at the expense of everyone else. And it sounds real good, you know, this idea of deficit spending, this idea of socialized government sounds real good. But the truth is that while maybe free enterprise and market-driven freedom is sometimes the unequal distribution of wealth, socialism has proven time and time again across the centuries to be the equal distribution of poverty.

Nothing has dragged more poor people out of poverty for longer periods of time than freedom and free enterprise, and the balanced budget amendment will reinvigorate that in this country, and it's time that we had it, and by the grace of God I hope that we proceed.

I join with my friends on both sides of the aisle to say it's time to put this country back on track to the greatness that the Founding Fathers dreamed of so long ago and to understand on our parts that if we do what we can, that America's best days are still ahead.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

I HAVE A DREAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tonight or in the very near future, I want everyone within the sound of my voice to read or reread Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, ''I Have a Dream'' speech, a speech that I usually refer to as his ''insufficient funds or bounced check'' speech.

I've often thought: I wonder what Dr. King's speech would sound like if he were here today to give it. Well, I'm not presumptuous enough to pretend that I know exactly what Dr. King would say. I really don't. But I thought it would be challenging and interesting to go through his speech, change it as little as possible, but insert today's circumstances and my own thoughts on how I think Dr. King's speech might have sounded if it were given today. So that's what I propose to do tonight. After all, on August 27, we will dedicate the King Memorial here in Washington, D.C., the day before his historic anniversary of the ''I Have a Dream'' speech on August 28.

As my colleagues have now departed this institution for the August recess to return to their homes far and near, I thought it would be especially appropriate that the final speech delivered after this very tumultuous debate would give reference and reverence to the extraordinary insight of Martin Luther King, Jr.

I also thought in light of the budget cutting deal and the bounced check and insufficient funds deal that was passed today in the Congress that it would also be appropriate.

So tonight I want to try and give what some might call an updated version of Dr. King's ''I Have a Dream'' speech and what it might have sounded like today.

Again, I make no pretense that my paraphrased version of Dr. King's speech does his original version any justice. But the following is my paraphrased version of that speech after reflecting upon today's budget deal.

Paraphrasing Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s ''I Have a Dream'' speech, and for those of you who are in your offices listening to the sound of my voice, you might want to Google or go on the Internet and actually find the true text of Dr. King's speech and actually compare it to my exercise.

Especially in light of today's budget deficits, cumulative debt, the need to raise the debt limit, and in the context of the need to also fight for jobs, education, health care, housing, equal rights for women, renewable energy, fair taxation and for the fundamental right to vote, Dr. King might have delivered this speech:

I would have been happy today to join with those willing to take a balanced approach to budget cuts and revenue enhancements to bring about the greatest deficit reduction and debt reduction along with the most massive full employment plan in the history of our Nation. But that is not what the President and congressional leaders negotiated.

Nine score and four years ago on September 17, 1787, 39 great Americans signed the U.S. Constitution as witnesses. This momentous decree came as a beacon light of hope to millions of Americans who had been seared in the flames of British injustice.

□ 2040

It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of taxation without representation.

But 224 years later, the American people are not free of deficits and debt. Two hundred twenty-four years later, the life of many Americans is still sadly crippled by the manacles of foreclosed homes and the chains of unemployment. Two hundred twenty-four years later, many Americans live on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. Two hundred twenty-four years later, many Americans still languish in the corners of American society and find themselves as exiles in their own land. And so we were elected as President and as Congresspersons to end this shameful condition.

In a sense, the American people are looking to our Nation's capital, the President and the Congress, to be able 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 Americans 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 insofar as many of her citizens are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, Congress has given many Americans a bad check, a check which has come back marked ''insufficient funds.'' But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this Nation. And so, many Americans are still waiting to cash this check, a check that will give them upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of a job and justice.

They are also looking to this President and this hallowed Congress to remind America of the fierce urgency of Now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of unemployment to the sunlit path of full employment. Now is the time to lift our Nation from the quicksands of inequality of income and wealth to the solid rock of economic justice. Now is the time to make full employment and social and economic justice a reality for all of God's children.

It would be fatal for the Nation to overlook the urgency of this moment. This sweltering summer of Americans' legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of jobs and equality. 2011 is not an end but a beginning, and those who hope that those who are currently blowing off steam and will soon be content will have a rude awakening if the Nation returns to business as usual, and there will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until Americans are granted their full citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our Nation until the bright day of full employment and economic justice emerges.

But there is something that must be said to those who stand on the warm threshold which leads into the palace of jobs and justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for jobs by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protests to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting oppressive economic forces with the spiritual force of unrelenting, but disciplined, determination.

This marvelous new militancy which has engulfed many Americans must not lead us into a distrust of all politics and all politicians, for some politics and politicians are committed to full employment, social and economic justice, and some politicians also realize that their destiny is tied up with this larger destiny. Some politicians have come to realize that their jobs as Congresspersons are inextricably bound to Americans also having jobs.

We cannot walk alone, and as we walk we must make a pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back. There are those who are asking the devotees of social and economic justice, ''When will you be satisfied?'' We can never be satisfied as long as the American people are the victim of the unspeakable horrors of home foreclosures. We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain a job at a livable wage. We cannot be satisfied as long as the education of America's children leaves them uncompetitive in a new world market. We can never be satisfied as long as our health care system is ranked 37th in the world. We cannot be satisfied as long as one person in America cannot vote or one American believes they have nothing for which to vote. No, no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until ''jobs and justice rolls down like waters, and righteousness like a mighty stream.''

I am not unmindful that many Americans are experiencing great trials and tribulations. Some Americans are fresh from job rejections, and some Americans have been refused an adjustment to their mortgage which has left their family battered by the storms of home foreclosures and staggered by the winds of homelessness. You have become the veterans of unearned suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive. Go forward in Mississippi, go forward in Vermont, go forward in Michigan, go forward in Hawaii, go forward in Oregon, go forward in Florida, go forward in the ghettos and barrios of our cities and in rural Appalachia knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed.

Let us not wallow in the valley of despair, I say to you today, my friends.

And so even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American Dream. I have a dream that one day this Nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.'' I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together around a table of brotherhood where full employment, high quality health care for all Americans, excellence in education for every child, and safe, sanitary and affordable housing for every family is their natural experience.

I have a dream that one day, absent the false excuse of sweltering deficits and debt and the heat of economic injustice, America will be transformed into an oasis of full employment, freedom and economic justice.

I have a dream that my two little children will one day live in a Nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character, and that voting will be as natural as breathing, and no trickery or legal obstacles will be thrown in their path.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day over Michigan, over Ohio, Illinois and Indiana, with its wicked unemployment and suffering families, that one day right there in Michigan, Ohio, Illinois and Indiana, all of these families will be able to enjoy full employment, social and economic justice, and all will be able to join hands as brothers and sisters.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted and every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight ''and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together.''

This is my hope, and this is the faith that I go forward with every day.

With this faith, we will be able to hew out of the mountain of deficits and debt a stone of economic hope and justice for all Americans. With this faith, we will be able to transform the jangling discords of unemployment and home foreclosures into a beautiful symphony of full employment and affordable housing. With this faith, we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free and fully employed one day.

And this will be the day. This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning:

My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing.

Land where my fathers died, land of the Pilgrim's pride,

From every mountainside, let freedom ring.

And if America is to be a great Nation, this must become true.

□ 2050

And so let freedom, full employment, and the right of private and public workers to organize into unions to protect their interests ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire. Let freedom and public education of equal high quality for all of America's children ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring and health care of equal high quality for all Americans ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania. Let freedom and a clean, safe, and sustainable environment ring from the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado. Let freedom ring with safe and sanitary and affordable housing from the curvaceous slopes of California.

But not only that, let freedom and equal rights for women, for gays and lesbians ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia. Let freedom, fair and progressive taxation ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee. Let freedom and the right and the ability to vote ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom, social and economic justice ring throughout America.

And when this happens, when, my friends, we allow freedom, full employment, social and economic justice to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every State and every city, we will be able to speed up the day when all of God's children, black men, white men, women, Jews, Gentiles, and Muslims, Protestants and Catholics, gays and straights, those who are whole and those who are handicapped, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: Free at last, free at last, thank God Almighty, we are free at last.

I want to remind everyone that I just finished giving my paraphrased version of what I thought Dr. King might have said had he been alive today and witnessed this debate, especially in light of the budget cutting, the insufficient funds, the bounced check deal that Congress passed on this day. I tried to remain as faithful as possible to the original speech, simply filling in my own thoughts and ideas in the current context, but I make no pretense to have done justice to the original version.

Again, I urge my friends and my colleagues and all those who can hear my voice to read or reread Dr. King's ''I Have a Dream'' speech at your earliest convenience.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this speech that Dr. King delivered the economic substance of his expectations of Democrats and Republicans in the Congress. America has issued all of us a bad check. It has come back marked ''insufficient funds.'' But we refuse to believe that the great vaults of opportunity of this Nation are bankrupt. If we can spend billions of dollars to put a man on the Moon, if we can spend billions of dollars on a war in Afghanistan, spend billions of dollars on a war in Iraq, spend tens of millions of dollars per week on a war in Libya, then, Mr. Speaker, this Congress can find enough money to put a man on his own two feet right here in America.

I have not given up on America, and I hope we don't give up on America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE NEED FOR SPENDING CONTROLS

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we took a vote here on this floor, a vote to protect the economy while demonstrating a commitment to reducing our debt—no more budget tricks, no more accounting gimmicks, no more empty promises.

You have the right to know the truth about America's budget. We have the responsibility to deliver it. This debate was done in plain sight. No more automatic deficit or debt balance increases. This was an opportunity for the American people to not only engage, but to cut the size of government. We need spending controls in place.

We were able to accomplish that here today because we believe that Washington isn't the solution; Washington is the problem. Which is why we need not only spending controls, but economic freedom through a balanced budget amendment.

You have heard a lot over the last several weeks about a balanced approach. To people in my district, they understand that a balanced approach increases taxes on those very job creators. I would just say, in conclusion, the economic security that we are looking for is a balanced budget amendment.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to be addressing you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. It's always interesting for me to sit here and listen to the other Members deliver their impression of what goes on and how they envision the future, and I enjoyed the gentleman from Illinois's presentation, and the gentleman from California, and particularly the gentleman from Arizona, who came here to talk about the balanced budget amendment. And so I take that issue up as we get ready to close out the evening, and I would like to add some of the points that I have to this.

That is, when I was first elected to office, it was in the State senate in 1996, and I believed that if I just simply made a cogent argument on principle that it would sway my colleagues over to my side. I didn't think it was all that complicated. It wouldn't be hard to talk about balancing the budget, keeping the spending within our times. Because, after all, each year government always provides more and more of what people were providing for themselves the years before. So this encroachment of government that is the growth in the nanny state and the decrease in personal responsibility had been going along for years back then. It's been accelerated in the last few years.

But the question I'd ask at this point is: What should government not do? What is it that is too much for government to do? Where should we draw the line? And as now I am halfway into the ninth year in this United States Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have been engaged in so many debates and pushed so many bills and supported and opposed so much legislation that I see the pattern. I see a pattern.

It's over here on this side, they believe the government should do everything and that anybody that is investing their capital and returning an income off of that and making some money is somehow an evil capitalist,

victimizing the proletariats and the workers. I get a little disappointed even with my own colleagues that constantly repeat this message that rings off the walls of the White House and rang off of the walls of the Speaker's office when NANCY PELOSI was the Speaker: Where are the jobs?

Well, okay, it's a legitimate question. But underneath that question is: Where are the profits? Where are the profits? Why would an individual invest their capital and their brainpower and their back power, their sweat equity, if they didn't have an opportunity to take that little pile of capital and build it up a little bit bigger, if they didn't have an opportunity to get a better return on their investment, if they just simply stuck it in U.S. Treasury bills?

People who invest money have to expect to have a profit. And then out of the profit, they pay the wages. And if they're making money off of the people they hire, they hire more people if they can see a model that will do that. That's how this worm turns. But it isn't evil capitalists.

I think Mr. FRANKS said it pretty well, but I will say this, that free enterprise capitalism has done more good for the world than any other system that's out there. It has gotten people out of bed in the morning. It's kept them up late at night. It's caused them to find another way to be more efficient. Competition makes us more efficient. And the desire to do well, sometimes just for the pure sake of the challenge of it all, that desire to do well drives many of us.

So the people that are out there creating jobs are doing so because there is a prospect for profit. That's where the jobs are. If the prospect for profit isn't there, if the degree of risk is not proportional to the potential for profit, they're not going to take the risk. It's that simple, Mr. Speaker.

And over on this side, I hear sometimes this lack of resolve that, yes, we ought to have a balanced budget and we need to get there, but it's just too soon to rush there, the resistance to the idea that we should take a look at this spending now and cut this spending now, get it under control now.

□ 2100

When I first came into this Congress and swore in here on this floor in January of 2003, shortly after that I went over to the chairman of the Budget Committee and said where is the balanced budget, 2003. And he said to me, we can't balance the budget. Why not? It's too hard. Why is it too hard? Because we have too many expenses, too many burdens.

Don't you know, don't you know, green freshman Congressman in 2003, that we have been hit by the enemy on September 11, 2001? Don't you know we had to create an entire TSA and put this huge security system up and merge together the Department of Homeland Security? Don't you know that we had to organize and deploy the military over to places like Afghanistan? Didn't I know that we were mobilizing to go into Iraq at that very time, that our expenses were too high, we couldn't balance the budget, couldn't provide a balanced budget because it was too hard. It was too hard to balance the budget because our financial system had taken a hard hit on September 11, 2001, and because we had a war to fight—actually two wars to fight, and because we had to create all of this billions of dollars worth of security so we could keep ourselves safe.

And didn't I know that that was right on the tail end of the first thing of the dot-com bubble that was a false economy, that bubble that actually was a huge component in getting the budget balanced during those late Clinton years—that dot-com bubble had to burst because it wasn't built on the ability to produce a good or a service and deliver it more efficiently, but it was built on the speculation that we could store information and transfer it more efficiently than ever before, and we could. But that didn't necessarily translate into the efficiencies that come that create the profit. So the dot-com bubble burst, September 11 came, TSA was created, Homeland Security was created, two wars were fought, and through all of that we lost that sight of austerity.

And I wish that President Bush had said to us, tighten your belt, we are going to pay for this conflict, and we are going to pay for this tragedy that happened to the United States of America by all of us sharing the sacrifice by tightening our belt, not by raising taxes on people that are producing jobs. But it didn't happen that way, and I made my arguments, and I made them every year. And I went through a lot to try to produce a balanced budget throughout those years. We never got a balanced budget that we could bring to the floor, not that balanced in a single year.

But I will say, Mr. Speaker, during the height of the Iraq war, when things looked as bad as they could have looked, and about the time that George Bush was preparing to order the surge, about that period of time, we had a budget that came within $160 billion of balancing, $160 billion, Mr. Speaker.

Now that $160 billion, boy, how do I wish we would have found a way to tighten it down so we didn't have that deficit, that we could have balanced that budget in that year. We came very, very close—$160 billion didn't sound close. It's close, it's really close compared to what we have today.

And so the President offers a budget that nobody will pick up and vote for and support, but it's a $1.65 trillion deficit spending budget, $1.65 trillion. And I listen to people that will say to me, Republicans overspent. Yes, we did. I make that confession. But the overspending of $160 billion compared to the overspending of $1.65 trillion is 10–1 Obama administration versus the Bush administration, 10–1.

And here we are now with a number that is greater than $3 trillion, maybe less than $5 trillion, and a deficit that has been created by the Obama administration with no end in sight. And the President insisted that this Congress grant to him $2.4 trillion in unfettered debt ceiling increase, a clean debt ceiling increase bill, no strings attached, $2.4 trillion.

Now, that was irresponsible, and when you find yourself with a divided government like we have, this government would have gone in that direction in a heartbeat if NANCY PELOSI had still been the Speaker. I can tell you if she would have been in charge, if Democrats would have had the majority here in the House of Representatives and HARRY REID would be running the shop down that hallway through there in the Senate, and the President asked for $2.4 trillion there would hardly have been a debate, Mr. Speaker, hardly a debate at all.

They would have brought a bill under a closed rule down here to the floor with a limited amount of debate. And if they thought there was going to be negative publicity, it would have happened at the time of the night that the press was not going to be able to report it so that the American people would pay attention.

And, yes, it would have leaked out, there wouldn't have been a lid on the secret. But neither would it have been with a great deal of fanfare. It would have been $2.4 trillion, rubberstamped by this Congress, House, and Senate and sent to the President for his signature, business as usual, and off we would have gone. And we would have seen ourselves then with a national debt of, oh, let's say, $16.7 trillion, no questions asked, no strings attached. That's what would have happened.

But the American people rose up over the last couple of years, and they formed organizations around this country spontaneously, Project 912 organizations, Tea Party organizations, not by the dozens or the scores—by the hundreds, by the thousands, Mr. Speaker. Organizations by the thousands across this country, some organized, some not, loosely organized, affiliated on each other's email list, paying attention, having meetings, energizing themselves, identifying candidates, running some of their own candidates, becoming candidates themselves, supporting people that will come to this Congress and to the State legislatures all across this land and put our fiscal house in order. That's what's been going on over the last couple of years in this country.

And another thing that mobilized the people in this country was ObamaCare. When the ruling troika at the time, I called it, that would be the Obama-Pelosi-Reid ruling troika, decided that they were going to force-feed ObamaCare down the throat of this country, we saw tens of thousands mobilized to come to this Capitol, to surround this Capitol, to jam the Capitol

to, heck, keep it so packed that people couldn't get in or out, so that they couldn't do business; demand, do not take American liberty, do not nationalize the second-most-sovereign thing we have, which is our health, our skin and everything inside it, but they did.

By legislative shenanigans and unprecedented maneuvering they did force ObamaCare care on us, and we are now hanging in the balance of whether we are able to repeal ObamaCare or whether it becomes the institutionalized roots down deep, permanent and perpetual law of the land.

I thought a wise statement was made a week ago Wednesday morning at a breakfast that I host when the guest speaker said that he believes if Barack Obama is reelected President that ObamaCare gets institutionalized in perpetuity as the law of the land. And if Barack Obama is not reelected, then we will repeal ObamaCare and pull it out by the roots.

That's one of the big things that are at stake, and I have staked a lot of my efforts over the last 23 or so months in working to first defeat and then to repeal ObamaCare. And when we passed the repeal here in the House of Representatives and the language that I drafted went over to the Senate, shortly after that, some weeks after that we took up the defunding of ObamaCare and we passed that legislation with the CR over to the Senate, where it was peeled off and voted down.

But every Republican in the House of Representatives and every Republican in the United States Senate has voted to repeal ObamaCare and has voted to shut off all funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare, every one, and it's been a bipartisan effort also to get those things done.

That's a piece of this large deficit spending that we have, and people said, what does it take for you to vote for this debt ceiling increase that passed the House tonight? And my answer immediately is, just put the repeal of ObamaCare and attach it to the debt ceiling increase, and I will salivate to vote for that.

The first full 10 years and outlays for ObamaCare are $2.6 trillion, according to the chairman of the Budget Committee, $2.6 trillion. So, in comparison, it stays consistent with Speaker BOEHNER's standard for, are we going to have more dollars in cuts than we have in debt ceiling increase; a 2.4 or actually down around a 2.2 debt ceiling increase, compared to a $2.6 trillion repeal of ObamaCare, I think is an okay bargain because we get back our liberty. We get back the chance to manage our health care and purchase a health insurance policy of our choice, one that's created by the market that's produced by the demand of the American people and not one that's managed and defined by the bureaucrats in Washington.

□ 2110

Mr. Speaker, I will just give you an example of what goes on and the oppressive nature of ObamaCare, a socialized medicine proposal that decides what kind of policy we can have and what kind of policy we can't have. Now, that's a constraint that I just can't abide in a free country.

If I want to buy a health insurance policy that has a $10,000 deductible, I want to do that. That's my business. If I want to buy a policy that has a 50 percent copayment for the first million dollars and I want to do that, that's my business. I don't need nanny state telling me what I can and can't buy, but they do.

And now they have concluded, as of a notice that came out today, that every health insurance policy in America that is approved by the Federal Government—that will be every one that you can buy under ObamaCare—shall cover contraceptives—no copayment, no charge, except it gets averaged across everybody else's premium. Contraceptives will become, by edict of the Federal Government, a component of everybody's health insurance policy under ObamaCare.

Now, think about that. We have people that are single, we have people that are past reproductive age, and we have priests that are celibate, all of them paying insurance premiums that cover contraceptives so that somebody else doesn't have to pay the full fare of that? And they have called it preventative medicine—preventative medicine. Well, if you apply that preventative medicine universally, what you end up with is you have prevented a generation.

Preventing babies from being born is not medicine. That's not constructive to our culture and our civilization. If we let our birth rate down below the replacement rate, we are a dying civilization. And right now we are at about 2.1 babies per woman. That is just the replacement rate, that's all it is. And Teddy Roosevelt wrote about that. It isn't committed verbatim to my memory, but he said that any race that doesn't care enough about itself to reproduce itself will essentially become extinct. And he said, I, for one, will not lament their loss, and I shall welcome the advent of a new generation, a new group of people who will care enough to have their own babies.

And now we have a Federal Government that has not just subsidized contraceptives but has written an edict that every health insurance policy will include contraceptives because they consider it to be preventative health care. Now, none of us would have health to worry about if they prevented us, would we, Mr. Speaker?

Now, that is bizarre. It is Orwellian. It is not even counterintuitive. But that's an example of what's going on in this country today, one of the reasons why we have to reverse the political power that is in the White House and in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the $2.6 trillion in the first full 10 years of outlays of the Obama administration is a piece of this irresponsible spending that we have been involved in. And now the administration is driving that 3 to maybe as much as $5 trillion in unnecessary and irresponsible spending and projecting this national debt that goes from $14 trillion on up to $16.7 trillion.

Here are some examples of what we need to do to solve this problem. One, as I said, repeal ObamaCare. Rip it out by the roots, lock, stock and barrel. Pull out all the vestiges of ObamaCare without any particle of DNA left behind so that it can't reproduce and grow back on us. We cannot let that happen. It's an unconstitutional taking of American liberty. It has got to go. It diminishes our vitality, it diminishes our future, and it diminishes our American potential. Pulling ObamaCare out by the roots is one big piece of the solution.

Another big piece of the solution, Mr. Speaker, is to pass the FairTax, the national sales tax, to end the IRS as we know it, and stop punishing people who are producing. We need people in the private sector that are out there creating a profit by their own nature of industriousness, intuitiveness, and entrepreneurialism. And we need to grow the private sector. We need to reward people for doing that. And instead, we punish them.

Uncle Sam has the first lien on all productivity in the country, every bit of it: if you have earnings, savings or investment, if you punch a time clock, if you have a passbook savings, if you have dividends or interest payments that are coming your way or an estate that is coming your way, or if you have capital gains that are coming your way. How about the rent check for an apartment complex that you might have invested in? How about the per acre rent on a farm? How about anything you might sell that you have produced, whether you've got a lemonade stand or whether you are the Donald, Uncle Sam is going to tax your productivity.

He stands there by that time clock day after day. And when you go to work on Monday morning at 8 o'clock and you punch the time clock, you hear that thunk and his hand comes out of his pocket and he holds it out and you go to work. And each dollar you earn goes into his hand until Uncle Sam has enough to satisfy his appetite for the fruits of your labor. When that moment comes in that day—you punch the time card at 8 o'clock—it might be 11 o'clock, it might be 11:30, it might be noon, it might be after lunch that you've finally earned enough that Uncle Sam will put all those dollars you have earned in his pocket and walk away for the day. Then you can go to work for the Governor. It's not as much. He puts that in his pocket. Now you're down to maybe you're doing it for the wife and kids, or the husband and the kids as the case may be. Not a lot is left for us. But the next morning, that wolf is at the door again. And you punch the time clock again, and there

stands Uncle Sam, and out comes his hand, and in goes each dollar you earn until he is satisfied and he puts it in his pocket and he walks away. You do it every single day.

And so why do people go to work when we have over 72 means-tested Federal welfare programs that reward people for not working? Over 72 of them. It can be a heat subsidy, a rent subsidy, SNAP—that's the food stamp program. Now, they had to rename it because ''food stamps'' had a bad image—and the TANF program, and the list goes on and on and on. No one can name all of them from the top of their head, which means no one can analyze how they interrelate or how they motivate people to go to work or not to go to work.

And I will tell you, people will do what you pay them to do. If you pay them to stay home, they'll stay home. If you pay them to have babies, they'll have babies. If you pay them to go to work, they'll go to work. If you give them an unemployment check and you say that you're not going to get this check if you go to work, they're not going to work anymore. Some will out of conscience, yes. We have good, decent people in this country. But by and large, if you pay people not to work, they're not going to show up to work.

So what we need to do is take all that tax off of productivity, put it over on the consumption side, let everybody go to work and earn all they want to earn, save all they want to save, and invest all they want to invest. They get 56 percent more in their paycheck under the FairTax, 56 percent more.

The goods and services that we buy go down in price an average of 22 percent, because in the price of what we're buying is the income tax and the payroll tax of the wages of the people that produced it. Employers have to, companies have to build that price in because they don't pay the tax. Last stop, consumers pay the tax—not corporations, not companies, not producers. They are the collectors. But they are not the payers. They are the tax collectors.

So if we go down that line and cut off and shut off the IRS and repeal and abolish the IRS Tax Code and let people earn all they want to earn and invest all they want to invest and save all they want to save, there will be an incentive there also for savings and investment, and our economy grows dynamically again. And the goods and services that are being produced in foreign countries start to come back here to be produced again.

We, Mr. Speaker, have gotten ourselves in a bad fix. We have exported, because of our tax structure and the bureaucratic burden and the regulatory burden, we have exported a lot of American industry to places like China. And now we buy Chinese goods and we borrow the money from the Chinese to buy the product of the industry that they've created that we've shipped there. And it has been a colossal mistake to turn us in the opposite direction from the industrialized, productive America into the America that sends IOUs to China and brings goods in from China that we used to make while we pay people not to work—$212 billion. Most of it went for unemployment benefits last December.

We pay people not to work. Not just the unemployment benefits; we pay people not to work by the 70-some means-tested welfare programs. And some of those that will work are nudged out of the job because we have a number of 12 million or more illegals in this country, of which about 8 million are statistically working in this economy, every one of them taking a job that an American or a legal immigrant can do.

□ 2120

It is bizarre for us, Mr. Speaker, to pay millions not to work through 70-plus means-tested welfare programs, pay others not to work on unemployment, and accept the idea that illegals come into America and take jobs from Americans, all the while while we shift our industry over to places like China and borrow money from the Chinese and the Saudis to buy things from the Chinese and the Saudis, let alone develop our own energy here domestically where we can, drill in ANWR, the Outer Continental Shelf, more drilling in the Gulf. And yes, I'd trade with Canada and bring that pipeline down here. Let's do business with our best trading partners.

While all of that is going on, and that's a list of some of the things that I lament, Mr. Speaker, but I'd add to that list, we are spending ourselves so deeply into debt that we aren't very many years from not being able to figure out a way to come out. And a constitutional balanced budget amendment is the only solution that I can see that can crack the intransigence of the people over here that believe that we can live in deficit spending in perpetuity, that we can run the debt up in perpetuity, and that we're never going to be held accountable, that we can always borrow and always spend, and we can borrow enough money to buy all of the wants that they have politically so they can pacify their constituents. And yes, it happens over on this side, some, too.

But I want to see a balanced budget amendment come through, and the stage is now set for us to spend the next couple of months marketing the idea of a balanced budget amendment. I want to see the balanced budget amendment that we marked up in the Judiciary Committee. It took 3 days to do so. BOB GOODLATTE drafted and introduced a balanced budget amendment that requires that this Federal Government live under a balanced budget, and it requires that there be a three-fifths majority in both Houses in order to waive that balance.

So if the body here and there decides we have to break that pledge to balance, we have to vote to do so, three-fifths; 60 percent supermajority. If we're going to raise the debt limit, it takes a supermajority of three-fifths to do so under the balanced budget amendment of BOB GOODLATTE. It requires that we spend below the cap of 18 percent of GDP, and we must not exceed an 18 percent gross domestic product cap. That's all the Federal Government can consume. We are up now to 23-something percent. We have to dial it down to a historic average of 18 percent. That is a two-thirds majority to spend above the 18 percent cap of GDP, and it requires a two-thirds majority to increase taxes.

Those are all standards that we need to hold to in this Congress, and it's going to take a two-thirds majority in this Congress to send that balanced budget over to the Senate and on to the States. I will be working to see to it that that happens.

Meanwhile, I just want to speak into the record that I voted no on this bill today that raised the debt ceiling, and I did so for a number of reasons. One of them is the standards that I have just put into the record for a balanced budget amendment are not written into the bill. So a balanced budget amendment might take any form. It might be a form that can simply be waived by a majority of the House and the Senate. That seems a little ridiculous, but I take you to that point because the definition doesn't hold us to any standard. I want to hold to the standard that I have just stated.

Another thing is this bill today does cuts as a condition to increase the debt ceiling; but those cuts are only $17 billion out of discretionary spending for the 1 year that we control, that is 2012 fiscal year. The Ryan budget produced $31 billion in cuts out of the 2012 fiscal year and discretionary; $24 billion less cuts already. It shows we don't have the resolve to do the early cutting, only the promise to do the late cutting. So if you have the late cutting instead of the early cutting, that means we may not be held accountable down the line. Politicians want to push that off on to future Congresses. They don't want to go home and face their constituents in this time.

So I urge that we pass a balanced budget here out of this Congress. We realize that we have taken a small step today. We have to take big steps if we are going to get this country where it belongs. And I look forward to the day I can say to my grandchildren: We did clear a path for you. We did do it right. We did get to a balanced budget, now it's up to you to take this country to the next level of its destiny.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 2, 2011, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2679. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Section 610 Review [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-06-0185; FV06-925-610 Review] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2680. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conditions of Guarantee (RIN: 0570-AA81) received July 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2681. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Emergency Homeowners' Loan Program [Docket No.: FR-5470-I-01] (RIN: 2502-AI97) received July 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2682. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule — Large Trader Reporting (RIN: 3235-AK55) received July 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2683. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0568] (RIN: 0910-AG41) received July 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2684. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Labeling and Effectiveness Testing; Sunscreen Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use [Docket No.: FDA-1978-N-0018] (Formerly Docket No.: 1978N-0038) (RIN: 0910-AF43) received July 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2685. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-046, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2686. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-051, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2687. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-047, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2688. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-030, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2689. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-045, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2690. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-043, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2691. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-057, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2692. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-034, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2693. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, ''Sufficiency Certification for the Washington Convention and Sports Authority's (Trading As Events DC) Projected Revenues and Excess Reserve to Meet Projected Operating and Debt Service Expenditures and Reserve Requirements for Fiscal Year 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2694. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, ''Fiscal Year 2010 Annual Report On Advisory Neighborhood Commissions''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2695. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA-365C, SA-365C1, SA-365C2, SA-365N, SA-365N1, AS-365N2, AS-365N3, and SA-366G1 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0551; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-013-AD; Amendment 39-16714; AD 2011-12-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2696. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Model (Robinson) R22, R22 Alpha, R22 Beta, R22 Mariner, R44, and R44 II Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0588; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-074-AD; Amendment 39-16717; AD 2011-12-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2697. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 727, 727C, 727-100, 727-100C, 727-200, and 727-200F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1272; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-226-AD; Amendment 39-16712; AD 2011-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2698. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0028; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-228-AD; Amendment 39-16716; AD 2011-12-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 384. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 365) to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (Rept. 112–190). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BACHUS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1751. A bill to amend the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 to require that weather radios be installed in all manufactured homes manufactured or sold in the United States (Rept. 112–191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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 Mrs. BONO MACK (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 2715. A bill to provide the Consumer Product Safety Commission with greater authority and discretion in enforcing the consumer product safety laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. considered and passed.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2716. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, impose penalties for failing to report, within a reasonable amount of time, the disappearance or death of a child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2717. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate one city in the United States each year as an ''American World War II City'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BACHUS, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 2718. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand tax relief for national disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2719. A bill to ensure public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument for educational, recreational, historical, scientific, cultural, and other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2720. A bill to clarify the role of the Department of Veterans Affairs in providing a benefit or service related to the interment or funeral of a veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 2721. A bill to provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help

build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 2722. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code, to increase the requirement for American-made content, to strengthen the waiver provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2723. A bill to amend title IV of the Budget Control Act of 2011 to protect the Social Security and SSI programs from budget cuts under such Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2724. A bill to amend title IV of the Budget Control Act of 2011 to protect the Medicaid program from budget cuts under such Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2725. A bill to amend the Budget Control Act of 2011 to protect the Medicare program from budget cuts under such Act; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2726. A bill to amend the Budget Control Act of 2011 to protect education programs from budget cuts under such Act; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2727. A bill to amend title IV of the Budget Control Act of 2011 to protect the Social Security, SSI, Medicare, Medicaid, and education programs from budget cuts under such Act; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2728. A bill to amend the securities laws to require that registration statements, quarterly and annual reports, and proxy solicitations of public companies include a disclosure to shareholders of any expenditure made by that company in support of or in opposition to any candidate for Federal, State, or local public office; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BASS of California (for herself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 2729. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend to physician assistants eligibility for Medicaid incentive payments for the adoption and use of certified electronic health records, whether or not such physician assistants practice at a rural health center or Federally qualified health center; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BASS of California (for herself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas):

H.R. 2730. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent human trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERG:

H.R. 2731. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to provide for demonstration projects designed to expedite the reemployment of unemployed workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2732. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for temporary student loan debt conversion authority; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2733. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to ensure that the basic allowance for housing in effect for a member of the National Guard is not reduced when the member transitions between active duty and full-time National Guard duty without a break in active service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 2734. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the participation of the territories in Federal-aid highway discretionary programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2735. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the look-through treatment of payments between related controlled foreign corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2736. A bill to permit an individual to be treated by a health care practitioner with any method of medical treatment such individual requests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2737. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make stillborn children eligible for optional life insurance coverage; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 2738. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program of awarding grants to owners or operators of water systems to increase resiliency or adaptability of the systems to any ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrologic conditions of a region of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, 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. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 2739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the increased deduction for start-up expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 2740. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain population census tracts for which information is not available as low-income communities for purposes of the new markets tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 2741. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. FUDGE:

H.R. 2742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to employers for providing training programs for jobs specific to the needs of the employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 2743. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in Pound, Virginia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2744. A bill to pay personnel compensation and benefits for employees of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. HECK:

H.R. 2745. A bill to amend the Mesquite Lands Act of 1986 to facilitate implementation of a mulitspecies habitat conservation plan for the Virgin River in Clark County, Nevada; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2746. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for coverage of oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the coverage provided for intravenously administered anticancer medications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, 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. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2747. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a cancer center construction loan program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. HONDA:

H.R. 2748. A bill to assess the potential of smart electronics to reduce home and office electricity demand, to incorporate smart electronics into the Energy Star Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2749. A bill to ensure the development and responsible stewardship of nanotechnology; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, 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. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. SUTTON):

H.R. 2750. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the investment tax credit for combined heat and power system property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2751. A bill to authorize a pilot program on enhancements of Department of Defense efforts on mental health in the National Guard and Reserves through community partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 2752. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct onshore oil and gas lease sales through Internet-based live lease sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2753. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide Internet access to Regional Fishery Management Council meetings and meeting records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 2754. A bill to provide the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Department of the Treasury with authority to more aggressively enforce trade laws relating to textile and apparel articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable personal credit to individuals who donate certain life-saving organs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. LATTA:

H.R. 2756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the 10 percent penalty on distributions from qualified retirement plans for mortgage payments on qualified residences and in respect of unemployment and to increase the age at which distributions from qualified retirement plans are required to begin from 70 1/2 to 75; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2757. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to maintain United States Armed Forces and military contractors in Iraq after December 31, 2011, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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 Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 2758. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding by new mothers and to provide for reasonable break time for nursing mothers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2759. A bill to require companies to include in their annual reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission a disclosure describing any measures the company has taken during the year to identify and address conditions of forced labor, slavery, human trafficking, and the worst forms of child labor within the company's supply chains; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 2760. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to improve the minting and issuing of coins, to reduce the current excess stockpile of $1 coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 2761. A bill to amend section 520 of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide flexibility to the definition of rural areas; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 2762. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to reauthorize the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2763. A bill to amend section 402(a)(2)(M) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to extend by two years the special rule relating to eligibility for benefits under the supplemental security income program for certain aliens and victims of trafficking; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 2764. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 2765. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the requirement that permit applications for the discharge of pollutants be approved by disinterested board members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2766. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to accelerate the delivery process for highway and public transportation construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OLVER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2767. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8 West Silver Street in Westfield, Massachusetts, as the ''William T. Trant Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2768. A bill to cancel public debt held by the Federal Reserve System and to lower the public debt limit by an equal amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 2769. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for any universal or mandatory mental health screening program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, 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. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2770. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend for 3 years reasonable cost contracts under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. RIVERA:

H.R. 2771. A bill to amend Public Law 89-732 to increase to 5 years the period during which a Cuban national must be physically present in the United States in order to qualify for adjustment of status to that of a permanent resident, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2772. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to permit eligible fishermen to approve certain limited access privilege programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. JONES, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2773. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37 of the United States Code to authorize the establishment of units of the National Guard in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 2774. A bill to repeal the Legal Services Corporation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STARK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2775. A bill to repeal a limitation in the Labor-Management Relations Act regarding requirements for labor organization membership as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2776. A bill to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2777. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Private First Class William P. Fesken of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2778. A bill to prevent the overproduction of $1 presidential coins by the United

States Mint in order to efficiently meet collector demand while reducing the surplus of already produced $1 coins in Federal Reserve System vaults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 2779. A bill to exempt inter-affiliate swaps from certain regulatory requirements put in place by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; 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. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 2780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the domestic production activities deduction rules relating to allowance of deduction by United States contract manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2781. A bill to establish a research, development, and technology demonstration program to improve the efficiency of gas turbines used in combined cycle and simple cycle power generation systems; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2782. A bill to provide for a program of wind energy research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2783. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 190-day lifetime limit on inpatient psychiatric hospital services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 2784. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the deployment of highly efficient combined heat and power property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 2785. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide improved access to physical medicine and rehabilitation services under part B of the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2786. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the unique needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2787. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. WOODALL (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 2788. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit a candidate for election to the office of Senator or Member of the House of Representatives from making campaign expenditures for the election from amounts that were not raised during the election cycle for that office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 2789. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to suspend the issuance of $1 coins for a 15-year period, or until excess stockpiles are exhausted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should ensure that the United States does not default on its debt by making every effort to negotiate passage of an increase in the statutory debt ceiling or, all such efforts failing, should use his authority under section 3 of Article II of the United States Constitution to uphold section 4 of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution to pay all debts of the United States as they come due; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of S. 365; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring Wilt Chamberlain and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any legislative language approved by the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction should not reduce benefits for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. PEARCE):

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution honoring the service of Sergeant First Class Leroy Arthur Petry, a native of Santa Fe, New Mexico and the second living recipient of the Medal of Honor since the Vietnam War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H. Res. 385. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 12, 2011, as National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. WATT):

H. Res. 386. A resolution recognizing the accomplishments and efforts of John I. Wilson, executive director of the National Education Association, for dedicating his career to education professionals and students, and honoring his retirement; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 387. A resolution recognizing that the religious freedom and human rights violations of Kashmiri Pandits has been ongoing since 1989; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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 Mrs. BONO MACK:

H.R. 2715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution the United States Congress shall have power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2717.

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, of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, 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 the Constitution shall be construed to as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 14 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to promote the general welfare, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 2728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Ms. BASS of California:

H.R. 2729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. BASS of California:

H.R. 2730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. BERG:

H.R. 2731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 2733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to raise and support Armies pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 as well as the power of Congress to organize militias (National Guard) pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 16

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 2734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3, 7 and 18, which grant Congress the authority to regulate commerce among the several states; to establish Post Offices and post roads; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7: All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Amendment XVI (16th Amendment): The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3, 14 and 18

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 2739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 2740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 2743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 2744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution, as well as Clause 3, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 2745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitution authority of this legislation lies in the power of congress to regulate commercial activity as described in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitution authority of this legislation lies in the power of congress to regulate commercial activity as described in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. INSLEE:

H.R. 2750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power ''to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.''

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KISSELL:

H.R. 2755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LATTA:
H.R. 2756.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Taxation: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. LEE
H.R. 2757.
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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. MALONEY:
H.R. 2758.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, which reads: The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. MALONEY:
H.R. 2759.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment 13—Slavery Abolished.

By Mrs. MALONEY:
H.R. 2760.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 5

By Mr. MANZULLO:
H.R. 2761.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate commerce)

By Mr. MANZULLO:
H.R. 2762.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate commerce).

By Mr. McDERMOTT:
H.R. 2763.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution that grants Congress the authority, ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. MEEHAN:
H.R. 2764.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:
H.R. 2765.
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. GARY G. MILLER of California:
H.R. 2766.
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. OLVER:
H.R. 2767.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution, which empowers Congress ''To establish Post Offices and post Roads''.

By Mr. PAUL:
H.R. 2768.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution:

By Mr. PAUL:
H.R. 2769.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Parental Consent Act is justified by Article 1, Section 9, which forbids the executive branch from spending money unless it has been appropriated by Congress and Article I, Section I which vest all legislative power in the Congress. These two sections clearly give Congress power to forbid federal funds from being used to support mental health screening programs conducted in public schools without parental consent.

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 2770.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. RIVERA:
H.R. 2771.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 (immigration clause) and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (travel regulation)

By Mr. RUNYAN:
H.R. 2772.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Commerce Clause, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 2773.
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, and 16), 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; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:
H.R. 2774.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. SHERMAN:
H.R. 2775.
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. SIMPSON:
H.R. 2776.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution (''The Congress shall have the Power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . .'').

By Mr. SIRES:
H.R. 2777.
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. SMITH of Washington:
H.R. 2778.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clauses 3 and 5 relating to Congress' authority to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among several States, and with the Indian tribes and to coin Money, and regulate the Value thereof

By Mr. STIVERS:
H.R. 2779.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIBERI:
H.R. 2780.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that ''All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.''

By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 2781.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1,
All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 2782.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1,
All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 2783.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1,
All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 2784.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TOWNS:
H.R. 2785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, known as the ''General Welfare Clause.'' This provision grants Congress the broad power ''to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 2786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WOODALL:

H.R. 2788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I, Section. 4.

''The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.''

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 2789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8—Powers of Congress

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 49: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 58: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 104: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 181: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 187: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 190: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 198: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 284: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WU, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 287: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 303: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 361: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 371: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 402: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 420: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 436: Mr. REED, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 452: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 458: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 459: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 469: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 488: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 507: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 512: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 531: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 589: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 615: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 642: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 645: Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 687: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 704: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 719: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 724: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 733: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 740: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 820: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 835: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 874: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 883: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 885: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 938: Mr. YODER and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 959: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 997: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1041: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1057: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1086: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1093: Mr. RIGELL and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 1113: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1154: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1161: Mr. LUJÁN and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1164: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1173: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1179: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1204: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1269: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1327: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 1338: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 1340: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1342: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 1370: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1386: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1394: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1418: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1426: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1464: Mr. FILNER and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1474: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1515: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1533: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1546: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1558: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 1568: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1574: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1591: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1612: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1620: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1623: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1625: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 1636: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1639: Mr. COBLE and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1655: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1687: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1697: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1703: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 1704: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1714: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1715: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1723: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1742: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1747: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 1754: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1755: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1781: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1802: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 1815: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1848: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1852: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1905: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LONG, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1936: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1947: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1953: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 1955: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1987: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1995: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1996: Mr. QUAYLE.
H.R. 1997: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 2005: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2016: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2086: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2091: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2104: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2105: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H.R. 2107: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2140: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2180: Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2198: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2215: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 2224: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2229: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2233: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2250: Mr. FORBES and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2257: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 2267: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2269: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 2272: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2295: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 2299: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2304: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 2305: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2315: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2324: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2337: Mr. RIVERA.
H.R. 2346: Mr. FARR and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2353: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2355: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2377: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2412: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2426: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2433: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2444: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2447: Mr. KISSELL and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2457: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 2471: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2492: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2497: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 2499: Mr. LANCE and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2510: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2513: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2514: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2529: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2541: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 2543: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2575: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2576: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2597: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2599: Mr. WEST and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2617: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2643: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2644: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2653: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2669: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2671: Mr. DREIER, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2674: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 2677: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2679: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2681: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2698: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2701: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. CRAVAACK.
H.J. Res. 73: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H. Res. 25: Mr. BURGESS.
H. Res. 60: Ms. WATERS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. GOSAR.
H. Res. 95: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H. Res. 134: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 179: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 216: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H. Res. 253: Mr. GARRETT.
H. Res. 271: Mr. HULTGREN.
H. Res. 295: Mr. BURGESS.
H. Res. 296: Mr. HULTGREN.
H. Res. 367: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 379: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 380: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KLINE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in S. 365 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 92: 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 conduct seismic surveying, oil or natural gas preleasing, or oil or gas leasing activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, or South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area identified in the Department of the Interior 2012–2017 5-year oil and gas leasing program.