

While those close to Sergeant Elwell have lost a husband, father, son, brother, and friend, America too has lost a hero. He served our Nation because he loved our Nation. His sister summed up his services perfectly when she said, "He did what he loved, so we could do the simple, everyday things that we take for granted." And although the grief of the family must be overwhelming, I hope that they're able to take a measure of solace in the gratitude of the Nation that Kenneth died defending.

Tonight his community will honor and remember him, but it is the duty of all of us here in Congress and across our grateful Nation to never forget his ultimate sacrifice and the family that he leaves behind.

COMMEMORATING LIBERIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize the rich history of Liberia as we mark Liberian Independence Day on July 26. We honor people of Liberia and those individuals of proud Liberian descent who are celebrating 164 years of independence.

Today we celebrate a great country, its people, their traditions, and the mark they have made on cities like Providence, Rhode Island, and others, making them great places to live, work, and raise families. Rhode Island's flourishing Liberian community has played an important role in making the State what it is today, and I would like to thank them for their great contributions. I am proud to honor your heritage and the difference you have made in our State and in this country.

Recently, along with my colleagues here in the Congress, I had the opportunity to welcome the President of the Republic of Liberia, Her Excellency Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, to Washington and confirmed our support for Liberian peace efforts. May we continue to be inspired to support the people of Liberia through their democratic tradition as we celebrate Liberian Independence Day.

IT'S TIME TO GET SERIOUS ABOUT THE DEFICIT

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, last night I had a town hall. Obviously I wasn't there; I had to be here. So we did it by way of Internet. And it was amazing how the consensus of those who were there was a request for those of us to take seriously our leadership responsibilities and do something about the fiscal mess we are in.

In answering them, I was thinking about what the President's bipartisan

deficit commission leaders said about the plan we passed here in the House. They called it a serious, honest, straightforward approach to addressing our Nation's enormous fiscal challenges. It sounds like that's the answer to the questions that were being asked last night by our constituents.

Interestingly enough, there is a poll out, rendering an opinion by the American people on the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill that we passed here in the House. Over 60 percent of the American people happen to think it's a good idea. Perhaps we ought to stop the name calling and look at what the American people are telling us to do and get serious, as the President's bipartisan deficit commission said, and come up with a serious, honest, straightforward approach to addressing our Nation's enormous fiscal challenge.

REPRESENTING MY CONSTITUENTS

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I am told on a daily basis by my Republican colleagues what the American people want. I certainly respect the election certificates of my colleagues. I would ask they respect mine. I also am not sure where they find the time to travel to these other districts to hear what is being said. My colleagues and my constituents are telling me we were sent here to make democracy work, to come up with a balanced approach, and take this country's fiscal responsibilities seriously.

The poll the gentleman just mentioned, in the CBS poll that came out yesterday, two-thirds of the American public want a balanced approach. That means a combination of cuts to revenues to balance our fiscal crisis. With that being said, we have a large number of Members who take pledges, pledges to not raise taxes, pledges to not ask oil companies to pay one penny more. The only pledge a Member of this House should ever make is when they raise their hand to serve the Constitution and this country.

I'm also told many times in this House what the intent of our Founding Fathers was. Now, while that's open for debate, there is one thing I'm certainly positive about: When our Founders gathered together, they created a government, not a Wall Street bank.

□ 0910

AN EQUITABLE SOLUTION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. In December the President caved to the Republicans and extended all the Bush tax cuts, immediately increasing this year's deficit by \$400 billion and the 10-year deficit by \$4

trillion, precipitating the great debt and deficit crisis.

Now we're hearing from the press today that the President is preparing yet another great cave. Instead of saying we will have some revenues to solve this problem, he is apparently about to cut a deal that will be all cuts.

So it's ironic. He cuts taxes to create a crisis, and then we cut spending to protect the tax cuts because tax cuts create jobs, except they haven't created jobs, but we've got to continue to protect them. It's all very, very sad.

If we get rid of all the Bush tax cuts—\$4 trillion—no cuts in Social Security, no cuts in Medicare, no cuts in veterans benefits, and \$4 trillion less in deficits, now, that would be an equitable solution.

TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, in the 5 years leading up to the economic collapse in 2008, 67 percent of the new wealth that was created in this Nation accumulated in the hands of the richest 1 percent. They now control about two-fifths of all the money in this Nation. But our Republican friends block them out of their line of sight when they look to see who can pay for our mounting deficit. They see only Social Security recipients and Medicare recipients, the disabled and the hungry.

It was bad enough that we were crazy enough as a Nation to fight two trillion-dollar wars while cutting taxes for the wealthy at the same time. Now Republicans are asking only the most vulnerable to help pay for it and threatening to collapse the world's economy by defaulting on American debt at the same time.

I won't stand for it, Madam Speaker, and my constituents won't either. Social Security and Medicare recipients didn't get us into two mismanaged wars. They didn't get the benefit of the Bush tax cuts, and they shouldn't have to pay for it.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2551, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 359 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in

the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2551.

□ 0913

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 21, 2011, amendment No. 11 printed in the House Report 112-173 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 21, 2011, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 112-173.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 211. There is appropriated, for salaries and expenses of the Office of Technology Assessment as authorized by the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (2 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), hereby derived from the amount provided in this Act for the payment to the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund \$2,500,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 359, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, for 23 years, Congress had the benefit of a really excellent organization, the Office of Technology Assessment. The OTA helped Congress look at the policy implications of new technologies. Then 16 years ago, OTA was defunded. When Congress turned out the lights, they argued that other organizations would provide what OTA did—think tanks, academies, universities.

We now have 16 years of evidence that we have not gotten from these other sources what we got from OTA. We need OTA now more than ever, and my amendment would shift a mere \$2.5 million into OTA to breathe life back into this important agency that had a great record of improving congressional decisionmaking, preventing tax dollar waste, and generally improving the debate on many policy issues.

OTA is still on the books; it was simply defunded and, with this amendment, can be funded again. The money comes from a well-funded, little used trust fund for Capitol building revitalization.

The OTA produced thorough, balanced nonpartisan studies on a huge variety of policy-relevant subjects. Listen to some of the reports, all produced by OTA in the years before it was defunded 16 years ago:

Adverse Reaction to Vaccines, Retiring Old Cars to Save Gasoline and Reduce Emissions, Environmental Impact of Bioenergy Crop Production, Testing in Schools, Treatment of Alzheimer's Disease.

Think about it; these studies, a few of the many on issues of great concern to us today, were written before 1995. The OTA was the best tool Congress has had to deal with our inability to look forward, to recognize and comprehend trends, to find perspective in problem solving—in other words, our congressional attention deficit disorder.

Sixteen years ago, Congress hoped to save money by cutting OTA, and, in the process, we lost one of our best opportunities to save money by avoiding costly mistakes. It is documented that OTA saved taxpayers several hundred million dollars by understanding the best IT system for use by the Social Security Administration, millions of dollars of savings through better Agent Orange programs, billions of dollars by avoiding a poorly constructed Synfuels Corporation.

Now, not every OTA project found favor with everyone. Some in Congress did not like to hear OTA call into question some of the extravagant claims of the missile defense contractors. But history shows OTA was right, and the missile defense folks at the Pentagon have spent a decade working around the problems uncovered.

Some in Congress complained that OTA reports did not have the quick turnaround of, say, CRS, but that is just the point. OTA is the antidote to the myopia that comes from our very short attention cycle.

OTA never advocated policy solutions; it didn't play politics. These are our jobs, but we need help. OTA was of Congress and for Congress. They knew our language and our decisionmaking framework. That's why our organizations never really filled the void created by the defunding of OTA.

If we had a functioning OTA in recent years, I think there's little doubt that we could have been more aware of and better prepared to deal with looming shortages of vaccines, to incorporate new designs for flood control levees, to extend high quality medical care to rural regions, to employee effective techniques for oil spill cleanup, or to reduce the risks of cell phone hacking, to name just a few issues of current interest.

The Office of Technology Assistance is not, and never was, a panacea. However, it is the best institutional tool we have had to recognize the policy implications of technology trends, to digest arguments involving technology, to expose some of our own blind spots—in other words, to illuminate and inform our legislating.

We in Congress have not distinguished ourselves in recognizing and comprehending trends and implications of technology. Now, most of our colleagues here in this body do not know OTA ever existed. Most Members do not miss it. This shows, I think, just how badly we need it. Always the first step in dealing with a shortcoming is acknowledging that we have it. We badly need OTA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0920

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate very much the gentleman from New Jersey's passion for this program. He mentioned that they turned out the lights in 1996, some 15 years ago, and I can't help but wonder why the lights haven't been turned on in the last 15 years.

I talked to the gentleman yesterday, and I didn't know much about the OTA, but I couldn't help but wonder why, in the midst of the financial mess that we find our country in, he would pick this time to try to resuscitate a program that has lay sleeping for 15 years. I don't know whether he has tried every year to resuscitate this program and nobody was listening. I hope he has tried before. There were probably times when money was more plentiful and he might have had a better chance of bringing back a new program, a little more government, but I think this is just bad timing.

I told him that if he wants to continue to try to educate the Members and tell them what a wonderful program this was up until 1996, there may be some day that it would be resuscitated. But the Members should know that in 2008 we gave \$2.5 million to the Government Accountability Office to do these kind of technological assessments, and they've been doing that for the last 4 years.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. In answer to your two questions, the first is, as I said, the fact that this body doesn't know that it lacks OTA is the strongest argument of how badly we need it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, reclaiming my time, if this was simply a question of education, I hope the gentleman has been working diligently for the past few years as hard as he worked for the last 24 hours to make people aware and to crank this thing back up. But again, this is the wrong time to try to start a new government program.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. As for the funding, there is an offset from a little-used fund, a

trust fund for building revitalization that is unlikely to be spent in the coming year.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Reclaiming my time, that's an interesting question too. I appreciate that question. And that \$30 million is there to use to make sure that we protect the health and safety of people in our buildings here.

So I understand it won't cost any more money, but it's just a brand-new Federal program that I think is not a good time to be trying to do that. Again, if you've been trying to do that for the last 15 years and no one has been listening, then it must not be all that great a program. But once again, I appreciate your being a champion of that, and maybe someday it will come back to life.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chair, to answer the question about whether it's a new program, it isn't. It was defunded back in '96.

Since 2008, through GAO, we have been trying to fund it through their end and build it up since then, but still a lot of folks didn't understand that this body really does need the kind of technological development in the public and private sector and harness outside experiences in the form of advisory panels and peer review, something that GAO and CRS cannot do, and we can do it through this program.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I would just simply say, as I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this, again, I thank the gentleman for bringing it to our attention. It seems strange that it hasn't been funded for the last 15 years. I think this is not the year to crank it back up, resuscitate it. I think we have plenty of bipartisan research that's available to the Members. And maybe there are some private and non-private corporations, big foundations that might want to do this on a voluntarily basis. But again, I urge a negative vote.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, I want to speak about an amendment Mr. MORAN is about to offer. This is about the use of Styrofoam in our cafeterias. You may remember that in 2007, then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI established the Greening the Capitol program, and the goal was to make the U.S. House of Representatives a national leader in resource stewardship and sustainable business practices, and we made significant progress.

One of the places where we made progress was we replaced the Styrofoam in the cafeteria and used recyclable dishware. We are now back to Styrofoam. McDonalds doesn't use Styrofoam. Years ago, McDonalds and other fast food restaurants replaced Styrofoam with recyclable paperboard containers. There is no reason we can't do that. There is no reason we shouldn't do it.

Polystyrene is practically unrecyclable. Most polystyrene containers end up in landfills and incinerators. There are cancer-causing chemicals that are used during its manufacture. In 1986, the EPA report on solid waste named polystyrene manufacturing the fifth largest creator of hazardous waste.

We should adopt the Moran amendment and do it the right way.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 21, 2011, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 112-173.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR
POLYSTYRENE CONTAINERS

SEC. 211. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to obtain polystyrene containers for use in food service facilities of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 359, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, at the beginning of the year, the House did away with the composting program that had been part of the Green the Capitol Initiative. It has been a success. People around the country were watching it and in fact following the example that we set. But at the beginning of the year, as I say, the House of

Representatives instituted the use of polystyrene containers instead of clean, biodegradable material.

My amendment would limit the use of funds made available by this Legislative Branch appropriations bill to obtain polystyrene products in our food service facilities. We should show our commitment to the health of our visitors and our employees and to the future of our environment. We should lead by example. That's the program that we had in place until this January.

The House should be using recyclable and biodegradable products and should be avoiding polystyrene foam packaging. We should be a model institution for others to follow. As the gentleman from Vermont said, over 20 years ago, McDonalds and other fast food restaurants replaced polystyrene foam with recyclable and paperboard containers. Making that our standard is the least we can do.

The House of Representatives is the only member of the Capitol Complex to revert to foam packaging. Neither the Senate, the Library of Congress, nor the Capitol Visitors Center food service centers use polystyrene products. Congress should be setting the standard for sustainability in the 21st century. We should be leading by example.

And my amendment provides a way through which we can show that leadership to the thousands of constituents who visit our offices each year.

Polystyrene is practically unrecyclable. Most polystyrene containers end up in landfills or incinerators; and problems with polystyrene include cancerous chemicals that are used during its manufacture, minimal recyclability, enormous bulk during disposal, and toxic byproducts that are released during incineration.

A 1986 EPA report on solid waste named the polystyrene manufacturing process the fifth largest creator of hazardous waste, and toxic chemicals leak out of these containers into the food and drink they contain and endanger the human health and reproductive systems of the people who visit the Capitol and who work in the Capitol.

□ 0930

105 Members have sent a letter to House leadership asking that they eliminate polystyrene from House food service operations. My amendment would do just that by limiting the funds made available in this act from being used to obtain polystyrene containers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute simply to give you three good reasons why we should defeat this amendment.

Number one, it really doesn't do anything because we don't spend any

money in this bill for House restaurant services. They are funded through a revolving trust fund, and that money comes from another source. So it wouldn't have any impact in the first place.

Number two, if it did have any impact, all it would do is raise the cost of everything in the restaurants, which would be passed on to the folks. That's not a great thing, to spend more money.

Number three, my last good reason, the gentleman mentioned that this year there was a bipartisan letter from the chairman of the House Administration Committee along with the ranking member to say we tried this program and we're going to end it.

So for those three reasons, I think it is appropriate to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, with regard to the argument that the gentlemen makes, first of all it seems to me that we should set ourselves on record, and the appropriations bill is the ultimate source of funding for the Capitol complex. But the argument that this will save money it seems to me is deficient when we are talking about human health. I mean, we could choose not to spend money on purifying our water. We'd save a lot of money. Just let people drink out of the tap or get their water wherever. But we feel that the health of our employees and our constituents who visit us is important enough that we should spend that extra money.

Science is telling us that, in fact, toxics leak from this material into the food and the drink that our employees and our constituents are using. We may not be as fully aware of that, but we know that polystyrene is a toxic material. It seems to me we should err on the side of caution, particularly when the health of our employees and our constituents is concerned.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, Chairman LUNGREN, the chairman of the House Administration Committee and the author of the letter that ended the program in January.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just reiterate, this came to my attention as chairman of the House Administration Committee when we received a letter from the Democratic side of the aisle as part of the transition team recommending that we discontinue this part of the greening initiative process, Greening the Capitol process; that is, this one did not work. It was a Democrat who told us we ought to get rid of it.

So once I heard that, I also heard complaints from both Democratic and Republican Members of the House and their staffs that the recyclable utensils we had didn't work—didn't work—and they asked for something that did work. And so we cancelled the program.

This idea about Styrofoam being a real health hazard, Linda Birnbaum, who is the toxicologist who heads the government agency that declared styrene a likely cancer risk, said this: Let me put your mind at ease right away about Styrofoam. In finished products, certainly styrene is not an issue.

The gentleman has said, and the other gentleman from Vermont said, that we ought to follow McDonald's. They no longer have this product. Well, yesterday my staff went out and got this product from McDonald's, which is Styrofoam; and got this product from McDonald's, which is Styrofoam; and got this product from McDonald's, which is Styrofoam. So I don't know where they get this information.

Lastly, they should understand that polystyrene is approved as safe for use in food service by the FDA. Anything that contains food product that comes into contact with individuals must be approved by the FDA. This is approved by the FDA.

Also, this week we are receiving bids back from our request for proposal on trying to get a waste energy recycling program to get rid of the waste that we have here on the Hill. This is to turn it into energy by way of heat energy and capture any of the offensive by-products that may be produced. This is what we are doing.

Look, you can have good science and you can have bad science. You can have smart science and you can have dumb science. You can have science or you can have no science. Now, I'm not sure which of the latter categories this proposal falls into, but it's not science. Science suggests that this is something that ought to be appropriate.

There are any number of producers of polystyrene in Members' districts around this country. There are 2,100 users of it. This amounts to billions of dollars and thousands of jobs, tens of thousands of jobs, 8,000 just in California alone.

So once again, we are using bad science to scare people. And what's the impact? It's going to cost more money. I approved of this program because it saves a half a million dollars in a single year—half a million dollars. It will save energy, and we will have literally no residue when we move from waste to energy production. It's a win/win/win situation.

By the way, members of our staffs have thanked me for doing this. They now have utensils that actually are usable.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, first of all, the letter that was sent did not request polystyrene products by any means. It was referring to another product that was corn based. Certainly Mr. BRADY was not recommending dangerous Styrofoam material.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, before I came here to Congress, I was in the restaurant business. We had to please the customers that we served. We certainly couldn't give them an inferior product. Only in Washington, D.C., would we spend more and get less. The gentleman from California has referenced \$500,000 a year more in cost, and if you did a survey of the people who used those products, it would be dismal.

I had the experience of putting a fork in a hot piece of meat one day, and it melted. That is ridiculous. We in Congress should not give inferior products to people who work here and serve here, and spend more money for it.

So with that, Madam Chairman, let's just do the commonsense thing here and get a product that works and spend less money.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BIGGERT, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1383. An act to temporarily preserve higher rates for tuition and fees for programs of education at non-public institutions of higher learning pursued by individuals enrolled in the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs before the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvements Act of 2010, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.