

Brown (FL)	Holt	Peters
Butterfield	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Inslee	Price (NC)
Capuano	Israel	Quigley
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Reyes
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Richmond
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kind	Rush
Clyburn	Kissell	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	T.
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Crowley	Levin	Schiff
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Loebback	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott, David
DeLauro	Lowey	Serrano
Deutch	Lujan	Sewell
Dicks	Lynch	Sherman
Dingell	Markey	Sires
Doggett	Matheson	Slaughter
Doyle	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Ellison	McCollum	Sutton
Engel	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Farr	McIntyre	Tierney
Filner	McNerney	Tonko
Frank (MA)	Meeks	Towns
Fudge	Miller (NC)	Tsongas
Garamendi	Miller, George	Van Hollen
Giffords	Moore	Velázquez
Gonzalez	Moran	Visclosky
Green, Gene	Nadler	Walz (MN)
Grijalva	Napolitano	Wasserman
Gutierrez	Neal	Schultz
Hanabusa	Oliver	Waters
Harman	Owens	Waxman
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Weiner
Heinrich	Pascrell	Welch
Higgins	Pastor (AZ)	Wilson (FL)
Hinchey	Payne	Woolsey
Hinojosa	Pelosi	Wu
Hirono	Perlmutter	Yarmuth

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

DeFazio Fitzpatrick Sessions

## NOT VOTING—15

Austria	Honda	Paul
Barton (TX)	Issa	Pearce
Boswell	Jones	Scalise
Cicilline	Mack	Smith (NE)
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Speier

□ 1132

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AUSTRIA. Madam Speaker, had I been present for votes, I would have voted for the previous question and for adoption of the rule to repeal the Democrats' job-killing health care law, and for H. Res. 27.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, on Friday, January 7th, I was unavoidably detained on account of official business in California and was not present for three rollcall votes on that day.

Had I been present I would have voted: "Nay" on rollcall No. 9 on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 26; "nay" on rollcall No. 10 on passage of H. Res. 26, rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2, Patients Rights Repeal Act, H. Res. 9, Instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the Affordable Care Act, and H. Res. 27, Ses-

sion/Fitzpatrick Clean up Resolution; and "nay" on rollcall No. 11 on passage of H. Res. 27, Session/Fitzpatrick Clean up Resolution.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret my absence in the House today as I was in my district attending to personal business. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes 9, 10, and 11.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, January 7, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 112th Congress or until modified by me. With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk of the House.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia on his election as majority leader of his party. He and I have had the opportunity to work together over the recent years. It's been a positive relationship, and I look forward to continuing that positive relationship, albeit in my diminished status.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for those kind remarks. I want to also reiterate my pleasure of being able to develop a positive working relationship with him, understanding full well there will be disagreements, but there is probably a lot more that we can agree on, and I look forward to exploring those avenues. I want to congratulate him on his election to the position of Democratic whip, and I look forward to working in this relationship. I know that these roles have been reversed now in these colloquies, so I look forward to that as well.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legisla-

tive business. On Thursday and Friday, the House will not be in session to accommodate the Republican retreat.

On Tuesday, we will consider at least one bill under suspension of the rules, which will be announced later today. We will also begin consideration of H.R. 2, the Repealing the Job-Killing Health Care Law Act. I expect the House to complete debate on H.R. 2 Wednesday afternoon.

Also, on Wednesday, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H. Res. 9, instructing certain committees to report legislation replacing the job-killing health care law.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for outlining the schedule. There was an interesting article in The Washington Post today about your job-killing comments always being attached to the health care bill. There are obviously some of us who know full well that was not part of the title, as I'm sure the gentleman would admit, and that in fact it does not do that at all. In fact, we think it creates jobs. But, in any event, I thank the gentleman for announcing the schedule.

I want to say we're disappointed, however, as he was when he was in my position, that we don't have a committee process for this very important piece of legislation. I think it's important from your perspective and it's important from our perspective, although we may have different perspectives on whether it should pass or fail. But it is an important piece of legislation. There was no committee process and no hearings; no opportunity for the public to be heard on the bill; no opportunity for the Members to testify with respect to that bill; no witnesses were heard. Furthermore, under the rule, of course we have been given no opportunity to amend.

The gentleman, when he was in my position, repeatedly indicated how disappointed he was that there were no amendments allowed on certain bills. I want to reiterate that concern. And given the lack of amendments, I want to clarify when he believes will be the finishing of votes on Wednesday. I understand debate will begin on Tuesday and it will conclude on Wednesday.

Mr. CANTOR. I would ask the gentleman to repeat the question.

Mr. HOYER. What time do you expect to conclude business on Wednesday?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, Madam Speaker, that it is our intention to conclude by 7 p.m. on Wednesday.

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

In light of the fact that your side has made a pledge to allow ample time for Members to read and consider it, and notwithstanding that they have already not pursued that as vigorously as I think you would have hoped and perhaps we would have hoped as well in the 112th Congress, I was wondering if the gentleman can enlighten us on what he expects to consider the rest of January, after next week, so that

Members might have opportunities to anticipate issues that you're going to be bringing forward.

Mr. CANTOR. As to the inquiry about openness and the ability for Members to have time to read the bills as well as for the public to realize its right to know, we on our side believe in making sure there is that adequate time, and we posted on Monday legislation coming to the floor for this week and next. So I would say to the gentleman from Maryland, Madam Speaker, that it is our intention to uphold our commitment to the 3-day rule to allow for the public's right to know, as well as Members themselves to understand, what it is we're voting for.

As to the gentleman's comments regarding the up-or-down vote on ObamaCare repeal, if the gentleman has looked at the postings online, he will know that the repeal resolution is a page and a half. This is a repeal of a bill that was the subject of significant legislative time and other over the course of the last 2 years. It is clear that the public has litigated and, in essence, has decided its position on that bill, given the results of November's election.

□ 1140

It comes down to whether you are for ObamaCare or you are against it. That is what the vote is.

Again, a page and a half is what the bill is, so we have committed to continuing in the vein of an open process when it comes to trying to get it right as far as replacing the health care status quo. We have committed and the Speaker has committed to making sure that our committees will go through regular order. Members of the minority and majority will have ample time to engage and participate in the discussions around what type of health care Americans deserve and what type of health care they want, which is how we will proceed when it comes to the so-called "replacement" resolution and its implementation.

I would also point out to the gentleman from Maryland that the Rules Committee has accepted the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Utah as far as a suggestion that he had regarding the SGR formula and the reimbursements for physicians under the Medicare program.

Again, we are trying to work in a fashion that is as open and as inclusive as we can. As the Speaker said in his remarks—and he was correct—we had no open rules under the last Congress. We intend for that not to be the case here. I know that the gentleman joins me in the desire for us to be able to work together, and we believe that that will provide the best way forward for that.

As to the gentleman's question about the remainder of January, Madam Speaker, we intend to focus on the theme of this Congress, which is "cut and grow." We are going to be talking about ways to cut spending. We are

going to live up to our commitment to bring a spending cut bill to the floor each and every week, Madam Speaker.

We also intend to focus on what it is that is impeding job growth in the economy, and we will be asking our committees to begin focusing on regulations that are being promulgated and pursued throughout the administration and its agencies that are precluding job growth. It is our hope, though, Madam Speaker, that these committees—our committees—will be fully organized by the end of the month so we can begin a process of regular order.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Obviously, the health care bill that he and his party seek to repeal had probably more consideration, more open debate, more transparency, more amendments, and more hearings than almost any bill that I have considered as a Member of this Congress over the last three decades—full and open consideration, amendments offered from both sides in committee on a very ample basis; but I am glad to hear that you agree that there has been ample debate time for that. There has not been any debate time in committees—or amendments—on the repeal of that law.

I am certainly hopeful that the gentleman does not mean to say that if the majority party concludes that the American people have already decided on the issue that that will be the exception to the rule that you have put forth in terms of full and ample notice, debate, the amendment process, and transparency. I would certainly hope that that would not be the case. I don't expect it will be the case, and I hope it won't be.

Let me say in addition that I am very pleased that the majority party allowed in order the amendment by Mr. MATHESON. As you know, we tried to have a permanent fix to the reimbursement of doctors who took Medicare patients. Unfortunately, the minority party in the Senate, which had the opportunity to do that, precluded us from accomplishing that objective. So I am pleased. That needs to be done. We need to have a stable funding expectation by doctors when they provide services to Medicare patients—to seniors—as we want them to do and as we want them to continue to do. So I am pleased that you allowed that amendment, and I would hope Members on your side will be supporting that amendment as we will on this side.

Let me ask you now, Mr. Majority Leader, as I am very concerned, and I expressed this on the floor. Your rules, in my view, provide for some \$5 trillion to be incurred in additional deficits. They allow that because you have exempted almost all of the possible reductions in revenues—tax cuts, reductions in revenues—notwithstanding no reduction in spending. Well, if you reduce revenues and you don't reduce spending commensurately, inevitably, you will create large deficits, which in-

evitably will be paid by future generations.

That has been the experience that, again, I have had when we had significant tax cuts in the 1980s and in the last decade of 2000–2001 to 2003—when we created very large deficits.

My presumption is that you will be finding commensurate reductions in spending to your tax cuts that you will want to continue. If you don't do that, deficits will inevitably follow. The majority party has not done that in years past. Is it your expectation that that will occur in the future?

The question I want to ask you as well is that you have provided in your rules for essentially ignoring CBO scores—the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which has issued a preliminary score for the Republican Patients' Bill of Rights. They believe it will increase the deficit by \$230 billion in the first 10 years by repeal and \$1.2 trillion in the second 10 years.

My question is: Having deemed in the rule today a provision allowing the chair of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, to ignore the CBO score, will the majority continue to ignore CBO scores on legislation for the rest of Congress or will we be fiscally responsible, in my view, and adhere to the advice and counsel we receive from CBO?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the Democratic whip.

Madam Speaker, I respond to his first question by saying that Washington doesn't have a revenue problem; it has a spending problem. We believe that it is better to allow folks to keep more of their hard-earned money so we can see a return to growth in our economy, and we are dedicated to making sure we deal with the spending problem here in Washington.

As I said before to the gentleman, we are intending and will bring to the floor each and every week a bill to cut spending. We are very focused, as you know, on bringing spending down to 2008 levels to make sure that we are abiding by our commitment to live according to the same rules that everyone else does. While businesses and families are living within their means and tightening their belts, there is no reason in the world that Washington can't as well. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me on that.

As for the issue surrounding the CBO, the issue that we have and the dispute we have is not with the Congressional Budget Office. The CBO score is what is put in front of them, and the reality is the ObamaCare bill, Madam Speaker, relied on smoke and mirrors and budgetary shell games in order to present the picture that it presents or alleges to represent.

Madam Speaker, there is nothing that has changed about the flawed assumptions underlying the old score of the ObamaCare bill. Only the dates have changed. These are the same gimmicks, producing more false deficit reduction and, in fact, real spending increases. In fact, as the gentleman

knows, Medicare's chief actuary says that the ObamaCare bill represents a maze of mandates, tax hikes, and subsidies that will push costs up. The bottom line, Madam Speaker, is we need to stop arguing about "inside baseball" budget gimmicks.

□ 1150

There's no question that a new, open-ended entitlement program will grow unsustainably fast, will drive costs up, and could potentially bankrupt this Federal Government, as well as our States.

Mr. HOYER. I want to say to my friend, the continuing rhetoric is Washington doesn't have a revenue problem, it has a spending problem. Americans in every family that I know understand that their revenues directly impact on their spending and vice versa, and if they don't, they have a real problem. If they don't have enough revenue to meet their expenditures, they've got a problem, and if their spending exceeds their revenue, they have a problem.

I tell my friend, I understand what you're saying, and I've heard this rhetoric all of my career here in the Congress. When President Reagan was President, we never overrode a Presidential veto of an appropriation bill because it spent too much. If he vetoed it, it spent too much, he never had a veto overridden. Nevertheless, we incurred an additional \$1.5 trillion in deficits. Under President George H.W. Bush, we didn't override any veto of his, and we incurred an additional \$1 trillion. That was \$2.5 trillion plus.

Under the Clinton administration, of course, in the economic program as you and I both know that your party universally opposed, we had a surplus, the only President in your lifetime and I think in mine, which is substantially longer, that's had 4 years of surplus. Now, I know you say, the response that Mr. DREIER gave to me, is that, well, yes, we took over the Congress in 1995. That's correct. And of course not only did you take over the Congress in 1995, but in 2000, you took over the Presidency as well and controlled the House and the Senate and the Presidency.

And during that period of time, we didn't pass any appropriation bills on our side. You were in full charge during the Bush administration's first six years, and \$3.5 trillion of deficit spending was incurred, making a total of over \$5 trillion of deficit spending during the time that your party took the position that we didn't have a revenue problem, we had a spending problem.

Well, it ended up being a \$5 trillion deficit problem, adding to the deficit for our children and for my grandchildren and for my great-granddaughter, and I'm concerned about that. And that is why I'm so concerned about statutory PAYGO, sticking with CBO scores, and accommodating our spending and revenue. They are both related, obviously, and to ignore that eliminating revenue without eliminating spending does cause deficits I think is to ignore reality.

So I would hope my friend would talk to Mr. RYAN of the Budget Committee and bring us legislation which would, in fact, do what you and I want to do; that is, eliminate the deficit. If we've got two messages during this past election, in my view, it was, A, focus on creating jobs. We've got to get to work. Americans are hurting. We had some good job numbers this month. We've created over 1.3 million jobs this past year as opposed to losing almost 4 million jobs in the last year of the Bush administration. That's progress. But as I've said so often, it's not success. Success will be when every American who wants a job, willing to work, can find a job, and they can support him or her and their families.

But we need to not pretend that revenues and spending are not inextricably related, and that if we give up revenues before we do the difficult thing, the tough thing, the adult thing, as Mr. BOEHNER said, and cut the spending, then cut the revenues if Americans are buying it, then we ought to be paying for it and not passing along the bill to our grandchildren, and I would hope the gentleman would pursue that.

If the gentleman wants to respond to that, I want to say something about health care briefly.

Mr. CANTOR. You know, Madam Speaker, the gentleman and I have gone through these discussions for the last 2 years, and when we get into discussing the past, I normally posit a quote from Winston Churchill when he said, If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find we have lost the future.

And what my response is, Madam Speaker, we are looking to see that we do take the tough steps and cut spending. So I'm hopeful with all the renewed enthusiasm that all of us have gained after the election towards fiscal sanity that the gentleman and his caucus can join us and vote with us in terms of the spending cuts that we'll be bringing to the floor every week.

The gentleman speaks about revenues, and absolutely, as an ongoing concern, this government has to be concerned with that. But we first and foremost must understand—and I think both of us realize, Madam Speaker, that in order to have revenues, we've got to have a growing economy—and so there is balance, and that is where perhaps our two visions diverge, but it is my hope that we can work together by putting priorities in place, cutting spending, growing the economy. And that's the formula by which we will be operating, and I'm hopeful we can operate in that formula together.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's comment, and briefly in closing, Madam Speaker, let me say this. I hope we can cooperate, but we do have a divergence, as my friend pointed out, and that's of course the nature of what the House of Representatives does, debates different points of view. Frankly, my experience, as I have said, is that when we diverged in a point of view in 1993,

when my Republican friends took the position that accommodating revenues to spending would, in fact, from their perspective, be a job killer—they talk a lot about job-killing legislation. They all voted against that legislation in 1993, and in fact, some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle lost their election because of voting for that piece of legislation. In fact, however, it helped create the most robust economy anybody in this Chamber has experienced in their lifetime. It created over 22 million jobs, as opposed to losing 8 million jobs in the last administration under President Bush, so that there was a substantial difference which you can see, touch, and feel and read about and know about.

So I tell my friend, yes, there's a difference of opinion, but there's no difference of opinion on what happened, and when Winston Churchill, who you quoted before and of whom I'm a great fan, one of the things that Winston Churchill was most known for was trying to remind his British friends: don't forget what dictators and despots do—and I make no aspersions, I want to make that clear. I'm simply saying he believed strongly in learning from the past and not continuing to make mistakes and not continue to do what failed in years before.

So I agree with the gentleman in looking at the past for instruction on how to make the future better and to create those jobs that both he and I want to create and that America certainly is looking for us to create.

I thank the gentleman for this colloquy.

#### —

#### HOURLY OF MEETING

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1200

#### COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. RIVERA. Madam Speaker, I rise today for the first time to address the House and express my strong support for passage of a free trade agreement with Colombia. Colombia is America's fourth-largest trading partner in Latin America, and the U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that 9,000 American companies trade with Colombia, most of which are small businesses and many of which operate in my district in south Florida.

While 90 percent of Colombian goods enter the U.S. duty free, American