

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

□ 1553

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted as follows: On rollcall No. 671, “no;” rollcall No. 672, “no;” rollcall No. 673, “yes;” rollcall No. 674 “yes.”

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 451

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 451.

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

There was no objection.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 383 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 383

Resolved, That during further consideration of the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 375, the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted.

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

□ 1600

Mr. DREIER. Madam 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 distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, as I began yesterday, when we launched the

debate, it was exactly 3 p.m. It’s 4:01 on Friday, July 29. And as we stand, as I do, or sit here, as any many of our colleagues do, we’re exactly 4 days away from that August 2 date at which time the Department of Treasury has calculated that the Federal Government will run out of money. At that point, we, as a country, will face impossible choices about what obligations to default on first.

As I said, with this August 2 date rapidly approaching, we know that we are faced with the potential of running out of money. We also know that under that kind of scenario, there are no winners, and there are no losers. We have a profound responsibility to resolve the crisis at hand and avert the economic catastrophe that will come if we do not join together and find a way to raise the debt ceiling.

But this looming crisis is not the fundamental problem. We’re facing this crisis because of a much larger, much longer-term problem. The Federal Government spends more than it has. If you think about it, Madam Speaker, we don’t have a debt ceiling problem; what we have is a debt problem. The former cannot be resolved without addressing the latter. You can’t address the debt ceiling issue unless you address the debt issue that is before us. That’s precisely what today’s process and the amendment that we are putting to the measure that we debated all day yesterday is all about. And the rule before us is moving us toward addressing the root cause of the problem.

We’re adding another layer of accountability, something that Democrats and Republicans alike regularly talk about. Accountability is being added to the plan that Speaker BOEHNER is moving forward. With the amendment that we’re going to consider that this rule will make in order, the House will proceed with the critical business at hand. We will pass a bold and credible plan to rein in our debt and responsibly avert the crisis that looms just a few days from now.

It’s extremely unfortunate that this process has become so lengthy and partisan. I think everyone feels very saddened at the fact that it’s become such a lengthy and very, very partisan process. But Madam Speaker, time is running out. Today we have the opportunity to do our work, and with passage of this measure, we will be moving the process forward to help avert the crisis that we potentially face on August 2.

When we pass this out, we will send a measure to the Senate, and as we all know, this is the only proposal that, when we pass it today, that will have passed either House of Congress. We need to have the support to do that. I hope very much that while many of my colleagues who are on the other side of the aisle may not be supportive of all the provisions in the Boehner plan, I hope very much to move the process forward so that we can ensure that our constituents get their Social Security

NAYS—1

Schrader

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Johnson (IL)

NOT VOTING—12

Baca	Giffords	Murphy (CT)
Bachmann	Grijalva	Rokita
Bishop (NY)	Hinchey	Speier
Burgess	Hirono	Waters

checks on August 3, since we all know the President, in his July 12 speech, said that if we don't increase the debt ceiling by August 2, he couldn't guarantee that Social Security checks would go out.

So to keep the process moving, to ensure that we get those checks out and address the other very, very important priorities that we need to have funding for, we can pass this in a bipartisan way so that we can get to the Senate, work out our differences as expeditiously as possible, and come back with what clearly has to be a bipartisan compromise to ensure that we are able to decrease spending, getting to the root cause of the problem, and at the same time, do what we all know has to be done and that is increase the debt ceiling.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California, the chair of the Rules Committee, 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. Madam Speaker, today we face a self-inflicted crisis, and the majority's proposed solution is no solution at all. The debt ceiling was created, ironically, to avoid forcing Congress to approve every new issue of debt. The debt ceiling was originally introduced to pay for World War I and was designed to be a formality that would help our country and economy operate smoothly and without interruption. All these years later, it having done that, the debt ceiling now appears to have outlived its usefulness. In fact, I believe we should abolish the debt limit altogether and never face a crisis like this again of whether we will be a responsible country that pays our bills. Only one other country has the debt limit, and that is Denmark. I think we really need to look at this as an anachronism from 1917.

Regardless, throughout the life of the debt ceiling, raising the ceiling has never been questioned. Since 1960, the ceiling has been raised 78 times. Throughout this time, there's been no quid pro quo demanded to raise the debt ceiling, no ransom demanded in exchange for raising our debt ceiling and preventing default. That is, until today. Bringing our Nation to the brink of collapse has been a conscious decision of the majority party. Placing ideology before country, they are demanding controversial and unacceptable cuts or else they are willing to let our Nation default.

We have been warned by the United States Senate and the President of the United States that the proposed legislation will not be passed into law. They have said it repeatedly. They have said it clearly. Yet the majority continues to believe this bill can actually avert the danger of default. They're playing

a dangerous game of chicken, asking the Nation to give into their demands if we want the American economy to live to see another day. I simply cannot agree to the extreme demands being put forth by the majority today.

□ 1610

After pulling yesterday's legislation from the floor, the majority has introduced a piece of legislation that demands the impossible. Today's bill doesn't just require a vote on a constitutional amendment; it demands that a constitutional amendment be approved by both Chambers of Congress this fall. If the amendment doesn't pass, then we not only face the prospect of default again 6 months from now, but we have even fewer options to avoid default.

If previous proposals are any guide, the constitutional amendment would place the burden of debt reduction squarely upon the middle class, threatening Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and Members of Congress would be given a Sophie's choice: Do we vote against this amendment and protect Medicare or do we vote for the amendment to avoid economic default? This is totally unnecessary.

In effect, this legislation releases one hostage and takes another. Six months from now, we would be forced to choose between a constitutional amendment and putting the Nation back on the brink of default. I refuse to trade hostages with the majority and prolong this crisis for another 6 months.

I urge my colleagues to put the country before any ideology and come together to solve an urgent and serious crisis that we are facing today. It's our duty to put the welfare of the country before all else. That is why we were elected by the people who expect us to do just that, and that is what we swear to do. It is time we answered the call.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on today's bill and urgently, urgently, get back to serving the American people. And we spent far too much time on the useless bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would say to my good friend that I would like to totally associate myself with her remarks at the end in which she said it is absolutely essential for us to work together in a bipartisan way to resolve this issue. But I know this will come as a surprise. When she began her remarks and said that we on our side are working overtime making a conscious decision to bring our Nation to the verge of collapse, that is a slight mischaracterization of exactly where we are.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Spring Hill, a hardworking and not-too-well-rested member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, for allowing me to speak.

I will be perfectly honest with you. There is a lot about this rule that I don't love but, quite frankly, we don't have much time left. We need to get something done and we need to get something done now. This rule provides us with the tools and the mechanisms that we need to get our jobs done and bring our economy and our country back from the brink of default.

Default is not an option. The underlying legislation, the Budget Control Act of 2011, saves us from default. Most of all, I support the Budget Control Act of 2011 because it means both Chambers of Congress must pass a balanced budget amendment before the President can raise the debt ceiling once again.

Do I like everything in the bill? No, I don't.

Does it do what the American people and the American economy need and deserve? Yes, it does. And that's why I support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the ranking member on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. The gentleman from California has been talking about moving the process forward. It does not move the process forward to pass a bill that's dead before arrival in the Senate. It doesn't move the process forward to pass a bill that is even more partisan than the one yesterday.

You know, the country has to be wondering, we are 1 day closer to default and, indeed, one step backwards. The Republicans are trying to squeeze out a majority here, and what they are doing is inserting a provision that requires a two-thirds vote in the Senate and the House, and that's completely a nonstarter.

The American public is looking for a solution, not a stalemate, and the House Republicans have become the party of gridlock. Passing this only increases it. It's a move backwards, maybe to protect your flank, but not to protect America.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say to my good friend that there's a bit of a disconnect from my perspective. So failure to act is not gridlock; passing legislation out of the House of Representatives is, in fact, gridlock.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Cincinnati, Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Our national debt stands at a staggering \$14.3 trillion and we currently borrow more than 40 cents on every dollar we spend, and our President and Democrats in the other body say that a balanced budget amendment is "dead on arrival."

Fifteen years ago, the balanced budget amendment passed the House with a bipartisan vote only to lose by one vote, one vote in the Senate. A constitutional amendment is the only way

to ensure that future Congresses live within their means and end the spending binge.

Our colleague, Congressman MCCLINTOCK, might have summed it up best in a Washington Times op-ed earlier this week. He said: Imagine a family that earns \$50,000 a year but is spending more than \$88,000 a year and has a credit card balance of \$330,000 a year.

That's us. We're bankrupt, and Washington is broken.

Why are Senate Democrats and the President so afraid of making a commitment to balance our budget?

Stop the spending. No more empty promises. No more excuses.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. You know, yesterday when the Speaker failed to secure the votes for his misbegotten deal, I thought all these Republicans would need to get under way today was a professional physical therapist to help heal the twisted arms, the sprains, perhaps even a dislocation as all that pressure was applied by the Speaker to get those final votes; you know, a therapist to kind of fit the slings and apply the splints.

But, no, the professional obstructionists among the Republicans have yielded for far less than a deep muscle massage. All they need is a meaningless vote on an amendment that is designed to fail, that they know will never rewrite the United States Constitution the way they would like to rewrite it to enshrine a little Republican dogma into the supreme law of the land.

I will admit that, through the years, the balanced budget amendment has gained more interest on my part. It became much more appealing as I saw years of Republicans entering wars without paying for them, insisting upon the mythology—no, indeed, it's really a political theology of Republicans—that you can cut taxes, raise spending, and everything will work out okay.

Their approach, even though their experts told them these tax cuts would drive us into deficit, they insisted on the political alchemy that they could take tax cuts and turn them into surpluses, just as if they could turn hay into gold. If there were one vote I could take to do something about the George W. Bush administration dripping in red ink, I would certainly want to take it, but a constitutional amendment is not a solution. It's an excuse for not having a solution, for not grappling with the financial problems we have. And the only reason it's being brought up this weekend is just to delay this crisis nearer and nearer to the precipice to which this Republican irresponsibility has taken us.

The credit worthiness and the full faith and the credit of the United States is endangered by the refusal to adopt a balanced approach that would close some tax loopholes and reduce

spending all at once. That's what we need. Instead of putting all the burden on the many, demand a little from the few at the top.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to one of our very capable and thoughtful new Members of the 112th Congress, the gentleman from Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

□ 1620

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak.

As we've been talking so much, I hear so much about a balanced approach. What we really need is a balanced budget.

The concern right now, as I talk to the many phone callers who are calling in, is that America has taken the time to tighten their belts at home; and when you talk to business people, they've made the tough decisions, and they're looking to us now to make the tough decisions as well.

And that's what I think this legislation has done, legislation which we can look at right now and we can put away the arguments from each side, the Republican side and the Democratic side. This is about America right now. The people who are calling in, who are watching, they are watching right now and greatly concerned because of the fact that they feel their economic security is at risk because we can't deal with the long-term implications of this budget and this debt.

There is a plan, and the Republicans in this House have put together a plan. And I'm not going to get into the partisan rhetoric. Let us go around this plan. If we've got differences, let us resolve those differences effectively for the American people. Let us get to work in this House, get it to the Senate, pass it today so we can get the good work done that will allow America to get back to work with a sense of confidence in the future of our economy, get people back to work creating jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to compliment him on his very thoughtful remarks, Madam Speaker, and say that as I listen to this newly elected Member of the House, it is very difficult to imagine that he would consciously engage in an effort to bring our Nation to the verge of collapse, because we want to solve this problem and ensure that we can have a strong and vibrant United States of America, creating jobs and getting our economy growing.

I thank my friend for his thoughtful comments.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a constitutional scholar.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, this rule provides for debate

of legislation that was slapped together behind closed doors, providing for trillions of dollars in unspecified cuts. The final version was sprung on the House after being made public just this morning, and now we're expected to vote the whole thing up or down, without amendment, in spite of the fact that 53 Senators are already on record saying that they will oppose it.

This legislation is in response to a manufactured so-called "crisis." We can avoid default on our obligations the same way we have done it almost once a year over the last half century, just increase the debt ceiling. And now this final version calls for default on our obligations unless we pass a constitutional amendment mislabeled a "balanced budget amendment."

The so-called "balanced budget amendment" reported from the Judiciary Committee does not require a balanced budget. In fact, it will make it more difficult to balance the budget, and it will certainly jeopardize Social Security and Medicare. It will also include a provision that requires a three-fifths vote to increase the debt ceiling, as if this week's drama isn't enough of a spectacle.

Madam Speaker, we should end this manufactured crisis, increase the debt ceiling to avoid default, and then seriously focus on legislation that will create jobs and restore fiscal responsibility.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I 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. Madam Speaker, the inevitable consequence of this bill is that when the United States wants to extend the debt ceiling to pay our bills, we will have to reduce Medicare and Social Security. That is the inevitable consequence of these balanced budget amendments. Therefore, inevitably, this bill will not see the light of day in the United States Senate.

What we ought to do is get to our inevitable obligation, which is to come to an agreement that extends our debt ceiling and makes a responsible down payment on our deficit. The President of the United States this morning outlined a way to do that, and that's what we ought to be working on. He talked about commonality between the two Houses and the two parties on cuts in annual programs in the area of 5, 6, 7 percent—painful, but necessary.

He talked about a fair process where a body that would act between the House and the Senate would consider all the options with respect to entitlement programs. Protecting Medicare and Social Security benefits, and looking at a contribution from the wealthiest Americans, the former revenue, would be considered and voted on. And certainly that approach would get us

out of this period of uncertainty by extending the debt ceiling for the country as was done 17 times without condition for President Reagan, seven times without condition for President George W. Bush.

This is an inevitable waste of time, this bill. It's a bad idea. Let's get on to the better idea of approaching this problem and fixing the problem for this country. Vote "no" on this underlying bill and this rule.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to yet another constitutional scholar, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WATT. Madam Speaker, I think this may be the absolute worst resolution I have seen before this House in the 19 years I've been here. It brings to continuing debate a bill that has already been debated yesterday with an amendment, but there is only 1 minute left in the debate.

And the change that is being made requires the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in order to ever raise the debt limit again. The effect of that is that we have 1 minute—we don't even have it, the majority has the 1 minute that's left in the debate. We have no time left in the debate on our side to debate whether we will pass an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that literally holds a gun to the head of the economy of the United States of America. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves legislating in this way. This is a terrible way to legislate to provide for a constitutional amendment. If we're going to do it, we ought to at least debate it in good faith.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, this is a Republican-contrived bankruptcy.

A decade ago, the majority party inherited surpluses as far as the eye could see, and then they promptly took away the revenue that enabled us to balance our budget. They crippled this country with deep tax cuts. In fact, we have the lowest revenue that we've had at any time since before Medicare and basically at any time since before the Great Depression.

What this is going to do and the reason we oppose this is that if this were on the books, we never would have had the ability to rescue the world from the Great Depression in the 1930s; we never would have had the ability to win the war for democracy in the 1940s; we never would have created a permanent American middle class with the GI Bill that provided the working class with homes and higher education, we never would have won the race to space for the free world in the sixties; we never would have been able to establish

Medicare and civil rights legislation in the mid-sixties.

And certainly, had we been stuck in this fiscal straightjacket, President Clinton never could have raised the needed revenue to balance the budget so we never would have been able to create 20 million new jobs as we did in the 1990s, and reduce poverty, and expand the middle class, and create all those trillions of dollars of projected surpluses that the majority inherited and promptly squandered.

This bill will make us a weaker, poorer and smaller country, and that's why it should be defeated.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very privileged to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Glendale, Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Obama and the Democrats have constantly and consistently said we need to take a balanced approach to the debt crisis facing America, but they steadfastly refuse to even consider the one truly balanced approach to this program, that being a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution.

This effort today will be the second time that the House of Representatives will have passed legislation requiring a balanced budget amendment, which would actually create a permanent solution to this crisis and make sure that economic freedom can be available for Americans today and for future generations.

□ 1630

Yet Mr. REID says he will kill this bill as soon as it comes to the Senate, or at least strip out the balanced budget amendment that's in it.

Madam Speaker, if we can get Mr. REID here and the President himself, and I guess we would have to put out an APB on the President because we can't find him. He is AWOL in this debate. But if we could, I would ask him two questions: First, what is your plan to deal with this issue? Secondly, what on earth is so radical about having a balanced budget amendment to create a permanent solution to this problem?

Now, I doubt we would get an answer, Madam Speaker. So today, we will have to do as we have done before, and we will try to proceed without them and try to do something truly historic that will save this Nation and its people from economic ruin.

Madam Speaker, long ago, right after the Constitution was finished, Thomas Jefferson said: "I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to the Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government to the genuine principles of its Constitution; I mean, an additional article, taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing."

Madam Speaker, Thomas Jefferson was right. And how I wish his contem-

poraries had listened to him about the balanced budget amendment, but they didn't. Now we have a crisis of \$14 trillion facing us as a result of not having this amendment, and it could crush us in a way that no military power has ever done. And in this moment in history in America, we may get a second chance. I hope my colleagues will join us in this historic effort.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking Democrat on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, we have a sad spectacle today of a substantive mess brought to us by a procedural bigger mess. But I can't entirely blame Speaker BOEHNER. We have seen him all week forced to retreat continually from an effort to be conservative but somewhat responsible to a position where today we have a bill that no one thinks will solve the problem because it makes as a prerequisite to raising the debt a constitutional amendment that no one thinks will pass.

I remember Speaker O'Neill when I got here, and there's one thing he and Speaker BOEHNER seem to have in common, and that's a theme song. Speaker O'Neill's theme song was "I'll Be With You in Apple Blossom Time." By now, Speaker BOEHNER is entitled to take as his theme song "It's My Party and I'll Cry If I Want To" because his party has forced him to retreat, first of all, from the position he tried to take to get this thing done; and, secondly, from a set of promises he made procedurally. As a result of where we are today, with martial law rules and amendments being sprung and amendments not being vetted, there is no procedural promise that the Republicans made that they have left unbroken.

So we have a flawed bill, brought to us by a weakened Speaker, under an unfortunate and undemocratic process. Once it's out of the way, once whatever impulses have driven members of his own party so to undercut him are satisfied, maybe then in an adult way we can sit down and work this out.

Now, I expect to vote for something I don't like because we have to compromise, but this bill doesn't even begin to meet any kind of serious test.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I'm shocked. We spent 4 hours on the floor of the House of Representatives in January reading the Constitution, and now we get to spend a minute debating it. It's pretty amazing how much the folks on the other side value the Constitution of the United States.

I'm opposed to the rule, the bill, everything that's connected with it. We approach this August 2 deadline. The markets have closed down yet one

more time before this weekend begins. And President Obama has been crystal clear. He said that any agreement to increase the debt ceiling has to extend it to 2013. And yet here we are considering something that the President has said is a nonstarter, the Senate has said is a nonstarter, the American people have said is a nonstarter, and here we are again debating something that will never go anywhere.

The Republican majority really should be embarrassed for the American people. They are putting everything in jeopardy and leaving nothing up to the President to decide come August 2 when this debt ceiling deadline approaches. And placing at risk our retirement security, placing at risk our ability to get credit, our ability to get a home mortgage, all of that because of this recklessness.

The bill that Speaker BOEHNER brought to the floor yesterday and this constitutional amendment that was hurriedly drafted today just to please the far right elements of the Tea Party, I can't even believe we are here today trying to satisfy the far right when we're not busy satisfying the needs of the American public and the markets around the world. Why are we voting on this plan and not one that has a fighting chance of avoiding default?

I want to say, Madam Speaker, it's time for America to get busy here, understanding that the Republican majority is ready to jeopardize our entire future and put at risk our entire future for this garbage.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the bill proposed last night by the House Republicans set us up to fail and risk a catastrophic default. Today's gimmick is more of the same. But to win over the crowd calling for default, House Republican leadership would now make the disaster even more likely by including a constitutional amendment likely requiring a three-fifths vote to avoid any future default.

As our Republican colleagues sadly demonstrated yesterday, that threshold will be impossible to meet today and in the future. Their blind adherence to the demands of the default caucus stands in sharp contrast to the desire of most Americans who, according to every poll, are demanding a balanced compromise.

This bill is a blatant, cynical exercise in raw political muscle and nothing more. To the House Republicans bent on turning our Founding Fathers into deadbeat dads, I would respond using Speaker BOEHNER's own words from last year: Hell no, you can't.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the

gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Madam Speaker, there is a little pattern emerging here. First we had our Republican colleagues walk out of the Biden talks. And then twice they walked out of talks with the President. And then they totally rejected a proposal put forward by the Republican leader in the Senate, MITCH MCCONNELL. And last night they said "no" to the proposal put forward by their own Speaker. And that brings us to where we are today.

In order to accommodate the more extreme elements of the Republican Caucus, they had to change the bill once again. Now what they are proposing is that ultimately we turn budget authority over not to the elected Representatives but to a Federal judge who would ultimately decide how we're going to deal with our budget. You talk about passing the buck, you talk about not taking responsibility, now is the time to come together to come up with a reasonable compromise, not to move the parties far apart.

The last point I want to make with regards to the deficit: We want to make sure that we have a plan, a balanced plan, to reduce the deficit. I'm just waiting for my colleagues on the other side to say that they're willing to get one penny from eliminating taxpayer subsidies to the oil companies or closing corporate loopholes for jets—just one penny—for the purpose of deficit reduction. Then we'll know that they're serious about that.

The President has said let's do \$3 in spending cuts and \$1 in revenue. But apparently asking \$1 in revenue by eliminating a subsidy for the oil companies, that's too far. Oh, yes, we owe China. We need to do something about our debt to China, but asking the oil companies to take less taxpayer dollars, Federal taxpayer subsidy dollars, no, we can't do that.

Let's be serious about balancing the budget and getting the deficit under control, but let's do it in a balanced way. This proposal takes us further in the wrong direction and doesn't bring us together to solve a problem for the American people. Now is the time to get serious.

Mr. DREIER. At this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), a very hardworking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, I think it is very revealing in the debate today that the American people can see that the opposition to the proposal before the House is that we are attempting to even suggest that there be a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, not any specific amendment.

□ 1640

We want, as a constitutional conservative majority, to see a vote in the

House and the Senate on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, something I've coauthored since 2001. Yet the majority is strenuously objecting to that. The minority objects to our effort to control the debt and the deficit without raising taxes. They object to strong spending caps in the future, which by the way, exempts anyone over the age of 55 and under Medicare, Medicaid. They're exempt under the Paul Ryan budget; they're exempt on the proposal that Speaker BOEHNER has brought to us today.

The Speaker has attempted to find the largest possible cuts with the strongest possible enforceable budget caps that could pass a Democrat Senate in order to get it on the desk of the President before the August 3 deadline. The Speaker and this new constitutional conservative majority are doing everything in our power to avoid a default while honoring the trust that the Nation put in us in this landslide election which just occurred in November. The Nation spoke decisively in electing this new majority to the House. We were sent here to control spending, to control the size of the government, to get the government out of our lives, out of our pocket, and back within the bounds of the Constitution as designed by the Founders. And we've attempted to do that.

I applaud Speaker BOEHNER for working so diligently to find the largest possible cut that could possibly pass a temporarily liberal-controlled Senate in the very short span of time that we've got here. We would all like to get more. But if you can get 60, 70 percent of where you need to go to get the Nation back on track to a balanced budget and avoid the brick wall that lies ahead of us on August 3, we need to do so to avoid a default.

I applaud the Speaker for bringing this package to the floor and urge all the Members to support it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to a member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady very much.

Last night, the Democrats were here waiting while the Republicans could not get their own conference together. If any of you were watching the national news, it was not because we were not ready to vote and to move forward on a compromise. It was because those who believe they had a landslide victory are still talking about elections instead of talking about the American people.

This is the worst bill that any American could ever imagine in the history of this Nation. I tell you that because this bill will in fact default the American Government in 6 months, and it will not adhere to the Constitution, which says the Declaration is the promise and the Constitution is the fulfillment.

We actually have the authority, Mr. President, under the 14th Amendment

to raise the debt ceiling by way of acknowledging that the public debt should always be recognized. But in this particular legislation, in 6 months if we do not cut by \$1.6 trillion and pass a balanced budget amendment, the Nation will default.

And the balanced budget amendment is not by a majority. It is 60 percent of this Congress will stop the American people from receiving their just due. We will not have Social Security. We will not have Medicaid. We will not have Medicare. In actuality, the mandate will cause us to support the Republican Study budget, which is \$9 trillion in cuts, 70 percent of discretionary funding. That means all of your Medicare, all of your Medicaid, all of your Social Security.

Madam Speaker, I ask the American people to call in and say, stop the madness and compromise. Do what is right. Mr. President, if not, raise the debt ceiling under the Constitution. You have the authority.

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

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

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

We need to change the tone here in Congress. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said it best when he stated in a recently before the House Committee on Financial Services. "We really don't want to just cut, cut, cut." Chairman Bernanke further stated "You need to be a little bit cautious about sharp cuts in the very near term because of the potential impact on the recovery. That doesn't at all preclude—in fact, I believe it's entirely consistent with—a longer-term program that will bring our budget into a sustainable position."

The Boehner plan does just that it will cut, cut, cut without taking into full consideration the serious cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. This bill is essentially a re-hashed version of the same bill that President Obama promised to veto and the Senate vowed to reject. It asks for \$917 billion in cuts from domestic spending for a \$900 billion increase in the debt ceiling, while demanding

nothing in revenue from the nation's wealthiest. This is nothing more than a ransom note, irresponsibly raising the debt ceiling for only a few months so that in just a short period of time, the American public will be hit again for \$1.6 trillion in cuts from Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans benefits. Anyone who believes that this plan will not result in a serious cut to Social Security should consider this . . . Social Security represents 20 percent of all federal spending, making it unrealistic to think such large cuts in mandatory spending will not affect Social Security benefits.

I state here today that the Boehner proposal is ill-conceived and fails to offer a balanced approach to decreasing the deficit. Instead of requiring shared sacrifice, the Boehner plan places the entire burden on the backs of seniors, the middle class and our nation's most vulnerable citizens, while doing nothing to close corporate tax giveaways and increase taxes on those most able to afford them.

The Boehner plan calls for large cuts in discretionary programs of \$1.2 trillion over the next 10 years through strict new spending caps. Most experts predict that the first round of cuts would target discretionary programs, including education, infrastructure, job training and law enforcement. The Boehner plan would then require an additional \$1.8 trillion in savings to be identified by the end of the year as a condition for raising the debt ceiling again at that time. Given the magnitude of these additional required savings, it would result in deep draconian cuts in federal entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. A repeal of health reform's coverage expansions. And a dramatic reduction in safety net programs for vulnerable Americans, such as food stamps and unemployment and disability insurance. This is unacceptable, and each is avoidable if corporations and the wealthy are required to shoulder a fair share of this burden.

The Speaker's plan requires a vote on an ill-advised constitutional balanced budget amendment in both chambers of Congress by the end of this year. The details surrounding exactly which proposed constitutional balanced budget amendment will be voted on are unclear. However, earlier proposals that have appeared in the House of Representatives, including H.J. Res. 1, would have a devastating impact on discretionary spending and on our modest economic recovery.

Passing an amendment to the Constitution is one of the most serious processes the United States Congress can undertake, requiring a two thirds supermajority of support in both the House and Senate and ratification by three fourths (¾) of the States. The Founders purposely made the amendment process a long and arduous one. Do my Republican colleagues really expect Congress to capriciously pass an amendment altering our nation's founding document on such short notice; an amendment that will fundamentally change our country without reasonable time for debate; without the opportunity for a hearing or questioning of witnesses; without any reports as to what impact it may have?

By tying the fate of whether the United States pays its debt obligations to the historically prolonged Constitutional amendment process, the Republicans who support this bill have demonstrated, at this critical juncture in American history, that they are profoundly irresponsible when it comes to the integrity of our

economy and utterly bereft of sensible solutions for fixing it.

The Speaker's plan will result in for \$2.7 trillion in deficit reduction and a \$2.5 trillion increase in the debt limit in two stages, with the two debt ceiling increases being conditioned upon enactment of an initial set of spending, cuts and a later, second deficit reduction measure.

I do not believe that Congress should yield its authority to what amounts to a Commission. BOEHNER's plan creates a 12-member joint congressional committee to develop a plan for an additional \$1.8 trillion in deficit reduction that Congress would vote on in December. In addition the Speaker's plan authorizes the president to submit a \$900 billion increase in the \$14.3 trillion debt ceiling immediately after enactment of this bill, and a \$1.6 trillion increase if the \$1.8 trillion deficit reduction measure is enacted. Both debt limit increases would take effect automatically unless Congress enacted resolutions of disapproval. The Speaker's plan also requires the House and Senate to vote by the end of the year on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. As I have stated before this will tie the hands of Congress.

Finally, as noted above, the Boehner proposal provides only a short-term extension of the federal debt ceiling. This means that the gridlock that now prevails in our government will continue for the remainder of the 112th Congress. According to the Center on Budget and Policy, recent reports have suggested that rating agencies will downgrade the U.S. credit rating if the Boehner proposal is enacted. This would result not only in higher interest costs to the federal government but also would raise the interest rate paid by individuals and families on car loans, credit cards and mortgages throughout the United States. Taken together, all of these factors would undermine the nation's fragile recovery.

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

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

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

Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States' poor population.

In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the nation, 20.7% of America's youth. The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that there are currently 5.6 million Texans living in poverty, 2.2 million of them children, and that 17.4% of households in the state struggle with food insecurity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the federal government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was

needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

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

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade. Congress last came together and raised the debt ceiling in February 2010. Today, the debt ceiling currently stands at \$14.3 trillion dollars. In reality, that limit has already been eclipsed, but due to accounting procedures by Treasury Secretary Geithner, the debt limit can be artificially avoided until August 2nd.

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

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

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

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

This unnecessarily places the American public and the economy between a rock and a hard place. Either Congress sides completely with the radical agenda of the Tea Party, which 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.

Moreover, the impending crisis would have already occurred were it not for the extraor-

dinary measures taken by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, including the suspension of the investment in securities to finance the Civil Service retirement and Disability Fund, as well as the redemption of a portion of those securities already held by that fund.

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

Once America defaults, investors who purchase U.S. bonds and finance our government will be less likely to lend to America in the future. Just as a person who defaults on a loan will find it harder to convince banks to lend them money in the future, a country that defaults on its debt obligations will find it harder to convince investors to lend money to a government that did not pay.

Showing the world that the United States does not pay its debts makes the purchasing of that debt less desirable because it requires the assumption of more risk on the part of the investors. The proponents of this bill are putting the country at serious risk of losing its status as the world's economic superpower. Our allies will lose faith in our ability to manage global economic affairs. Our status in the world will be diminished, which will undermine our leverage on the world stage that allows us to command the respect and compliance of other nations when it comes to decision-making. This bill will reduce America's ability to compete with a surging China.

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

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

The Speaker's plan is a short term fix for a long term issue. It is a patch rather than a proper repair. BOEHNER's plan requires that Congress address debt ceiling once again in a short span of time, which will once again lead to market uncertainty in a time when we are trying to rebuild our nation. This plan is not good for Wall Street and it is not good for the American people. The Speaker's bill is a short-term debt limit increase that will only ensure that Congress will go through this exact same standoff again in the next few months. Short-term proposals risk further uncertainty and the potentially damaging downgrade of the U.S. credit rating. The markets have made it clear that a short-term extension is not sufficient and could result in very serious consequences. While Democrats support deficit

reduction, we support doing it in a balanced way that provides certainty to the economy.

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

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

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

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

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

If Congress cannot find a resolution then Congress will open the possibility that the President may invoke the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, Section four, which states "the validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be questioned." The argument can be made that if Congress will not resolve our nation's pending default then the President, to protect the interest of our nation, must act. The President would then have to consider his powers under the Fourteenth Amendment which may grant him the authority to raise the debt ceiling, on his own, through executive order if Congress fails to raise the debt limit by the August 2, 2011 deadline. As a body we should not place the President or our country in this position.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents in their home districts who would be hurt by this bill. I urge my colleagues to return to the world in which the vast majority of Americans live; a world in which our shared destiny is determined by reasonable minds and good faith efforts to compromise. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben

Bernanke warned that defaulting could "throw the financial system into chaos," and "destroy the trust and confidence that global investors have in Treasury securities as being the safest liquid assets in the world."

Instead of injecting ideological spending cuts and Constitutional amendments into the traditionally non-political business of raising the debt ceiling, we must work quickly to pass a bill that makes good on our debt obligations and restores confidence in American credit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to one of our thoughtful, hard-working new Members of this Congress, the gentleman from Manchester, New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

What I want to say to the American people is: Let's stop the spending. Let's not call the President or the Congress to say stop this madness. Call this body and say: Stop the spending. Because we have a \$14.3 trillion debt. We have a \$1.6 trillion deficit. Most Americans know and appreciate that that is not sustainable.

We today, through the will of the House and the work over the course of this week and past several weeks, have a piece of legislation that is responsible in that it cuts spending, caps future spending, requires a balanced budget amendment, so the country can finally have a voice—have a voice in how people in this body spend taxpayer dollars.

It's time for us to tell the American people the truth about how their money is being wasted. It is time to stop that spending. It is time to get responsible and serious. And we are here to do that. Not just my freshman class, but this Congress is here to do that. And I ask my friends from the other side to join us in that fight to protect taxpayers and vote for this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for her generosity.

I advise my colleagues, budgets will balance when people go back to work. I rise against this amendment, the rule, and the underlying bill as "inartful" dodges from necessity. When a patient is weak, do you pull out their intravenous feeding tubes, or do you help them recover? Do you do everything possible to build their strength, or do you keep shutting off their oxygen machine?

America's economy is struggling to grow after the deep Bush recession triggered by his bailout of Wall Street abuse, two wars, and trillions in tax cuts to the super-rich who, by the way, didn't create any jobs with it. Revenues to our Federal Government have fallen over \$400 billion a year due to unemployment. That's \$4 trillion over

a decade. So what does the majority do to the patient? They pull out the tubes, and they now shove them down the elevator chute.

Never before has any political party chosen to hurt America when she was recovering by edging her toward default. Their dangerous behavior has already caused hundreds of billions of dollars of losses in the stock market, pension funds and annuities. Social Security and Medicare checks are threatened, and economic growth and jobs are stalled due to all this uncertainty in the markets.

Madam Speaker, America needs a Congress and President that focus on economic recovery and job creation. Budgets will balance when people go back to work. To delude oneself the cause is otherwise is to take America down the proverbial black hole. Jobs are the answer—not more dodges, not pushing the patient down the shaft, and not proposing amendments that truly dodge the real question, which is full economic recovery for the people of this country.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of my good friend from Rochester how many speakers she has remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I believe I have two.

Mr. DREIER. In light of that, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentle lady for her leadership.

I rise in opposition to the Republican rule.

We have all been getting numerous phone calls from our constituents who are rightly worried that the interest rates will be going up on their homes, on their cars, on their student loans, because they see that this Congress is in chaos. Already since last Friday, shareholders in U.S. markets have lost over \$400 billion in value just due to the uncertainty and the lack of action. Our constituents' retirement funds have been taking a hit—and will continue to until this issue is decided. We have less than 4 days.

We must stop this "Republican roulette" and get to work on a plan that is realistic, that can pass both Houses. This is a dangerous game, putting forward a partisan bill that, each time it comes back, is more partisan, appealing to a narrower sliver of America.

Madam Speaker, we need to revisit a clean vote on the debt ceiling—as we have done 78 times since 1960. If we don't, the President should do his constitutional duty and raise the debt ceiling on his own under the authority of the 14th Amendment. The Republican leadership has walked out on President Obama, on Vice President BIDEN, on MCCONNELL, and even their own leader, BOEHNER. Then they want us to revisit

this in 6 months and put the economy in uncertainty. This is the wrong direction.

I urge a “no” vote.

□ 1650

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. I oppose the Republican default bill because it will lead to drastic cuts to Medicare and Social Security. Also, I oppose the Republican default bill because it protects tax breaks and loopholes for those Americans who make millions and billions of dollars in income per year. I oppose the Republican default bill because it calls for another default summit, another default crisis, in 6 months, thereby undermining the certainty that American businesses, investors, and families need to create jobs and move our country forward.

With only a short-term increase under the Republican default bill, the full faith and credit of the United States will once again be held hostage to the differences in Washington. The Republicans’ short-term plan that creates uncertainty will result in billions of dollars in increased interest rates that will hurt every single American and will hurt our country.

I urge my Republican colleagues to join with the Democrats, to join with President Obama in creating a balanced plan with shared sacrifice that solves our debt crisis and eliminates this cloud hanging over our economy.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to the former mayor of one of the 10 most livable cities in the United States of America, the gentleman from Rogers, Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding some time.

On my way over to the Capitol this afternoon, I was accompanied by some young people from back in my district, Payson and McKenna from Mena, Arkansas, and Adam and Grace Anne from Fayetteville, Arkansas; and we were having a conversation about the debate that’s going on right now in Washington, the debate about the debt ceiling. I explained to these young people that the current debt of the United States of America, their share of that current debt, is well into the mid-\$40,000 range, \$46,000-or-so of debt.

It is for this very reason that we are proposing what we are proposing, because the only way to keep this debt on these innocent young people from soaring to greater and greater levels, to an area that they can no longer afford, is to restrain, constrain government; and the only sure way to do that, the only guaranteed enforcement mechanism that I know that can accomplish that very thing is a balanced budget amendment.

So on behalf of these young people and on behalf of young people across

America, let’s quit piling more and more debt on our children and grandchildren. Let’s pass the rule. Let’s pass this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. In my 1 minute, I want to make a special appeal that we pay close attention to what I consider the most devastating, damaging part of this bill, and that is what we are doing and what the Republicans are doing to Social Security, to Medicare, and to Medicaid.

In this bill, it requires that we set up a joint select committee. There are no protections in here. And it says in order for us to give the raise to the debt ceiling, we must concur and cut \$1.6 trillion from the budget from discretionary funding. The Center for Policy and Budget Priorities has said that since 80 percent of the discretionary areas come from Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare, it doesn’t take a genius to know that we’re talking about drastic cuts in this area, and they will come out to a tune of about a thousand dollars for each recipient.

Now, I don’t know about you all, but we have some people in this country who are hanging on by their fingernails. We have widows, we have seniors, we have youngsters who are depending upon Social Security, depending upon Medicare; and to say that in this measure that we will make these drastic cuts in Social Security and Medicare is totally irresponsible, and for that reason let us vote this measure down.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, this rule and the bill will further drive a wedge between the two parties rather than bringing us closer to an agreement, which we must have. It’s been a week since the bipartisan discussions over the \$4 trillion “grand deal” broke down, and we’ve seen little progress toward a solution since then.

Missing in today’s debate is a bipartisan approach toward our Nation’s fiscal health. We must have a bipartisan approach. We can cut through the partisan rhetoric with a balanced package. For me, that means implementing the Simpson-Bowles recommendations to reduce spending by \$4 trillion over the next 10 years, lowering tax rates, ensuring solvency of Medicare and Social Security, and stabilizing our debt.

The House should also consider a clean balanced budget amendment, H.J. Res. 2, which says the country can’t spend more than it takes in. This amendment and the Simpson-Bowles recommendations must be coupled with a debt limit increase to get us through the next 18 months.

It’s time for cooler heads to prevail. With the clock ticking down, our Nation’s first-ever default is at hand. We

cannot afford to wait a minute longer. Default is not an option.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, ranking Democrat on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentle-

lady.

The Republican Party deficit plan is very simple:

Number one, send the financial markets into a nose dive.

Number two, drive up costs for home mortgages, student loans, and credit cards.

Number three, spook businesses to stall job growth, bringing the Nation to the brink of economic collapse.

Number four, repeat it all again and again until election day 2012.

The Republicans don’t want compromise; they want capitulation. The Republicans have brought to the floor a constitutional amendment to balance the budget that’s going nowhere. It is phony. But there’s another sinister constitutional amendment being debated here, it’s very real; and it will cause our country to default on its obligations.

Amendment 14, section 4, of the Constitution says: “The validity of the public debt shall not be questioned.” But this bill would change the Constitution forever—forever.

Under this Republican bill, our country would be pushed into defaulting on our obligations. The Republican Party would turn the 14th Amendment from a guarantee into a question mark. Now, under the Republican bill: “The validity of the public debt shall be questioned.” That is what they are doing this weekend.

This is unacceptable and would have a disastrous effect upon our economy and the middle class. The only way to end this historic nightmare is to resolve another massive deficit, the leadership deficit in the Republican Party. We must vote down this constitutional amendment, which will have us not honoring the full faith and credit of the United States which was built into the 14th Amendment of our United States Constitution. They are amending that Constitution here this evening. They are leading us to a default which will be a violation of that Constitution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the Democrat leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and commend her and her colleagues on the Rules Committee for their important work in bringing legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, the clock is ticking. The clock is ticking on the need for us to raise the debt ceiling so that we do not default on our past obligations, that we uphold the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

□ 1700

As we continue this debate today, one thing is very clear to me. If our goal were to find deficit reduction in a balanced, bipartisan way, we could certainly do that. We've had models by Simpson-Bowles. We've had the Gang of Six. We've had the President's conversations with Speaker BOEHNER. We could find a path to very serious deficit reduction, but I think it has become very clear that that is not the goal of the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

They keep moving the goalpost, making it very evident that their goal is to reduce the public role in the lives of the American people. That's why, in other legislation on the floor, like the Interior bill that has been debated, you see the abandoning of clean air standards, clean water, food safety. I've said before I come to this Congress as a mother and a grandmother. We all want to do the best for our children personally, but we need a public role in their education and, again, in clean air, clean water, food safety. We can't do that for ourselves, but part of the Republican plan is to unravel 50 years—five decades at least—of bipartisan progress on behalf of America's middle class families.

Flatout, this bill and the other bills accompanying it will end Medicare, will end Medicaid, will say to seniors, You will pay more for your health care costs to get less so that we can give tax subsidies to Big Oil. We will say to those families, We're going to cut Medicaid. What that means to seniors in nursing homes is that we will give tax breaks to corporations sending jobs overseas. We will say to the young people, You're going to pay more for your college loans so that we can give tax cuts to the people at the highest end.

We all know that we have to participate in reducing the deficit. Everybody has to ante up. Why is it that the Republicans insist on having the middle class pay the price so that the high end is off the hook?

If we are concerned about addressing the problems of the American people, we would end this debate. This bill is going nowhere. It is a total waste of time. Every day that we spend on these wastes of time that are not going anywhere is another day we are not talking about the highest priority of the American people, which is job creation, job creation, job creation. That is their priority. We have an obligation to reduce the deficit and get on with it so we can create jobs.

If we are concerned about the economic security of the American people and their families, we must recognize that, since the Republicans' most recent walking away from the table—they've done it on more than one occasion, but last Friday the Speaker and the Republicans walked away from the table—the stock market has dropped 483 points, and the American people have lost over \$400 billion in their personal assets, \$400 billion. Every day

that goes by and if the market goes down any more, it comes right out of what the American people have in their 401(k)s, in their pensions and other pensions, and in their savings for their children's educations.

I remember when we had the debate on TARP. We cooperated with President Bush at that time to bring legislation to the floor. It was very unpopular. It was probably the most unpopular vote any of us will have to take, but we were on the brink of a financial crisis, and we had to act; but the Republicans did not step up to the plate, and the market went down 777 points the next day.

Is that what they're waiting for, for the market to go down not 485 points in the last few days but hundreds of points more, diminishing the personal assets and wealth of the American people? I certainly hope not.

When the Speaker walked away and he made his statement, Speaker BOEHNER, our Speaker, said that we couldn't reach agreement, words to that effect, that we couldn't connect because we have different visions of America. I believe the Speaker when he speaks, but I don't believe we have different visions of America.

President Obama's vision of America is one where we are committed to the education of our children so they can reach their personal fulfillment and so our country through innovation can continue to be number one—committed to creating jobs, good-paying jobs, for America's workers. I think that vision is the vision of the American people, the high ground of where we share values: in the education of our children, jobs for our workers, in the dignified retirement and health security for our seniors, and in the personal safety and national security of our people—all done in a fiscally sound way.

I think that that's common ground on the high ground of values. If you believe that, if you agree with those values, as I think Speaker BOEHNER must agree with President Obama on that vision of America, you couldn't possibly vote for any of the legislation that the Republicans are bringing to the floor in these few days—you couldn't possibly—because they do undermine the education of our children, the financial and health security of our seniors. The deep cuts early on hurt the economic recovery and the creation of jobs. This isn't done in a fiscally sound way as we've taken revenue off the table. Fifty-seven percent of the American people at least think we should have a balanced, bipartisan agreement to end this default and to do so in a way that doesn't take us down this path again.

So let's be clear. What is on the floor today is a balanced budget. Balanced in what way? Balanced in whose favor? It looks like a seesaw to me in favor of the "haves" at the expense of a great middle class in our country. It must be rejected.

For every day that we waste on another Republican ideological ploy or

scheme is another day that we are not creating jobs. Since the Republicans took office, which is over 200 days ago—last Saturday it was 200 days, going on 207—the only bills that they have brought to the floor which they claim to be jobs bills are not job creators; they are job losers. H.R. 1 loses about 700,000 jobs—H.R. 2, a similar number; H.R. 34, a similar number with nearly 2 million jobs lost. Almost 10,000 jobs a day they're losing. Their infrastructure bill that they have brought in to committee—they haven't voted on it yet, thank God—is estimated to lose another 700,000 jobs when it's supposed to be the big job creator. Even the Chamber of Commerce has rejected it as something that will not only not create jobs but will lose current jobs.

So let's get on with the business of job creation. Let's really be honest about what we're here to do in terms of deficit reduction and not use it as an engine for the destruction of the public role that is so important in the defense of our country, in the health of our children, in the security of our seniors and their retirements, and in the vitality and innovation of our economy—and again, do it in a way that is fiscally sound. I don't want to go into how we got here in the first place. Whatever it is, we have to go forward, and we must go forward in the way the American people want us to do: bipartisan, balanced, and with an eye to job creation.

Reject what is on the floor now and support the American people. We owe it to honor the sacrifices of our Founders, the vision of our Founders, the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform, the aspirations of our children and our families. This budget should be a statement of values that honors all of that, and if we are to honor that, we must reject what is being proposed here today.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the consequences of this bill are so dire and the circumstances of this constitutional amendment are so far-reaching and damaging that I implore everybody in the House of Representatives, in the name of the Founding Fathers, in the name of our soldiers fighting for our Nation, for people who kept the economy the envy of the world, for the sake of our children and generations yet unborn, to vote against this rule. I have never felt this way before. The process and everything about this is wrong. They are making it absolutely impossible the next time for us to meet our obligations, and we really should not besmirch the reputations that we have as thoughtful legislators by voting for this.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1710

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The gentleman from California has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we began this debate at 4:01. It's now 5:11.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation so that as August 2 approaches, we will be able to say that we have reduced the size and scope and reach of government and we have not allowed our country to go into default.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation.

I have never witnessed such a legislative and political travesty. The Republican majority is threatening to take the entire economy hostage unless we write their draconian budget—which would end Medicare and Medicaid—into the Constitution.

Throughout this week, the Republican leadership and Republican caucus have been operating in a world of unreality. The Speaker and his team have persisted in passing legislation that everyone in the real world knows is dead on arrival in the Senate.

Today, we have moved from unreality to fantasy.

We are being told that if we do not pass a constitutional amendment to end Medicare and Medicaid, then the debt limit will not be raised—the United States of America will default—and the American people will suffer grievously.

I want to remind the House why the underlying Boehner legislation is so unacceptable. At its heart, this bill is a mortal threat to Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security and the protections of the Affordable Care Act.

The Boehner legislation will end Medicare as we know it by turning it into a voucher program and raising premium costs to beneficiaries by thousands of dollars per year.

Medicaid will be eviscerated, throwing women and children and seniors in nursing homes into great distress.

Social Security will be on the chopping block. The retirement age will be raised and benefits will be cut.

And under a balanced budget amendment, Congress will be placed in a straightjacket and the government will not be able to respond to compelling humanitarian and public health needs in times of economic downturns.

This is not the moment to engage in fantasy. This House must take its responsibilities seriously and do its proper duty for the nation.

The bill before us, with the poison pill of a balanced budget amendment, is a vicious assault on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, along with public health, scientific research and environmental protection.

I urge the defeat of this rule and the terrible consequences that will flow from it.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 187, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 675]

YEAS—239

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

NAYS—187

Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Capps
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Capuano
Andrews	Blumenauer	Cardoza
Baldwin	Boren	Carnahan
Barrow	Boswell	Carney
Bass (CA)	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Becerra	Braley (IA)	Castor (FL)
Berkley	Brown (FL)	Chandler
Berman	Butterfield	Chu

Ciilline	Hoyer	Peterson
Clarke (MI)	Inlee	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Israel	Price (NC)
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Clyburn	(TX)	Rangel
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Reyes
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Conyers	Kaptur	Richmond
Cooper	Keating	Ross (AR)
Costa	Kildee	Rothman (NJ)
Costello	Kind	Royal-Allard
Courtney	Kissell	Ruppersberger
Critz	Kucinich	Rush
Crowley	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Cummings	Larson (CT)	T.
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (IL)	Levin	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lipinski	Schiff
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Schrader
Deutch	Lofgren, Zoe	Schwartz
Dicks	Lowe y	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lujan	Scott, David
Doggett	Lynch	Serrano
Donnelly (IN)	Maloney	Sewell
Doyle	Markey	Sherman
Edwards	Matheson	Shuler
Ellison	Matsui	Sires
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Eshoo	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Farr	McDermott	Stark
Fattah	McGovern	Sutton
Filner	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Frank (MA)	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
Fudge	Meeks	Tierney
Garamendi	Michaud	Tonko
Gonzalez	Miller (NC)	Townes
Green, Al	Miller, George	Tsongas
Green, Gene	Moore	Van Hollen
Grijalva	Moran	Velázquez
Gutierrez	Murphy (CT)	Vislosky
Hahn	Nadler	Walz (MN)
Hanabusa	Napolitano	Wasserman
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Schultz
Heinrich	Olver	Watt
Higgins	Owens	Waxman
Himes	Pallone	Welch
Hinojosa	Pascrell	Wilson (FL)
Hirono	Pastor (AZ)	Woolsey
Hochul	Payne	Wu
Holden	Pelosi	Yarmuth
Holt	Perlmutter	
Honda	Peters	

NOT VOTING—6

Baca	Hinchey	Speier
Giffords	Pingree (ME)	Waters

□ 1735

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay." Messrs. NEUGEBAUER and FLEMING changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, proceedings will now resume on the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Thursday, July 28, 2011, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) had 1 minute of debate remaining on the bill.

Pursuant to House Resolution 383, the further amendment printed in House Report 112-187 is adopted.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 301, in the matter proposed to be inserted as section 3101A(a)(2)(A) of title 31, United States Code, strike "is greater than

\$1,600,000,000,000" and insert "is greater than \$1,600,000,000,000 and 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'".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. My colleagues, I would like to cut through all the fog here rather quickly.

Today's GDP figures remind us that our economy is still not creating enough jobs. Americans are worried about finding work. They are worried about our economy, and they are worried about the mountain of debt that is facing them and their children.

Today, we have a chance to end this debt limit crisis. With this bill, I think we are keeping our promise to the American people that we will cut spending by more than the amount of the increase in the debt limit. The Congressional Budget Office has certified this commonsense standard, and it has been backed by more than 150 distinguished economists from across the country.

We are also imposing caps to restrain future spending to stop the expansion of government while giving our economy a chance to grow and create jobs, and we are advancing the great cause of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

What this bill now says is that before the President can request an additional increase in the debt limit, two things have to happen: A joint committee of the Congress must produce spending cuts larger than the increase in the debt limit, and both Houses of the Congress must send to the States a balanced budget amendment.

Listen, the balanced budget amendment, it's time for this to happen. It enjoys support in both Houses of this Congress, and it enjoys bipartisan and widespread support across our country.

The bill also ends this crisis without raising taxes, which would cripple our economy, and there are no gimmicks. There are no smokescreens here that represent the old and comfortable way of doing things.

Now, the bill before us still isn't perfect. No Member would argue that it is. It's imperfect because it reflects an honest and sincere effort to end this crisis by sending a bill over to the Senate that at one time was agreed to by the bipartisan leadership of the United States Senate.

And to my colleagues in the Senate, if they were here, I would say this, if this bill passes, this House has sent you not one, but two different bills to cut spending by trillions of dollars over the next decade while providing an immediate increase in the debt limit. And to

the American people, I would say, we have tried our level best. We have done everything we can to find a commonsense solution that could pass both Houses of Congress and end this crisis.

□ 1740

We have tried to do the right thing by our country, but some people continue to say "no."

My colleagues, I have worked since the first week of this session when we were sworn in in January to avoid being where we are right this moment, but 2 days after we were sworn in, the Treasury Secretary sent us a letter asking us to increase the debt ceiling. I immediately responded by saying we would not increase the debt ceiling without serious cuts in spending and serious reforms to the way we spend the people's money.

We passed a budget. The other body spent over 800 days and still no budget, no plan. This will be the second bill we send over to the Senate, and yet not one piece of legislation out of the Senate has passed that deals with this crisis.

And my colleagues, I can tell you that I have worked with the President and the administration since the beginning of this year to avoid being in this spot. I have offered ideas. I have negotiated. Not one time, not one time did the administration ever put any plan on the table. All they would do was criticize what I put out there. I stuck my neck out a mile to try to get an agreement with the President of the United States. I put revenues on the table in order to try to come to an agreement to avert us being where we are, but a lot of people in this town can never say "yes." A lot of people can never say "yes."

This House has acted, and it is time for the administration and time for our colleagues across the aisle to put something on the table. Tell us where you are.

Yes, people can be critical of what we've done, but where are the other ideas? At this point in time, the House is going to act and we're going to act again, but it is time for our colleagues across the aisle to tell us what they're for, tell us how we can end this crisis.

Ronald Reagan has been quoted throughout this debate over the last few weeks, and Ronald Reagan would probably be flattered, I'm sure, if he were here. But Ronald Reagan, on his desk, had a little placard, and that placard was real simple. It said: "It can be done." I have a replica of that placard on my desk, and let me tell you, Members of this House, it can be done, it must be done, and it will be done if we have the courage to do the right thing.

So for the sake of our economy, for the sake of our future, I'm going to ask each of you, as representatives of the people of the United States, to support this bill, to support this process and end this crisis now.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, we have reached a critical point in our months-long de-

bate over the best approach to addressing our country's deficit and debt and raising the statutory debt limit. It is important to be clear, that the decision to raise the debt limit is about paying the bills we have already accumulated. The debt limit has been raised over 70 times since 1960 by Republicans and Democrats, in fact, more times under a Republican president. In 11 years, we have gone from a \$5.6 trillion surplus to a \$1.4 trillion deficit. We can argue about how we got here—and I would argue the Bush tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 and the Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, all of which I voted against, are the primary reasons—but there is enough blame to go around, and the critical point now is to avoid the first default in the history of the United States of America.

The good news tonight is that we can see the outlines of a final agreement. Both the Boehner plan and the Reid plan seek to enact at least \$2.4 trillion in budget cuts with a similar increase in our debt limit. Both would set up a lawmaker committee to decide which programs to cut with a vote on the package without amendment by both the House and Senate. The key differences are the time-frame for raising the debt limit and the requirement that a Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA) to the Constitution is passed in Congress and sent to the states. The Boehner plan calls for an immediate debt limit increase of \$900 billion which lasts only through the end of this year. The Reid plan would raise the debt limit through the end of 2012. Moreover, while I have voted for a BBA in the past, it is very unlikely it will receive the two-thirds vote necessary in both Houses to be sent to the states, guaranteeing a future default. I believe the Reid plan is the better approach and will vote against the Boehner plan for this reason.

We have heard a great deal in recent weeks about the potential, dire consequences of a default, notably a lowering of our country's credit rating that would cause a rise in interest rates—raising costs for people at every income level—and a likely drop in the stock market, affecting pensions and crippling our economic recovery. One thing that should be clear is that we don't want to go through this again just a few months from now. Financial markets want certainty so businesses can invest and create jobs, and I believe we will be better served to raise the debt limit through the end of next year.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a very tough process. While I will not vote for the Boehner proposal today, I believe we are closer to reaching a final product that represents a workable compromise. And at the end of the day, that is what the American people expect us to do.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, it has been one week since bipartisan discussions over the \$4 trillion "grand deal" broke down yet we have seen little progress toward a smaller package of spending cuts that would allow us to raise the debt limit and begin getting our fiscal house in order.

It's easy to point fingers and cast blame—and there's certainly plenty to go around—but fundamentally I believe the reason we have seen so little progress is that the American people aren't looking for a short-term solution or a small gesture. They want a "grand deal" that will put us on a fiscally responsible path today and for the future.

We all have our own ideas about our nation's fiscal priorities, but what is missing in today's discussion is a bipartisan, centrist approach to addressing our nation's fiscal health, such as the recommendations by the Simpson-Bowles National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform.

No one party has all the answers, and no one party can do this alone. It's time to put our economy back on the path to fiscal sustainability, and this House should consider the Simpson-Bowles recommendations that aim to accomplish that goal by reducing spending by \$4 trillion over 10 years, lowering tax rates, ensuring the solvency of entitlements such as Medicare and Social Security and stabilizing the debt.

To compliment the \$4 trillion Simpson-Bowles plan the House should also consider a clean balanced budget amendment. H.J. Res. 2, is identical to legislation that passed the House in 1995 with 300 votes and I plan to support it if the House take it up. It is a commonsense approach to ensuring long-term fiscal responsibility by operating the federal government's finances in the same way every American family and even all 50 states must do.

This clean balanced budget amendment, coupled with the Simpson-Bowles recommendations and a debt limit increase to get us through the next 18 months, is a package I believe would find broad bipartisan support in both Chambers of Congress.

Yesterday the House debated Speaker BOEHNER's debt limit proposal, which was yet another example of the partisanship that has paralyzed Washington and disgusted the American people. Leading credit rating agency Standard & Poor's has said the Speaker's two-step approach to the debt limit could still result in a downgrade of our nation's credit rating because of the uncertainty it would create. I simply cannot bring myself to vote for legislation that would yet again call into question the full faith and credit of the United States.

With the possibility of a credit downgrade by national and international bond rating agencies looming over our head, kicking this can further down the road could mean a greater burden on the American people and American businesses in the form of higher interest rates, higher mortgage payments, negative impacts on retirements savings and higher student loans. This is unacceptable and—more importantly—completely avoidable.

It's time for cooler heads to prevail in order to resolve this economic crisis. A balanced approach that includes the Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction recommendations, a clean balanced budget amendment and a one-step, 18-month increase of our nation's debt limit could be the bipartisan solution that has been elusive through all of the partisan rhetoric. With the clock ticking down to our nation's first ever default we cannot afford to wait a minute longer.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, as the clock ticks down toward default, we are debating a bill that will not solve the debt problem. It will make life worse for 98 percent of Americans—to protect the wealthiest 2 percent of our society. Meanwhile nearly \$1.6 trillion would be cut from programs like Social Security and Medicare.

Yet, despite these cuts, under this bill, we would face the exact same crisis just six

months from now. We often hear about the need for "certainty" in the business community. With financial markets ready to tumble and our credit on the brink of a downgrade, how does kicking the can down the road for six months provide certainty?

Failing to resolve this crisis will be disastrous for our economic recovery. Capital that is already hard to come by for entrepreneurs will be even further out of reach for our nation's small businesses. That's some jobs plan.

Working families will pay \$250 more in credit card interest. Mortgage payments will rise by \$1,000. Older workers could lose thousands of dollars in retirement investment.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect us to act swiftly and responsibly. The bill before us fails on both counts. Let's reject this measure and develop a real solution.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

The Republican majority has pushed our economy to the brink of default through its refusal to work with Democrats on a balanced plan to end the default crisis. Despite the fact that this legislation cannot pass the Senate and would be vetoed by President Obama, the Republican majority chose to continue their political gamesmanship rather than bring to the floor a legitimate plan to prevent default.

By presenting a short-term fix rather than a long-term solution, the majority's plan puts our economy at greater risk of a credit downgrade and higher interest rates. American families and businesses cannot afford a higher cost of borrowing, which will raise the price of mortgages, loans, and credit card debt.

Defaulting on the federal debt is not an option. Congress should deliver a balanced plan that ends the default crisis; reduces spending responsibly; and prioritizes the health and security of hard-working middle-class families, senior citizens, and vulnerable Americans.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the bill being considered S. 627, The Budget Control Act. This bill should be called the Boehner Default Act because it is just another attempt for Congressional Republicans to hold the American economy and jobs hostage while they relentlessly pursue an extreme partisan agenda that seeks to balance the budget on the backs of seniors and the middle class. This approach has been met with widespread rejection by the public and it should be rejected by the House now.

This bill is not a serious attempt to deal with the national debt limit and it is not responsible legislation. House Republicans need to go back to the drawing board and show real leadership by crafting a plan that does not threaten the United States with a credit downgrade and higher interest rates while providing only a short-term debt limit increase.

It is inexcusable for Congress to have set up yet another partisan standoff on this issue just a few months down the road. It is unacceptable to slash Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security from our nation's seniors while asking nothing in return from the nation's most wealthy corporations and individuals.

It is time for Republicans to stop trying to score points with their political base and start legislating on behalf of the American people. As the majority party in the House of Representatives, the American people are owed better.

Ms. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

On July 27, Carol Augias from Mahopac, New York wrote to me:

"Representative Hayworth, I have never written to a Congressperson before, however, I am deeply troubled by the debt ceiling stalemate. While I firmly believe that the massive debt we carry in this country needs to be reduced (I personally curtail my spending when my debt exceeds my comfort level), I am very concerned about what may happen if we default on our loans. Please find a way to get this issue resolved prior to the August deadline. Some compromises must take place. Once we have taken care of the immediate issue we, as a Nation, must evaluate our financial position so that our country will continue to flourish and children will also be able to purchase a home, afford a college education."

Mr. Speaker, Carol is right. We need to resolve the debt limit crisis for the sake of future generations. Just as the American people—like Carol—pay their bills, the federal government must do the same, so we are obligated to raise the Treasury's debt ceiling. But we must do so responsibly because our nation has another critical and painful problem that is related to our enormous debt: 14 million Americans need jobs.

We can make our economy grow, and create jobs, by assuring that the dollars Americans work so hard for are theirs to spend and save and invest. To do this, the federal spending juggernaut has to stop.

And, as Carol pointed out, there is a need for cooperation. We can reform our tax code and close loopholes, as the President has urged, and we can do so without raising net taxes. We cannot, in good conscience, increase the burdens on Americans who need a vigorous economy.

Our nation didn't reach the point of fiscal crisis overnight, and we aren't going to get out of it overnight either—but we can make progress in the right direction now, and continue doing our utmost together to bring this federal government to the right size, and empower our citizens to enjoy the freedom and dignity that is their birthright as Americans.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, many concerned Americans are fed up with a Washington system that doesn't solve the underlying problems facing the nation, including the ongoing debt crisis.

This ongoing debt debate represents not just a crisis, but a crossroads.

In the past few decades, Congress raised the national debt limit more than 70 times, usually with little or no debate. Each time very few people batted an eye and this history has been used by liberal extremists as a reason to continue with the status quo. Now things have changed.

Over the last five years our national debt has increased by more than 50 percent. In just the past three years the debt increased by more than \$4 trillion dollars. Even worse, the debt has increased by \$9.2 trillion since a Balanced Budget Amendment failed by one vote in the Senate 15 years ago. As a result, the total national debt is now nearly equal to our entire economic output.

The independent Congressional Budget Office warns that the federal government's current path of borrowing is unsustainable and could lead to slower economic growth as debt

payments consume more and more of our economic output. Add to this that the private-sector agencies like S&P that grade government debt have stated that if Congress doesn't do something to halt the rapid growth of debt they will downgrade the U.S. debt rating, likely driving up interest rates.

The bottom line is simple: the government can pile up only so much debt before it becomes impossible to make the payments without destroying its ability to fund priorities like national defense or Social Security. As the national debt accumulates at a record clip we are quickly approaching that point.

If we don't cut spending now, America will face a painful national reckoning in the coming years. This reckoning will make today's high stakes debate look quaint. That's why this debate is so critical. The longer Congress puts off making tough decisions, the more pain the nation will experience when the music stops.

So when people ask me if I favor increasing the debt limit my response is, "it depends." Any status quo increase in the debt limit is absolutely out of the question.

However, we have to consider what happens if Congress doesn't increase the debt limit. Someone will not get paid.

We cannot ignore that the government is currently borrowing more than 40 cents of every dollar that it spends. As a result, if Congress does not raise the debt ceiling the federal government would have to slash spending immediately by more than 40 percent. That would endanger America's ability to keep its promises to those who have paid into programs like Social Security for years.

Consider these facts.

If Congress completely eliminated foreign aid the budget would be reduced by only 2%.

If Congress funded only Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid as well as the national defense budget there would be no money left to pay for anything else—not even the interest payments on the national debt.

If Congress prioritized spending that is on auto-pilot, such as unemployment benefits, Social Security, interest payments and the like, there would be nothing left for the defense budget, or any other spending, including education and transportation.

That's why I'm in favor only of drastic spending cuts accompanied by a smaller increase in the debt limit. And for the first time ever, Speaker BOEHNER's bill does just that, by proposing deficit reductions of \$2.7 trillion—including \$22 billion next year. Large reductions like this that protect Social Security and Medicare for current retirees will stop the reckless accumulation of debt and help us avoid the sort of catastrophic debt crisis we will face if Washington continues with business as usual.

It's not news that no one wants to raise the debt limit. The real news is the old way of raising the debt limit is over. Raising the debt limit, as Congress has done in the past, without accompanying spending cuts would be a disaster with severe economic consequences. Washington is in debt because it has a spending problem. It's past time we addressed that and today's bill does just that.

Due to chronic overspending, Washington is at a crossroads. I'm confident that Congress can find a way to tackle this issue responsibly. It will not be without difficult or unpopular decisions. But refusing to make tough decisions today will result in even tougher ones tomorrow.

For the sake of future generations of Americans we need to make the right call today and put dramatic, permanent spending cuts in place and pass a Balanced Budget Amendment before raising the debt limit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 375, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. HOCHUL. Yes, I am opposed to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Hochul moves to recommit the bill (S. 627) to the Committee on Rules, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Amend section 401(b)(3)(B) by adding at the end the following new clause:

(vi) **PRIORITIZE DEFICIT REDUCTION FROM CORPORATE SUBSIDIES BEFORE CUTTING EDUCATION.**—The joint committee shall first consider the elimination of—

(I) oil and gas subsidies for the major integrated oil companies, and

(II) subsidies for corporate use of aircraft, before cutting essential education programs that are necessary for the creation of jobs, economic recovery, and investment in America's future.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. HOCHUL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, here we are. The eyes of the world are upon us. The eyes of the American people are upon us, but, most importantly, the eyes of the people who put their faith in us in sending us to this institution are certainly upon us.

As we engage in this debate, I will say there is one thing that is clear to me: that everyone in this room loves this great country. America has stood the test of time and risen above disasters as one people.

In the last decade alone, we've been rattled by wars, unprecedented natural disasters, and the longest recession since World War II. As we approach the 10th anniversary of 9/11, we are reminded of what we can do when we pull together. We are a resilient people. But, Mr. Speaker, never, never in our history has there been an intentional disaster perpetrated by the very people who are sent here to be the caretakers of this country. That is exactly what

will happen if we refuse to take action to prevent default and pay our Nation's bills now, not 6 months down the road.

I understand a spirited debate in defense of one's viewpoints certainly, but when I look down at the copy of the Constitution that I keep on my desk, I thank God that our Founding Fathers found it in their hearts to give and take—and, yes, compromise for what is in the best interests of this country.

I can't go back to the Hillview restaurant on Transit Road in Lancaster and look into the eyes of my early-bird seniors and tell them that we didn't get this job done, that we decided to continue this game of political chicken, to dangle default cruelly over the heads of our citizens and our businesses and our economy and hold it hostage while we, as you've heard so many times, kick this can down the road again.

Mr. Speaker, am I really supposed to tell the Greatest Generation that when they passed us the torch, we dropped it because we couldn't compromise? That is why my amendment is a simple statement of America's priorities. It says, before we cut our education for our children, we first must cut subsidies to Big Oil and corporate jets.

This amendment is one of our last chances to reaffirm the values that bind us as a Nation. I know one of these shared values is our sense of obligation to create a better world for our young people to inherit, that we give these young people a better chance at achieving their dreams than even we had. The next generation will be more prosperous and more secure, but only if we invest in it now, in the human capital whose creativity, innovation, and work ethic can ensure this country remains the world's leader and the beacon of hope to others.

But, Mr. Speaker, I feel this is all at risk. Speaker BOEHNER's plan results in consequences I can't imagine anyone in this room really wants.

On top of the unconscionable uncertainty and instability we leave our economy in with this temporary fix, we're putting at risk the investments in education that are so critical for our young people to compete with China, India, and Europe on the global stage.

My amendment is about priorities, the priorities of the people we represent. Slashing programs for seniors, young people, and the middle class all because we're afraid of the influence of Big Oil, that is wrong on so many levels.

I come from a family of entrepreneurs. My mom started a small business. My father helped grow a business of four people to 3,200. I get it. I know what it takes, and I have tremendous respect for companies that have grown to be that size. And if they have a chance to have a corporate jet, I don't begrudge them; that's great. But in this time when we all agree that our deficit must be reduced, tell me why we can't ask them—Big Oil and people who have corporate jets—to give us a hand

and help this great country that made them what they are today.

□ 1750

You know, little Seaman's Hardware Store in Genesee County run by generations of the Seaman family, how is it that they pay more in taxes than the big companies that are shipping jobs overseas? I can't explain this to the Seaman family. I don't know about you, but I cannot do that.

And you know what, my constituents are hurting in upstate New York. Some of them, at a time of huge corporate profits, can barely afford to fill the gas tank to get to their minimum wage jobs at the dollar store.

There is one value we share, and that's fairness. This bill is fundamentally unfair.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this doesn't prioritize Social Security. It doesn't prioritize Medicare. It doesn't prioritize veterans. It doesn't propose one item that would cut spending. All it does is engage in class warfare and increase taxes. Vote against the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 244, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 676]

AYES—183

Ackerman	Clay	Fattah
Altmire	Cleaver	Filner
Andrews	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Cohen	Fudge
Bass (CA)	Connolly (VA)	Garamendi
Becerra	Conyers	Gonzalez
Berkley	Cooper	Green, Al
Berman	Costello	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Gutierrez
Bishop (NY)	Critz	Hahn
Blumenauer	Crowley	Hanabusa
Boswell	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Heinrich
Brale (IA)	Davis (IL)	Higgins
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Himes
Butterfield	DeGette	Hinojosa
Capps	DeLauro	Hirono
Capuano	Deutch	Hochul
Cardoza	Dicks	Holden
Carnahan	Dingell	Holt
Carney	Doggett	Honda
Carson (IN)	Donnelly (IN)	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Doyle	Insee
Chandler	Edwards	Israel
Chu	Ellison	Jackson (IL)
Cicilline	Engel	Jackson Lee
Clarke (MI)	Eshoo	(TX)
Clarke (NY)	Farr	Johnson (GA)

Johnson, E. B.	Moran	Schakowsky	Roby	Scott (SC)	Tipton
Jones	Murphy (CT)	Schiff	Roe (TN)	Scott, Austin	Turner
Kaptur	Nadler	Schrader	Rogers (AL)	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Keating	Napolitano	Schwartz	Rogers (KY)	Sessions	Walberg
Kildee	Neal	Scott (VA)	Rogers (MI)	Shimkus	Walden
Kind	Olver	Scott, David	Rohrabacher	Shuster	Walsh (IL)
Kissell	Owens	Serrano	Rokita	Simpson	Webster
Kucinich	Pallone	Sewell	Rooney	Smith (NE)	West
Langevin	Pascrell	Sherman	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland
Larsen (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Shuler	Roskam	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Larson (CT)	Payne	Sires	Ross (FL)	Southerland	Wilson (SC)
Lee (CA)	Pelosi	Slaughter	Royce	Stearns	Wittman
Levin	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)	Runyan	Stivers	Wolf
Lewis (GA)	Peters	Stark	Ryan (WI)	Stutzman	Womack
Lipinski	Peterson	Sutton	Scalise	Sullivan	Woodall
Loeb sack	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (CA)	Schilling	Terry	Yoder
Lofgren, Zoe	Polis	Thompson (MS)	Schmidt	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Lowe y	Price (NC)	Tierney	Schock	Thornberry	Young (FL)
Lujan	Rahall	Tonko	Schweikert	Tiberi	Young (IN)
Lynch	Rangel	Towns			
Maloney	Reyes	Tsongas			
Markey	Richardson	Van Hollen	Baca	Hinchey	Waters
Matsui	Richmond	Velázquez	Giffords	Speier	
McCarthy (NY)	Ross (AR)	Visclosky			
McCollum	Rothman (NJ)	Walz (MN)			
McDermott	Rothman	Wasserman			
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Schultz			
McIntyre	Ruppersberger	Watt			
McNerney	Rush	Waxman			
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Welch			
Michaud	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)			
Miller (NC)	T.	Woolsey			
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Wu			
Moore	Sarbanes	Yarmuth			

NOES—244

Adams	Ellmers	Lamborn
Aderholt	Emerson	Lance
Akin	Farenthold	Landry
Alexander	Fincher	Lankford
Amash	Fitzpatrick	Latham
Austria	Flake	LaTourette
Bachmann	Fleischmann	Latta
Bachus	Fleming	Lewis (CA)
Barletta	Flores	LoBiondo
Barrow	Forbes	Long
Bartlett	Fortenberry	Lucas
Barton (TX)	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Bass (NH)	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Benishek	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel
Berg	Gallely	E.
Biggert	Gardner	Mack
Bilbray	Garrett	Manzullo
Bilirakis	Gerlach	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	Marino
Black	Gibson	Matheson
Blackburn	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Bonner	Gohmert	McCaul
Bono Mack	Goodlatte	McClintock
Boren	Gosar	McCotter
Boustany	Gowdy	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Granger	McKeon
Brooks	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Broun (GA)	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Buchanan	Green, Gene	Rodgers
Bucshon	Griffin (AR)	Meehan
Buerkle	Griffith (VA)	Mica
Burgess	Grimm	Miller (FL)
Burton (IN)	Guinta	Miller (MI)
Calvert	Guthrie	Miller, Gary
Camp	Hall	Mulvaney
Campbell	Hanna	Murphy (PA)
Canseco	Harper	Myrick
Cantor	Harris	Neugebauer
Capito	Hartzler	Noem
Carter	Hastings (WA)	Nugent
Cassidy	Hayworth	Nunes
Chabot	Heck	Nunnelee
Chaffetz	Hensarling	Olson
Coble	Herger	Palazzo
Coffman (CO)	Herrera Beutler	Paul
Cole	Huelskamp	Paulsen
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Pearce
Costa	Hultgren	Pence
Cravaack	Hunter	Petri
Crawford	Hurt	Pitts
Crenshaw	Issa	Platts
Cuellar	Jenkins	Poe (TX)
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Pompeo
Dicks (KY)	Johnson (OH)	Posey
Diaz	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Dreier	Jordan	Quayle
Duffy	Kelly	Reed
Duncan (SC)	King (IA)	Rehberg
Duncan (TN)	King (NY)	Reichert
	Kingston	Renacci
	Ribble	Ribble
	Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell
	Kline	Rivera
	Labrador	

Scott (SC)	Tipton
Scott, Austin	Turner
Sensenbrenner	Upton
Sessions	Walberg
Shimkus	Walden
Shuster	Walsh (IL)
Simpson	Webster
Smith (NE)	West
Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland
Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Southerland	Wilson (SC)
Stearns	Wittman
Stivers	Wolf
Stutzman	Womack
Sullivan	Woodall
Terry	Yoder
Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Thornberry	Young (FL)
Tiberi	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1809

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2213 and H.R. 789, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 210, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 677]

AYES—218

Adams	Coffman (CO)	Graves (MO)
Aderholt	Cole	Griffin (AR)
Akin	Conaway	Griffith (VA)
Alexander	Crawford	Grimm
Austria	Crenshaw	Guinta
Bachus	Culberson	Guthrie
Barletta	Davis (KY)	Hall
Bartlett	Denham	Hanna
Barton (TX)	Dent	Harper
Bass (NH)	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Benishek	Dold	Hartzler
Berg	Dreier	Hastings (WA)
Biggert	Duffy	Hayworth
Bilbray	Duncan (TN)	Heck
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Herger
Black	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Blackburn	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Boehner	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Bonner	Flake	Hunter
Bono Mack	Fleischmann	Hurt
Boustany	Fleming	Issa
Brady (TX)	Floures	Jenkins
Brooks	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fox	Jones
Buerkle	Franks (AZ)	Kelly
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burton (IN)	Gallely	Kingston
Calvert	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Camp	Garrett	Kline
Canseco	Gerlach	Labrador
Cantor	Gibbs	Lamborn
Capito	Gibson	Lance
Carter	Gingrey (GA)	Landry
Cassidy	Gohmert	Lankford
Chabot	Goodlatte	LaTourette
Chaffetz	Gosar	Latta
Chobot	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Coble		

LoBiondo	Petri	Sensenbrenner	Sires	Towns	Waxman	Conaway	Hirono	Murphy (PA)
Long	Pitts	Sessions	Slaughter	Tsongas	Welch	Connolly (VA)	Hochul	Myrick
Lucas	Platts	Shimkus	Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)	Conyers	Holden	Nadler
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Shuster	Southerland	Velázquez	Wilson (SC)	Cooper	Holt	Napolitano
Lummis	Pompeo	Simpson	Stark	Visclosky	Woolsey	Costa	Honda	Neal
Lungren, Daniel E.	Posey	Smith (NE)	Sutton	Walsh (IL)	Wu	Costello	Hoyer	Neugebauer
Manzullo	Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)	Thompson (CA)	Walz (MN)	Yarmuth	Courtney	Huelskamp	Noem
Marchant	Quayle	Smith (TX)	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman		Cravaack	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent
Marino	Reed	Stearns	Tierney	Schultz		Crawford	Hultgren	Nunes
McCarthy (CA)	Rehberg	Stivers	Tonko	Watt		Crenshaw	Hunter	Nunnelee
McCaul	Reichert	Stutzman				Critz	Hurt	Olson
McCotter	Renacci	Sullivan				Crowley	Inslie	Olver
McHenry	Ribble	Terry	Baca	Hinchey	Waters	Cuellar	Israel	Owens
McKeon	Rigell	Thompson (PA)	Giffords	Speier		Culberson	Issa	Palazzo
McKinley	Rivera	Thornberry				Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
McMorris	Roby	Tiberi				Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Pascarell
Meehan	Roe (TN)	Tipton				Davis (IL)	(TX)	Pastor (AZ)
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Turner				Davis (KY)	Jenkins	Paulsen
Miller (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Upton				DeFazio	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Walberg				DeGette	Johnson (IL)	Pearce
Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Walden				DeLauro	Johnson (OH)	Pelosi
Murphy (PA)	Rokita	Webster				Denham	Johnson, E. B.	Pence
Myrick	Rooney	West				Dent	Johnson, Sam	Perlmutter
Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland				DesJarlais	Jones	Peters
Neom	Roskam	Whitfield				Deutch	Jordan	Peterson
Nugent	Ross (FL)	Whitfield				Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Petri
Nunes	Royce	Wittman				Dicks	Keating	Pingree (ME)
Nunnelee	Runyan	Wolf				Dingell	Kelly	Pitts
Olson	Ryan (WI)	Womack				Doggett	Kildee	Platts
Palazzo	Schalise	Woodall				Dold	Kind	Poe (TX)
Paulsen	Schilling	Yoder				Donnelly (IN)	King (IA)	Polis
Pearce	Schmidt	Young (AK)				Doyle	King (NY)	Pompeo
Pence	Schock	Young (FL)				Dreier	Kingston	Posey
	Schweikert	Young (IN)				Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)	Price (GA)
	Scott, Austin					Duncan (SC)	Kissell	Price (NC)
						Duncan (TN)	Kliene	Quayle
						Edwards	Kucinich	Quigley
						Ellison	Labrador	Rahall
						Ellmers	Lamborn	Rangel
						Emerson	Lance	Reed
						Engel	Landry	Rehberg
						Eshoo	Langevin	Reichert
						Farenthold	Lankford	Renacci
						Farr	Larsen (WA)	Reyes
						Fattah	Larson (CT)	Ribble
						Filner	Latham	Richardson
						Fincher	LaTourette	Richmond
						Fitzpatrick	Latta	Rigell
						Flake	Lee (CA)	Rivera
						Fleischmann	Levin	Roby
						Fleming	Lewis (CA)	Roe (TN)
						Flores	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)
						Forbes	Lipinski	Rogers (KY)
						Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
						Fox	Loebach	Rohrabacher
						Frank (MA)	Long	Rokita
						Franks (AZ)	Lowey	Rooney
						Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen
						Fudge	Luetkemeyer	Roskam
						Garamendi	Lujan	Ross (AR)
						Gardner	Lummis	Ross (FL)
						Garrett	Lungren, Daniel E.	Rothman (NJ)
						Gerlach		Royal-Allard
						Gibbs	Lynch	Royce
						Gibson	Mack	Runyan
						Gingrey (GA)	Manzullo	Ruppersberger
						Gonzalez	Marchant	Rush
						Goodlatte	Marino	Ryan (OH)
						Gosar	Markey	Ryan (WI)
						Gowdy	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda T.
						Granger	Matsui	
						Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
						Graves (MO)	McCarthy (NY)	Sarbanes
						Green, Al	McCaul	Scalise
						Green, Gene	McClintock	Schakowsky
						Griffin (AR)	McCormack	Schiff
						Griffith (VA)	McCotter	Schilling
						Grimm	McDermott	Schmidt
						Guinta	McGovern	Schock
						Guthrie	McHenry	Schrader
						Gutierrez	McIntyre	Schwartz
						Hahn	McKeon	Schweikert
						Hall	McKinley	Scott (SC)
						Hanabusa	McMorris	Scott (VA)
						Hanna	Rodgers	Scott, Austin
						Harper	McNerney	Scott, David
						Harris	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
						Hartzler	Meeks	Serrano
						Hastings (FL)	Mica	Sessions
						Hastings (WA)	Michaud	Sewell
						Hayworth	Miller (FL)	Sherman
						Heck	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
						Heinrich	Miller (NC)	Shuler
						Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Shuster
						Herger	Miller, George	Simpson
						Herrera Beutler	Moore	Sires
						Higgins	Moran	Slaughter
						Himes	Mulvaney	Smith (NE)
						Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)	Smith (NJ)

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1825

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 against:

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, had I been able to attend today's floor proceedings, I would have voted "no" on S. 627—Speaker BOEHNER's Short Term Default Act.

SERGEANT JASON W. VAUGHN
POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2213) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Eastport Street in Iuka, Mississippi, as the "Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 678]

AYES—420

Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Canseco
Adams	Bishop (NY)	Cantor
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Capito
Akin	Black	Capps
Alexander	Blackburn	Capuano
Altmire	Blumenauer	Cardoza
Amash	Bonner	Carnahan
Andrews	Bono Mack	Carney
Austria	Boren	Carson (IN)
Bachmann	Boswell	Carter
Bachus	Boustany	Cassidy
Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Barrow	Brady (IA)	Chaffetz
Bartlett	Brooks	Chandler
Barton (TX)	Brown (GA)	Chu
Bass (CA)	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Bass (NH)	Buchanan	Clarke (MI)
Becerra	Buschon	Clarke (NY)
Benishek	Buerkle	Clay
Berg	Burgess	Cleaver
Berkley	Burton (IN)	Clyburn
Berman	Butterfield	Coble
Biggert	Calvert	Coffman (CO)
Bilbray	Camp	Cohen
Bilirakis	Campbell	Cole
Markey		
Matheson		
Matsui		
McCarthy (NY)		
McCaul		
McClintock		
McCormack		
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)		
Edwards		
Ellison		
Engel		
Eshoo		
Farr		
Fattah		
Filner		
Frank (MA)		
Garamendi		
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		
Edwards		
Ellison		
Engel		
Eshoo		
Farr		
Fattah		
Filner		
Fincher		
Fitzpatrick		
Flake		
Fleischmann		
Fleming		
Flores		
Forbes		
Fortenberry		
Fox		
Frank (MA)		
Franks (AZ)		
Frelinghuysen		
Fudge		
Garamendi		
Gardner		
Garrett		
Gerlach		
Gibbs		
Gibson		
Gingrey (GA)		
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		
Edwards		
Ellison		
Engel		
Eshoo		
Farr		
Fattah		
Filner		
Fincher		
Fitzpatrick		
Flake		
Fleischmann		
Fleming		
Flores		
Forbes		
Fortenberry		
Fox		
Frank (MA)		
Franks (AZ)		
Frelinghuysen		
Fudge		
Garamendi		
Gardner		
Garrett		
Gerlach		
Gibbs		
Gibson		
Gingrey (GA)		
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		
Edwards		
Ellison		
Engel		
Eshoo		
Farr		
Fattah		
Filner		
Fincher		
Fitzpatrick		
Flake		
Fleischmann		
Fleming		
Flores		
Forbes		
Fortenberry		
Fox		
Frank (MA)		
Franks (AZ)		
Frelinghuysen		
Fudge		
Garamendi		
Gardner		
Garrett		
Gerlach		
Gibbs		
Gibson		
Gingrey (GA)		
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		