

waiting for their checks. Retirees are waiting for their checks. And we stand here on the brink of default.

I would ask the President of the United States to exercise whatever authority is necessary to pay our seniors their Social Security benefits and to meet the obligations of the United States.

It's time for us to do our job. It's time for this majority to compromise. It's time for us to lead.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) at 2 p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF S. 627, BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-187) on the resolution (H. Res. 383) providing for further consideration of the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 382 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 382

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of August 2, 2011.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 382 waives the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported by the Rules Committee. This would allow for the same-day consideration of any resolution reported through the legislative day of August 2, 2011. This rule will ensure that Congress has the necessary tools to pass a bill that ensures we cut spending without defaulting on our national debt.

Madam Speaker, today you will hear my friends the Democrats argue about a closed process, but you will not hear them discuss the unprecedented spending spree that my friends the Democrats on the other side of the aisle went through for the last two Congresses. We will discuss how Republicans continue to come up with thoughtful solutions—and I add, balanced, thoughtful solutions—to our Nation's economic troubles, what we think will, and what has up to now, only failed in the Senate. We will talk about the magnitude of this vote and the importance of reaching an agreement before Tuesday. Madam Speaker, it is time to stop pontificating and start acting like Members of Congress. The Nation calls for a solution, and Republicans are the only ones to offer solutions in legislation, in debate on the floor, and with actual votes.

My friends on the other side of the aisle will go on and on today about how Republicans are closing the process and shutting out Members of Congress, when we're really here providing for the flexibility for the Speaker of the House to simply work with the Senate to ensure a solution to the looming debt crisis deadline is met so that we will not default on our obligations. If my Democrat colleagues were serious about finding solutions to this problem, they would vote in favor of this rule today.

The facts of the case are clear: The chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California, DAVID DREIER, has issued more open rules in the last month than Congress has seen over the last two Congresses—or for a total of 4 years combined. Additionally, in the 111th Congress, under the leadership of NANCY PELOSI and the chairman of the Rules Committee at the time, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, 26 same-day rules were reported out of the Rules Committee. And in the previous Congress, the 110th Congress, under the same leadership, 17 same-day rules were reported out by the Rules Committee. In comparison, the process regarding these rules in this Congress is a far cry from the previous Democrat leadership's unorthodox and unprecedented closed processes.

I rise today in support of this rule. This rule is essential to allow the

House of Representatives the flexibility it needs to ensure the safety and soundness of our country's economic future. Over the past 4 years we've seen record debt and deficits, which have brought us to the crossroad that we face with the looming August 2 deadline for raising the debt ceiling. Americans continue to speak out loudly and clear. And just as they did last November, they are saying it is time to stop the out-of-control spending, wasteful Washington spending, and excessive government. Republicans have cut spending at every opportunity in this Congress, and we are hoping to do that again today.

Discretionary and mandatory spending at Federal levels are on unsustainable paths. In the last 2 years of Democrat control, Congress has approved and the President has signed into law an 84 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending, and the President's budget proposes to freeze discretionary spending at these inflated levels. America can no longer support or afford this kind of leadership.

The President's proposed FY 2012 budget also doubles, then triples the Federal deficit over the next 10 years. And while increasing taxes on the Nation's job creators by \$1.6 trillion sounds like a good deal to the President, in fact, free enterprise system employers and American workers know otherwise. Additionally, the President's budget makes no substantial effort to address the unsustainable rate of entitlement spending, one of the major aims of the President's own fiscal commission, which he has ignored. Obviously, the President has no intention of cutting spending or reining in Big Government programs. Big Government, more taxes, more regulations are directly in the President's strike zone. And that is the process he intends to challenge Congress to come right along with him on and keep marching toward the cliff.

Madam Speaker, we're at the end of the road. Once again today, Republicans are saying, We are going to have to make tough choices. That's why we came to Congress. And the majority party will continue to do that today. Over the past 7 months, Republican leadership has been steadfast in their support for cutting spending and getting control of our record deficit and debt. The House passed H.R. 1, a continuing resolution that brought back spending levels to 2008 levels, cutting \$100 billion in 1 year. In April, this House passed a budget that would cut \$6.2 trillion in government spending over the next decade compared to the President's budget. Just last week, this body passed Cut, Cap, and Balance, which would limit discretionary spending, cap spending to a lower percentage of GDP, and lead to a Balanced Budget Act, so Congress could no longer write checks that they can't cash without passing the debt on by asking foreign governments and others to make up the difference for us.

Republicans are willing to pay the balance if the President is willing to cut up the credit card. And that is why we are here also today. Republicans have again and again in the House offered commonsense solutions to rein in spending and cut down our debt. My friends on the other side of the aisle continue to reject every single proposal. So, one might ask, What is their solution? What have they have offered this Nation to spur economic growth and to put Americans back to work, we would ask. So, let me tell you. By raising taxes. By raising taxes on individuals, on small businesses, and corporations alike. This is no wonder why we see stagnant job growth, GDP that lags behind, and high employment rates—and that means we cannot meet the needs of this country.

□ 1410

Even when the increase in taxes hurts our economic recovery, slows job growth and places more uncertainty in the marketplace, our friends the Democrats continue to argue for more spending and more taxation.

President Obama has asked Congress for an increase in the debt ceiling, and my Republican colleagues and I refuse to grant that request without a commitment to long-term spending cuts. We reject President Obama's insistence for a blank check to pay the credit card bills that he has run up over the past 2½ years. President Obama's unwillingness to address the true drivers of our debt assured me and my party that we cannot achieve a true solution to the debt crisis we are facing today unless we're able to make tough decisions.

The Budget Control Act we discussed yesterday and what we will discuss today is a step in the right direction. It accomplishes what Republicans and the American people have been asking for since the beginning of this process. It will reduce spending more than we increase the debt limit, it imposes no new taxes on anyone, and it guarantees to Americans that the House and the Senate will vote in the next 6 months on the only permanent solution to our debt crisis.

Yes, Madam Speaker, the Republicans are here on the floor again working on behalf not only of employers and employees but the middle class of this country, those of us who are concerned about where we are headed. There is nothing in this resolution that should cause anyone to worry about losing Social Security or Medicare. That is not even intended in this process. What is is to solve the spending and the debt crisis that we have in this country.

I encourage a "yes" vote on this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I have a point of personal privilege. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

We on the Rules Committee and as Members of Congress rely on the hard work of our staff people, particularly

on Rules Committee, working into the wee hours of the night, last night being an example, until 11:30. After 3 years of tremendous service, my Rules associate, Rosalyn Kumar, has accepted another position in the Senate, and I just want to express my appreciation for her hard work.

She hails from the city of Dallas, Texas, and her hometown Representative is my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS.

I'd like to yield for a moment to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Rosalyn, congratulations. I am going to miss you. It is a good day for you; it's a bad day for us. It is with regular occurrence that I look over at you. You have a bright, smiling face. You have the enthusiasm not only of a bright, young professional staffer on the Rules Committee, but I think you will be a true asset to Senator STABENOW, as you take the experiences from a body that does a lot of work to a body that needs to do more work, and I wish you the very best.

If I could, I would also like to tell the gentleman that Jenny Gorski, who is behind me, a professional staff member of the Rules Committee, will also be leaving. I have found out, after this process. She will be going to Congressman DOC HASTINGS' office to be his adult supervision. So we're taking two Rules Committee professional staff members who will aid and help other Members in their betterment.

I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to be perfectly clear about what we're talking about here today. From the moment Speaker BOEHNER walked away from the negotiating table last Friday to the opening bell of the stock markets this morning, shareholders in U.S. stocks, American retirees, investors, our middle class have lost \$405 billion based on Third Way's analysis of data from the Standard and Poor's 500 Index, and Americans stand to lose more if we fail to resolve this crisis.

Third Way has put together a comparison between the interest rate paid on sovereign debt between AAA and AA nations. This is why credit is important. People understand that. Depending on your credit rating, you pay a different rate on your home mortgage. You might have different financing opportunities on your credit card. If America misses a debt payment, the rating agencies have let us know that it likely will result in a downgrade from AAA status to AA status.

I would also point out that this current bill before us would likely lead to that as well because it only contains a short-term, a 6-month renewal of our debt ceiling. Having watched the dysfunction of Congress over the last few weeks, the global investment commu-

nity, those who loan us money, will say the last thing we need to do is put ourselves through this again in 6 months to ensure stability.

Countries that have AAA ratings have an average 10-year bond rate of 2.98 percent. Countries that have AA have an average bond rating of 3.75 percent. So, three-quarters of a percent difference. What does that mean? It means three-quarters of a percent on your variable rate home mortgage; it means three-quarters of a percent on your automobile; and, yes, it means more government expenditures, bigger government expenditures, just to cover the debt that we already have. In fact, that difference, that 0.75 percent difference over the next 10 years, will cost taxpayers, in additional interest payments, over \$1 trillion.

So here we are with a bill that cuts spending, cuts \$915 billion of spending, but, because it will likely lead to a downgrade, will cost over a trillion. The bill before us today will increase the deficit by over \$100 billion. At a time of record deficits when we all know we need to enforce fiscal discipline, the last thing we need is an irresponsible bill to increase the deficit by \$100 billion, which is what we have before us today.

Now, if we had this bill before us 2 weeks ago or 3 weeks ago, I would still oppose it—increasing the deficit is the last thing we need to do now—but it would have been an interesting discussion. It would have been maneuvering and politics and all this stuff that this body does too much of in posturing, in my opinion. But here we are 3½ days from the debt ceiling expiring, and the gentleman from Texas and the chairman of our Rules Committee and many others have said, We want to. We know we need to do this. We know we need to do this.

If we know we need to do this, why are we doing this 3½ days before the expiration of the debt ceiling? Why are we potentially passing a bill that will increase the Federal deficit? that will almost certainly lead to a downgrade? that the Senate has said they will kill? that the President has said he will veto?

I understand that the plan was to pass this bill last night. I understand that the majority party was short of a few votes. That would have been yet another window of opportunity for this Speaker, who has had many, to negotiate a real solution, to be the statesman, to work with the President and the Senate to come up with a bipartisan package to increase the debt ceiling, cut spending, decrease the deficit.

The President has talked about decreasing the deficit by \$4 trillion. Instead, we have a force of bill that's likely to increase the deficit by \$100 billion—the last thing we need from Congress at this juncture in time. Three-and-a-half days is how long we have to get this right.

I ask you, Madam Speaker, is this the step we need to take towards that

outcome, passing yet another ideological bill that will cost taxpayers \$100 billion and cost middle class families another percentage point on all the debt that they have?

Madam Speaker, there is a route out of this, and the route out of this does not involve the majority party trying to pull back the four or five or six people that they need over there. The path out of this is the Speaker engaging us, engaging all Members of this Chamber, engaging the President of the United States, who has to sign this at the end of the day, engaging the Senate majority leader and the Senate minority leader, to go back to that table that Speaker BOEHNER walked out on last Friday, to negotiate a real solution to the deficit crisis and the spending crisis that has gripped this country, that could very well lead to a downgrade and increased deficit spending unless we get our arms around it.

□ 1420

Look, I think many on my side of the aisle are open to a compromise. President Obama, himself, has called for a compromise, and I know my office and the offices of many other Members of Congress have received hundreds of calls from constituents who echo that desire to reach a solution on this. I fear that the step before us today is yet another example of the dysfunction of this institution under this leadership, but it's not too late.

I call upon the Speaker to move away from this direction and get back to the negotiating table to establish a real solution: to reduce the deficit, retain our Nation's good credit and faith in our system and show that this institution—the institution of the House of Representatives and the institution of Congress—can work and do what's right for our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to a brand new member of the Rules Committee, one of our 87 new Republican freshmen, the gentleman from Lawrenceville, Georgia, Congressman WOODALL.

Mr. WOODALL. I very much thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

It's true. I'm one of the new guys there on the Rules Committee, one of the new guys here in this Congress; and because I haven't been watching this process go on quite this closely before, I'm prepared to answer the questions today of "Why are we here?" and "Why are we here doing this?"

Now, for folks who don't watch the process, who haven't watched it like I have, this rule that we're working on today is to say that you can bring up a bill in the Rules Committee and then bring that bill to the floor on the very same day. That's unusual because regular order in this body says, if you bring something up, let's let it sit overnight so that everybody has a chance to look at it, and we'll bring it up the next day. I'm a big proponent of reg-

ular order. I believe we get the best work product out of this body when we work through regular order, and we've done that time and time and time again in this Congress, and we'll do it time and time again in the future.

But today we're faced with a predicament where August 2 is looming on the horizon.

Now, it's Friday. For folks who don't know, we're not going home tonight after work. Don't worry, Madam Speaker. As you know, this House is going to be in full swing tonight, tomorrow morning, tomorrow night, on Sunday, on Monday to get America through this challenge; but my White House, my President, tells me that August 2 is the day by which we must pass a bill, and here we are at the last hour to make that happen.

Now, why are we at the last hour? That was a question my friend from Colorado asked, and I have the answer: because we didn't actually start this process today. We didn't start it last night in the Rules Committee. We started this process back in February with H.R. 1, a bill to fund the government all the way through October 1 of this year.

It was an open rule. For the first time in the history of this House of Representatives, it was an open rule on a continuing resolution. It took us 5 days, going day and night—24 hours a day at the end—to get that bill discussed fully, because we all had input on that process; we all had things that we wanted to add. This House passed that bill. It went across to our friends in the Senate, and they did nothing.

We had another shot at this in April when we worked through the budget process. That budget process, as you know, Madam Speaker, is supposed to take us through 10 years—10 years. We asked every Member of this House of Representatives to bring their ideas to the floor. The Rules Committee, in its wisdom, made every single budget that any Member of this House offered available as a bill on the floor to consider, and we debated them all. There were some that raised taxes by \$10 trillion. There were others that cut spending by \$10 trillion and all in between. We debated them all, and the House decided on one: the House budget in April of this year. We sent it to the Senate, and they did nothing. In fairness, they did defeat that bill we sent to them. They defeated ours. We only got 40 votes on ours, which was better than when they worked on the President's budget over there—he got zero votes on his. So they're good at defeating things, but they didn't pass anything at all.

That's the partnership we have to have. I say to my friend from Colorado that I'm so proud of our partnership in the Rules Committee and, really, of our partnership beyond the Rules Committee, too, on some of the issues that we work on here. If we could develop the kind of partnership with our friends in the Senate that we've been

able to develop between ourselves here on the House side, it would be a completely different situation here in Washington, D.C.

But even as part of that raucous freshman class that folks read about in the newspaper, I don't have the ability to control what goes on in the United States Senate. All I have the ability to do is to come down here and participate in our process, which in February produced H.R. 1, which could have averted this crisis today; in April produced the House budget, which could have averted this crisis today; and last week produced Cut, Cap, and Balance—which was sent to the Senate and they did nothing—which could have averted this crisis yet again.

In light of all of those failures of action in the Senate, we are forced to come here today. We don't have overnight to lay a bill over. We don't have 72 hours to lay a bill over. We only have 72 hours until my President tells me D-day arrives for our financial markets. So we're here supporting this rule for same-day consideration so that we can do whatever it takes to get the job done.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. I very much thank the gentleman from Texas.

We're going to do whatever it takes to get the job done, but there is a teaching moment in this process, Madam Speaker. Maybe it's obvious to some of the senior Members. Again, I'm one of the new guys—only 7 months on the job here in Congress—but what I've noticed this week is this:

Last night, we tried to bring up a bill. Now, it was a bill that our Speaker and the majority leader of the Senate negotiated over last weekend. We thought bringing that bill to the floor would be that compromise, and I promise you it was a compromise because it was not what I wanted to bring to the floor of this House. We thought that compromise would be the solution to get America out of this situation.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. The majority leader in the Senate has never at any time expressed support for this bill and actually opposes this bill.

I would ask the gentleman to clarify that.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend.

There is a lot of conversation in this town, but I maintain that this was the topic of discussion and agreement between the Speaker and the majority leader last week. Absolutely, the majority leader has walked away from that agreement since then, and I don't dispute that; but here's the thing:

We had this agreement on the floor of the House last night, and we couldn't find one Democrat vote in favor of it. Fair enough. Folks ought to vote their

consciences; they ought to do what they need to do. We couldn't find one Democrat vote in favor of it, and we've come back with a new bill today that moves us to the right. Now, as someone who comes from one of the most conservative districts in the country, I think that's fantastic. More moving to the right. Let's keep on moving. There's a lot more space over there. Let's move some more over to the right.

But I say to my friends on the left as we try to get through a crisis, a national crisis, that we only needed a few votes from you last night, and then this would have been a bipartisan bill. Instead, we're back down here today.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding.

Here we go again, my friends. Here we go again wasting another day of debate on a proposal that is more of a press release than a plan. News broke this morning that, from the moment Speaker BOEHNER walked away from the table last Friday to the opening bell this morning, shareholders in United States stocks lost over \$400 billion.

My colleagues have been unwilling, not unable, to reach compromise in this Chamber. They have been unwilling, not unable, to tell extremists that while they write their press releases and shake their fists, the rest of us must get down to governing. They have been unwilling, not unable, to let us vote on a balanced plan; and that choice, for it was a choice, cost the American economy almost as much in 5 business days as my Republican colleagues are trying to cut from the budget in 5 years. They're using a manufactured crisis to make the problem worse.

So here we are again. My Republican colleagues have wasted another 24 hours making a bad plan worse, a plan that is based on the same tired policies that got us into this mess: cut taxes for millionaires; give kickbacks to special interests; pay for it all with cuts to the middle class, including Medicare and Social Security.

□ 1430

If they try to tell you that these cuts are not in this bill, ask them to sign a pledge that this legislation will not be used to cut benefits for seniors in the next 12 months. They won't.

After my Republican colleagues pulled their bill from the floor last night, they went back to the negotiating table. But with whom? The Senate? No. The President? Surely not. No, they went back behind closed doors to negotiate with themselves to run further to the right at the behest of the most ideologically entrenched members of their caucus. This may be good politics, but it's not good government.

I'm tired of it, my constituents are tired of it, anyone who's watched the

nightly news for the last 6 months is tired of it.

Washington loves to kick the can down the road. That's how we got here in the first place. This is our moment. We need a plan, not another Republican manifesto, and there are better plans out there.

So, again, I ask my Republican colleagues, let us vote on a plan that has a chance.

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

Mr. POLIS. Again, my colleague from Georgia mentioned that there are no Democrats behind this initiative. Again, Democrats were not consulted or talked to to ask for their support or input into this initiative. And you won't find much support for a proposal that would increase the deficit by \$100 billion over 10 years.

The Democrats and our Democratic plan are seeking to decrease the deficit by trillions of dollars over that same period rather than increase it by \$100 billion as the Republican plan does.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed martial law rule.

Today is a sad, sad day. In just a few days, the process in this House has completely devolved. It's shameful. We've gone from open rules to closed rules to same-day martial law rule all because a few extreme Members of the House refuse to do the right thing.

The rule today paves the way for a bill today that is even a worse bill than the one the Republicans were forced to pull from the floor yesterday. That's not coming together, Madam Speaker. It's pushing us further and further apart.

These last few days have not been about trying to find a united solution. These last few days and last few weeks have been about trying to unite the House Republicans. It has been wasted opportunities.

For weeks and weeks and weeks my Republican friends have walked away from a balanced, fair, and bipartisan approach allowing the United States to pay its bills. They've walked away from a balanced, fair, and bipartisan approach to addressing the Nation's long-term fiscal challenges. Democrats have been willing over and over and over again to move forward on such an approach.

To be honest, I'm not thrilled with some of the things that President Obama has put on the table. But I'm willing to consider them in order to get past this crisis. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership of this House is unwilling to meet us halfway. They're not even willing to meet us a tenth of the way.

All we're asking for, and I think all the American people are asking for, is a balanced approach. All we're asking for is for everyone to chip in to solve this problem.

I'll say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, if you're going to ask seniors to pay more for their Medicare, if you're going to cut vital investments in education, transportation, medical research, and other programs, then the least you can do is ask the various wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share.

How in the world can my friends on the other side of the aisle justify slashing Medicare while they refuse to ask Big Oil and gas companies or corporate jet owners or hedge fund managers to give up their unnecessary and unjustified taxpayer subsidies. But that's their position, Madam Speaker, not asking billionaires to pay a little bit more but asking middle class families to pay a lot more. It's reckless, it's wrong, it's unfair. And I for one will not go along with it.

My friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) says we have to make tough choices. I agree, we have to make tough choices. But why do you always have to be tough on working families or on poor people or on senior citizens? They didn't create this economic crisis.

We're in this mess because of unpaid-for tax cuts, mostly for wealthy people; we're in this mess because of two wars that are not paid for that are on our credit card; we're in this mess because of a prescription drug bill that wasn't paid for.

I would say to my colleagues, enough of the press releases, enough of the theatrics, enough of the political stunts.

I urge you to reject this martial law rule and get back to the negotiating table and avert an economic crisis.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAULO).

Ms. DELAULO. We are now 4 days away from an historic, unprecedented, and needless default that could grind this economy to a halt. And yet, even as they show their disarray to the entire world, this House Republican majority is continuing to hold our Nation hostage to press their radical agenda. Worse, there's only 4 days to go. They're moving in the wrong direction.

The Speaker should have taken yesterday's rebuke by his own party as a clear indication that he needs to go back to the drawing board and pass a debt ceiling increase that both parties can sign on to.

Instead, he and the Republican majority have doubled down on ideology and dangerous brinksmanship requiring that a balanced budget constitutional amendment—a total non-starter—that would threaten Medicare and Social Security be sent to the States before a second debt ceiling increase is approved. This ensures another Republican-created crisis in only a few short months.

This bill slashes \$917 billion from critical public investments: education, infrastructure, research, law enforcement, food safety. And even though the

spending on these programs is less than what it was under the Reagan and the first Bush administration, in fact members of the majority even balked at \$17 billion in Pell Grant funding in the bill because to some of them helping Americans go to college is "the welfare of the 21st century."

We know the deficits have grown because revenues are lower than they've been in the last 60 years thanks to the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy and the two wars that have been put on the Nation's credit card.

With 14 million unemployed, we should be focused on creating jobs, putting Americans back to work. It's time for the majority to quit playing political games, start acting responsibly with the stewardship of our economy.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. Start to work on what the American people need most right now—that's jobs.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted that the gentlewoman comes down and talks about this game that's going on about jobs.

I am going to read from an article that I will insert into the RECORD regarding information on tax hikes and what that does to American jobs:

"This past January, Illinois Governor Pat Quinn signed into law a 67 percent increase in the State personal income tax rate and a 45 percent increase in the State corporate tax rate. Between its passage then and June, Illinois lost 56,223 jobs.

"To combat the job loss caused by the higher taxes on businesses, the Illinois Department of Commerce 'has already shelled out some \$230 million in corporate subsidies to keep more than two dozen companies from fleeing the State.'"

Well, this is exactly what President Obama is suggesting for America, the same thing that they do in his home State in Illinois, raise taxes substantially on all of those rich people and corporations. Madam Speaker, a 56,000 job loss. They're now having to spend an incredible amount of money to convince people, really to pay them off, just to stay.

This is the game that the Democratic Party plays. This is exactly what the gentlewoman was talking about about the serious elements of jobs and the consequences of killing jobs in this country.

Madam Speaker, I will tell you the Republican Party will not fall victim to raising taxes like the Democratic Party and like President Obama want us to do.

We will not raise the debt limit without making tough choices. And, Madam Speaker, we're going to add jobs and do the things that are right that the American people expect us to do. And that's why we're here today.

THE REAL-WORLD IMPACT OF TAX HIKES ON AMERICAN JOBS

(By Rep. Pete Sessions & Rep. John Shimkus)

[From the Daily Caller, July 28, 2011]

Over the last few weeks, President Barack Obama has adamantly supported raising

taxes on corporations and small businesses that employ millions of American workers as a precondition for cutting our bloated federal spending.

To see the real-world effect of this proposal on jobs and the economy, President Obama's home state provides a useful and cautionary example.

This past January, Illinois Governor Pat Quinn signed into law a 67 percent increase in the state personal income tax rate and a 45 percent increase in the state corporate tax rate. Between its passage and June, Illinois lost 56,223 jobs, according to statistics released last week.

To combat the job loss caused by the higher taxes on businesses, the Illinois Department of Commerce 'has already shelled out some \$230 million in corporate subsidies to keep more than two dozen companies from fleeing the state.'

So not only is Illinois bleeding productive jobs, but it's now allowing the government to pick winners and losers.

Extracting an ever-increasing toll from job creators is simply the wrong answer for American jobs. Just ask the 56,000 Illinoisans who have lost their jobs since January. Spreading this failure nationwide is simply not an option.

We are in a debt crisis not because we tax too little, but because Democrat-led Washington spends beyond its means. House Republicans have been focused on encouraging and providing certainty (not new burdens) to our nation's job creators—and trying to get our debt and deficit-spending under control.

The rest of America simply cannot afford more of the failed policies of the president's home state, and House Republicans will fight against tax hikes so that we may ensure a brighter future for generations to come.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I have an article entitled, "Debt Ceiling Impasse Rattles Short-Term Credit Markets," again from The New York Times, discussing how this uncertainty that is not being caused by external factors but is being caused by us, by politicians, by people here in this body, is rattling those who lend our country money. And that's why this plan before us today will increase the deficit by over \$100 billion over 10 years. In addition to those spending cuts, it will cost taxpayers more in interest payments if it jeopardizes our credit rating.

[From the New York Times, July 28, 2011]

DEBT CEILING IMPASSE RATTLES SHORT-TERM CREDIT MARKETS

(By Nelson D. Schwartz and Azam Ahmed)

The reverberations of Washington's impasse over a debt deal are already being felt in the short-term credit markets, a key artery of the economy that daily supplies trillions of dollars of credit.

Over the last week, big banks and companies have withdrawn \$37.5 billion from money market funds that invest in Treasury debt and other ultra-safe securities, the biggest weekly drop this year. Meanwhile, in the vast market for repurchase agreements, in which many financial firms make short-term loans to one another, borrowers are beginning to demand higher yields.

These moves underscore how companies and big financial institutions are beginning to rethink their traditional view that notes issued by the United States Treasury are indistinguishable from cash, even though many experts say they think it is unlikely that the government would miss payments on its obligations.

The \$37.5 billion drop, reported Thursday in a weekly survey by the Investment Company Institute, echoed what other analysts were seeing.

In the first three days of this week, investors pulled \$17 billion from funds that invested only in government securities, a reversal of the daily inflows of \$280 million for much of July, said Peter Crane, the president of Crane Data, which tracks money market mutual funds.

"It's big, no doubt about it," he said. "Seventeen billion isn't a run, but it's definitely indicative that investors are shifting their assets. If this were to continue for another week or two, it would be very disturbing."

Though lawmakers have been clashing all week on proposals to cut the deficit and raise the debt limit ahead of an Aug. 2 deadline set by the Treasury Department, bond markets have largely shrugged off the risk of a default or a downgrade of the Washington's AAA credit rating.

Interest rates on longer-term Treasuries have held steady, but the yield on notes coming due next week, after the deadline, has moved sharply higher in recent days. The yield on Treasury bills coming due Aug. 4 jumped five basis points to 15 basis points, a significant move for a security that carried a yield close to zero earlier this month, said Jim Caron, head of interest rate strategy at Morgan Stanley.

"It's a tell-tale sign of something that could reverberate if it spreads to other markets, and all the uncertainty with the debt ceiling is the functional equivalent of a tightening," Mr. Caron said. "I don't think there is a default risk at all but the market is saying it's not going to take any chances."

While money market fund managers say they are not seeing a sizable wave of redemptions yet, they are setting aside more cash, leaving it at custodial bank accounts in case investors demand their money back. At Fidelity, the Boston-based firm that has \$442 billion in money market assets, managers are avoiding Treasury bills that come due on Aug. 4 and Aug. 11, however unlikely a technical default may be.

"We are positioning our portfolio to respond to a downgrade or a default and we are positioning the fund to respond to redemptions," said Robert Brown, president of money markets at Fidelity. Mr. Brown would not say how much cash was being kept at hand, but said "it's a higher balance than one would expect to see."

In the commercial paper market, where companies raise funds for their short-term borrowing needs, buyers are also seeking shorter-term paper.

In the last week, investors have shown signs of wanting quick access to their money, with financial borrowers raising on Wednesday only \$1 million in notes that come due in 81 days or more, according to the Federal Reserve. That is down from \$479 million on July 22.

At the same time, the amount of commercial paper issued with a duration of just one to four days rose to \$920 million, from \$771 million.

"Investors are scrambling to bolster their liquidity profile," said Chris Conetta, head of global commercial paper trading at Barclays Capital. "They understand that a default or downgrade could be a big, systemic event."

In the repurchase market, known as the repo market, borrowers take loans and in exchange hand over a little more than the equivalent loan amount in securities. Because of their risk-free status, Treasuries are highly favored as collateral, estimated to account for about \$4 trillion in the repo markets.

The fear is that if the United States credit rating drops, the value of those treasuries

could respond in kind. Borrowers would then have to post more collateral to obtain their loans, effectively raising the cost of borrowing. That could ripple into the broader market, raising interest rates on all types of loans, analysts warn.

"The repo market is a pressure point because it can have an impact on overall credit availability, which bleeds through to mortgage rates," said Robert Toomey, managing director at the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association. "Treasuries become a little less attractive if they are more expensive to finance."

The overnight repo rate, which started the week at about three basis points, was about 17 basis points Thursday evening, according to Credit Suisse. That means that to finance \$100 million overnight in the repo market it would now cost about \$472 per day, up from about \$83 on Monday.

"It's a bigger deal than a lot of people recognize," said Howard Simons, a strategist at Bianco Research, a bond market specialist. "If you downgrade the securities you have to put more up for collateral and that affects pretty much everybody out there who has held these in reserve. I don't care if you're a bank, insurance company, exchange or clearinghouse."

To be sure, most observers say the ripples in the repo market will not be anything like those felt in the fall of 2008, when creditors lost faith in the ability of banks to pay back their short-term loans. That caused a problem for companies like General Electric, which struggled to finance its daily operations as a result. Back then, the sharp drop-off in repo lending helped bring the financial system to its knees.

"I think people are looking at the U.S. as the cleanest shirt in the dirty laundry pile," said Jason New, a senior managing director at GSO Capital Partners.

"To me, the downgrade is not dropping a boulder in a still lake. This is dropping a pebble, but nevertheless there are still ripples."

□ 1440

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, yesterday our Republican colleagues said that their party was using the leverage of the default crisis to get what they want, their ideological agenda passed. The problem is it's not what the American people want. Our constituents have made it very clear that when we're trying to solve our deficit crisis, they want a real compromise, shared sacrifice, where millionaires, billionaires, and oil companies are asked to contribute. They also want their Social Security and Medicare benefits protected. Now with the clock ticking on the entire economy, they definitely don't want us wasting time on this hoax of a bill that has no chance of passing in the Senate.

The Republicans took a bad bill and made it worse and less likely to pass, putting in the requirement for sending a constitutional amendment to the States, which requires a two-thirds vote in each body. If that doesn't happen, 6 months from now, what happens? The country defaults again. That may help the Republicans. It may help the Republican leadership save face with

the Tea Party and their party, but it does nothing to help the American people or save us from a pending economic chaos.

This isn't leadership. It's the worst type of failure. It's a failure to stand up for what we know is right, a failure to stand up for the American people, and a failure to protect and preserve the United States of America.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Savannah, Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Americans have had to tighten their belts. All around the country, American families have had to decide what is important to them and to divide their needs from their wants. Washington, D.C., has to do that. We have to have not just a balanced approach, we need to have a balanced budget. We need to cut our spending, we need to control our spending, and we need to have accountability so that when Washington politicians make decisions, that the families back home can take a look at it and decide what are the consequences of these decisions.

Now, there have been a lot of consequences that America has suffered because of the failed economic policies of President Obama. One must ask him- or herself, when will President Obama admit that his stimulus program was a failure? When will the President admit that the consequences of his health care mandate has killed jobs? When will President Obama admit that Cash for Clunkers wasn't such a great idea? And, most importantly, when will President Obama admit that it's a failure of leadership not to present a plan to balance the budget to Congress? We need to see the President's plan.

Today, we will be voting on yet another Republican proposal to cut spending and control spending and give accountability to our process, but we have yet to have a bill introduced by the President of the United States. And keep in mind, before he was President, as a Senator, he voted against increasing the debt ceiling, citing a lack of leadership. Today, the bill that we will be considering cuts spending now. It also controls spending because it has an across-the-board trigger that if we spend too much money, there will be a cut.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, these cuts are real. They are measurable. This is what the American people need to know, something that is accountable. This puts in place a 10-year budget.

The United States Senate, under HARRY REID's leadership, has not had a budget in 3 years. There's no end to their spending without a budget. Amer-

ican families have budgets. Why doesn't the U.S. Senate?

So this bill puts in accountability, 10 years' worth of accountability. It puts in controls in spending, across-the-board triggers. And finally, it has cuts to it.

Again, Madam Speaker, American families have had to tighten their belts. Washington must do the same thing, and that's what we're doing here today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation and "yes" on the rule.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Georgia mentioned that the President hasn't introduced a bill. I would just like to point out that the President of the United States cannot introduce a bill in the House or Senate. The President can sign a bill. In fact, in this particular case, he said he would veto this bill because it increases the deficit, it risks increasing it by over \$100 billion.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a study that shows the difference in interest rates between AAA and AA ratings, which demonstrably shows, in fact, that if this bill is passed here today with only a 6-month extension, it would likely cost taxpayers over \$100 billion.

AAA OR AA? IN WHICH CLUB DO WE WANT TO BELONG?

AAA Ratings	10-Year bond yield (%)
Australia	4.92
Austria	3.39
Canada	2.93
Denmark	2.99
Finland	3.13
France	3.25
Germany	2.76
Hong Kong	2.26
Luxembourg	3.29
Netherlands	3.14
Norway	3.24
Singapore	2.10
Sweden	2.75
Switzerland	1.45
United Kingdom	3.04
USA	3.00
AAA Average	2.98
AA Ratings	10-Year bond yield (%)
Abu Dhabi	3.84
Belgium	4.32
Chile	2.92
China	4.12
Israel	5.16
Japan	1.09
Qatar	3.95
Saudi Arabia	3.97
Spain	5.99
Slovenia	4.43
Taiwan	1.50
AA Average	3.75

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

What's going on here, Madam Speaker, is extraordinarily dangerous and it's completely unnecessary. We are using the full faith and credit of the United States, the reputation this country has had since its founding that we are a country who pays our bills, we are using that as political leverage to get our way on budget and tax issues. That's wrong. It's dangerous.

Ronald Reagan, no stranger to fierce tax and budget battles, would never allow the linkage to be made that would jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States. We're a bigger and better country than to threaten that we won't pay our bills. This is wrong. We should raise the debt ceiling cleanly because that is what Americans do. We pay our bills.

Second, the bill before us now is, as my friend from Kentucky said, making a bad bill worse. The process that Americans want is a balanced approach. Balance is revenues along with cuts. Democrats have to make concessions on cuts. We're prepared to do that. The President has led. But there have got to be revenues, particularly when we have got a Tax Code that is completely a mess.

What we've seen is that in the Biden discussions, Mr. CANTOR walked out when there were revenues on the table. The Speaker walked out on the President when revenues were still on the table. And now this bill is attempting to impose a constitutional amendment and has no chance of passing; and it, in effect, is a white flag of surrender to a small group in the Republican caucus who won't pass the bill that was brought to us before.

We've got to work together. That means we've got to put everything on the table. We've got to maintain our credit rating by paying our bills, and we have to have a balanced approach to long-term fiscal stability that requires revenues as well as cuts.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to another one of our 87 new freshmen, Mr. WOMACK, the former mayor of Rogers, Arkansas, one of the most beautiful cities in America.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman not only for yielding some time but also for his glowing remarks about a great community and one of the 10 most livable cities in all of America that I had the privilege of presiding over for about 12 years as mayor, a city that continues to enjoy tremendous economic development and influence in the State of Arkansas.

And let me just say this, using that as a context for my remarks, that I think the model that the community that I had the privilege of presiding over for 12 years is the model that Washington needs. It's a model that balances its budget.

When I inherited that city in 1999 as its mayor, it did not have a balanced budget. The government was in the way. The discriminate developer did not want to develop in that community because there were too many regulations, too many reasons why they could go elsewhere and have better margins. Well, we changed all that, and now the city is flourishing in a remarkable sort of way.

And I want to steal something from a colleague of mine from Mississippi that was said yesterday out on the Triangle

in a media event. He said: All across America we're sitting down with legal pads, and we're drawing that line down the middle and we're discussing the amount of income that we have. This is what's happening to families around the country, what kind of income we have and what kind of expenses we have.

□ 1450

Where the expenses exceed the income, we are having to make some very difficult choices as to what to do without. Well, quite frankly, I think that that's exactly what's happening in this Congress right now. We have to take the legal pad out. We have to decide those things that we can do that we need and those things that we can do without based on the amount of income that we have coming in.

The sad thing is in order to be able to create that kind of fiscal discipline, it's going to take something like a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in order to guarantee an enforcement mechanism that this Congress or future Congresses cannot undo. So it's that context that I bring to the table today.

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

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

Mr. WOMACK. It is that basis on which I think this Congress should rally behind the plan that we have offered today that is going to cap spending, that is going to cut spending, and is going to require a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution so that future Congresses can't put us in a similar situation that we are in today.

So I would urge a "yes" vote. I support it wholeheartedly, and I would ask the American people to join us by promoting fiscal sanity by approving this piece of legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

Well, we are approaching the real prospect of default for the first time in American history, and we have wasted 2 days. While we have wasted 2 days, the American public has lost over \$400 billion of wealth as the stock markets started to slide when Speaker BOEHNER walked away from negotiations with the President. The Republicans have been twisting arms to make a bill that could never pass the Senate even more objectionable by chasing a few extreme Members of their party instead of working with over 180 Democrats on a balanced approach.

I would suggest that people think of three words. First is recklessness. This is the first time in history that we have taken the debt ceiling discussion and held it hostage; 102 times we have increased the debt ceiling since 1917. This is an entirely manufactured crisis.

Second is abuse. This is an abuse of power to try and hold this debt ceiling

discussion hostage, refusing to compromise, trying to avoid a balanced approach that is supported by the American public and what ultimately is going to be required to solve this problem.

The third point is hypocrisy. On this floor, earlier this week, when Republicans actually had the chance to vote for real spending cuts that would be required under their bizarre proposal for spending reductions in the future, when they had a chance to vote for it, in this Congress, offered up by the Republican Study Committee—and I think it was misguided, but at least it was honest—and what did the Republicans do? They voted it down, 104 of them, including their own subcommittee chairman, because it was too extreme.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire about the time remaining on both sides, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 8½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, many words will be spoken at podiums on the House floor today, some helpful and illuminating, some not. But there are a few facts that need to stand in very stark contrast to all the din.

First, this has never happened in the history of the United States, not from the first Congress until this very moment, that a Congress, a caucus in this body, has tried to hold hostage the American economy in exchange for raising the debt ceiling. Never before, never. We will distinguish ourselves as a body that has failed and has deliberately harmed the American economy because of obstinacy, stubbornness, and recklessness. First time.

Second, in less than 3½ days, our Nation will default. This will, without a doubt, cause a dramatic amount of cost on the American people in almost every aspect of our lives, whether it's in the area of credit cards, mortgages, car notes, or many other areas. Our State and local governments' costs will go up. Investors, pensioners, 401(k) holders will suffer. This is in no way helpful and in dramatic contrast to everything we have ever done before.

There is no doubt about it, Madam Speaker. The Republicans and the Democrats have a very different view of the role of government. Democrats believe that a government in partnership with a free market works well to guarantee a strong economy for the American people, and Republicans see almost no role for government at all and speak derisively and contemptuously about government all the time.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. ELLISON. The American people, I believe, will agree with the Democrats and history will bear us out as being on the right side.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, day after day the American people receive more bad news, economic bad news, about the shape our country is in. That is what Republicans respond to.

Today, news came out that the first quarter GDP that was provided by the Federal Government, first quarter, was actually wrong, dead wrong. They said the GDP growth was 1.9 percent. Today we find out it was .4.

Madam Speaker, the disastrous results of the Obama-Pelosi years are evident. Republicans want jobs. We need a middle class, and we are willing to fight for it. That's why we are here today with commonsense legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Thank you very much for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and in opposition to the bill that we will vote on later today. And, yes, the Bush economic policies have really now come home to haunt us.

It's shameful that the Republican Party continues their drive to plunge our Nation into default and our economy over the brink. And the bill that Speaker BOEHNER has unveiled today does exactly that. His plan fails to end the threat of default.

And his plan targets, mind you, targets the programs aimed at America's most vulnerable, our seniors, our children, and our low-income families for more draconian cuts. And this plan would sign these cuts into the Constitution; it would sign these cuts into stone into the Constitution.

Trying to balance the budget on the backs of the poor is morally wrong and it's economically bankrupt. This rule and this bill begin to erode and dismantle Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security; and it creates more unemployment. There will be more job loss as a result of this rule and bill.

Instead of creating jobs, the Republicans are holding our economy hostage once again and threatening to plunge our economy back into recession. Instead of quickly passing a debt ceiling vote and bill, the Republicans are marching lockstep towards default. Instead of supporting the safety net that will protect our most vulnerable, the Republicans are trying to balance our budget on the backs of the poor while maintaining tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires and Big Oil. It's totally irresponsible to put forth a bill that would put the economy on the brink of disaster once again in 6 months.

Madam Speaker, there is no time for these Republican Tea Party games. This rule and this bill turn the American Dream into a nightmare for millions. Seniors need to know that they will receive their Social Security checks. Veterans need to know that

they can go to the doctor. Small businesses need to know that they have some financial security and stability to create jobs.

Defeat this Boehner rule and bill. It's really a default Boehner rule and bill.

□ 1500

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts. Tax cuts solve all problems, especially for the millionaire and billionaire job creators.

We're in the 10th year of the Bush tax cuts: \$4 trillion. We're in the third year of the Obama tax cuts: \$1 trillion. Now we have to cut programs to continue the tax cuts that don't create jobs.

What's one of the specified targets? Student financial aid. Hey, they don't know anybody at the country club who can't afford to put their kid through medical school, but at the top of their list is cutting student financial aid.

Cutting investments in transportation that could put millions to work. Stopping taxes on the aviation industry, which is, guess what, capturing the money, not lowering prices, and laying off 90,000 people and stopping critical infrastructure jobs for that industry. Tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts.

Let's get real. Let's do things for the American people, put people back to work, and solve the deficit problem.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. A very interesting point in our progress here in America. There is a real difference in view, and we're in the process now of choosing which path this Nation will go.

This is not about a deficit. This is about the very nature of America. It's about our heart and soul. Are we going to be a country that uses all of our resources, whether they are the public resources or the private resources, to fill the needs of our people—their education, their health care, their well-being after they retire—or are we going to go a different path and not use all of our potential?

The Republican proposal that's before us—this is not the first—would change America and really drive us back to the 19th century, a time in which the government did not have a social welfare program such as Social Security and Medicare.

Make no doubt about this and have no doubts that the proposal before us is a very significant step towards ending Social Security and Medicare. If that's what the American people want, well, we shall see.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

You know, this is political theater at its worst. This bill has no chance of becoming law. It's extreme. It was put together so that the Speaker could pick up the last two or three votes from the extreme element of the Republican Party. We refuse to be held hostage and the American people refuse to be held hostage.

Let me say to my Republican colleagues: Why don't you try working with us? Why don't you try to work with the Democrats? Why don't we kind of move to the sensible middle and have a bill that can pass? This is what the American people want us to do. They are sick of the political posturing. They are sick of this day in and day out. We are now bringing our country to the brink of financial disaster because of cheap political games. Meet us in the middle.

In order to balance our budget, we need to have a cut in spending, yes, but we also need to have those who can afford to pay more pay a little more, and we need to close corporate tax loopholes, not protect the rich. My Republican friends want to balance the budget on the backs of the middle class, want to tell seniors that Medicare as we know it will be destroyed, want to tell our students that they cannot get Pell Grants. We don't want to do this.

Pass a clean debt ceiling. That's what we need to do. We did it 18 times under Reagan and eight times under Bush. We ought to do it again now and stop the political charade.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the reason why we're here today is because we're spending too much money.

Another reason why we're here today is because the Democratic Party and the Members—many of them who have spoken today—took \$500 billion out of Medicare, and that's why that system is in real trouble. Republicans will save Medicare, not bankrupt it like our friends the Democrats have done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First, in response to the claim of the gentleman from Texas in regards to saving Medicare, well, if ending Medicare is one way of saving it, I guess that would be consistent. In fact, the Republican package that was passed in this House phased out Medicare. Nobody under 55 would receive Medicare.

By definition, Medicare is a medical insurance program for seniors. It would be replaced with a voucher that would pay for part of private insurance that seniors need to get, but it would no longer be Medicare. It would no longer exist. So, certainly, getting rid of Medicare, if you consider that a way of saving it, the Republican budget will do that. But if you want to save Medicare, it requires cutting costs and investing in the system and making it work for more American families.

Again, what we have before us today, Madam Speaker, is not a solution; it's further political machinations of the

House. Rather than talking to the President, rather than talking to the Senate, unfortunately, the Speaker of this body has chosen to talk to five or six people, move the bill further away from the middle, further away from what the President will sign, further away from what the Senate will pass with only 3½ days left.

Three-and-a-half days left before what? Three-and-a-half days left before this country jeopardizes our credit rating and our good standing as a Nation that pays interest on our debt. And just as American families, when your credit score gets messed up, you pay more, taxpayers will pay more if this bill passes.

Madam Speaker, it has been estimated that the approximately 1 percent interest rate increase that a downgrade from AAA to AA would provide will cost taxpayers over \$1 trillion over 10 years. And this bill will increase the deficit by \$100 billion.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the conjecture the gentleman has made and extrapolated this out of what this bill would do. In fact, that's not what the bill does at all.

The bill says that we will approach in a reasonable way and with respect to the American taxpayer—and to the marketplaces—a plan, a plan that will put America on sound financial footing, which would be the envy of the world, which is part of what the Republican Party would choose to do.

Madam Speaker, once again, this rule provides the necessary flexibility the Republican leadership needs to ensure that we do not default on our obligations in the next 4 days. Republicans will continue to provide sound, balanced, and real leadership and pass solutions while the President continues on the pathway—along with the Democratic Party, as we've heard here today—of tax increases and job-killing ideas.

With over 14 million Americans unemployed, a \$1.4 trillion projected deficit this year, and over \$14 trillion in debt, our current financial policies are simply not working. I don't know why we would continue doing what we've been doing when it doesn't work, but perhaps that's what our friends, the Democrats, want to do. We, as Republicans, disagree.

So I'm asking the Democratic colleagues, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to join their Republican colleagues and me for real fiscal change. Cutting spending and reducing government programs, each of these help us encourage economic growth, not just as we heard in Rogers, Arkansas, but all over this country. It does work, putting Americans back to work.

Madam Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD an article titled, "Texas Bucks

National Unemployment Trends," because they do things that balance out the marketplace.

I applaud our Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN BOEHNER, for his hard work and commitment to the American people, and those people here in the House of Representatives who will do their duty and provide for real and conservative solutions, market-based answers to get our economy back on track.

Madam Speaker, this Republican House will not raise taxes. We will not raise spending. We will not yield to the old ways of taxing and spending and not listening and then thinking we know better than others.

We're for the free enterprise system.

□ 1510

We're for families back home. We're for job growth and real meaningful opportunities for the future of our children. That is what we stand for.

So we are here today. Yes, we'll stay in town until we get our job done. We're the people who believe in the free enterprise system. We're the people who believe in the people back home. And we're the people who are going to say "no" to Washington, D.C., taxing, spending, big wasteful government. We are the people, the Republican Party. The elephants are in town, and we have a great memory. We know what works. So, Madam Speaker, I encourage a "yes" vote on the rule.

TEXAS BUCKS NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT TREND

(By Tony Gutierrez)

Finding work may not be quite that simple, but it sure seems that way. While the nation's job growth has limped along since the economic recovery began two years ago, the Lone Star State is enlarging payrolls in Texas-size fashion.

From June 2009 to June 2011 the state added 262,000 jobs, or half the USA's 524,000 payroll gains, according to the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Even by a more conservative estimate that omits states with net job losses, Texas' advances make up 30% of the 1 million additions in the 34 states with net growth.

The stunning showing could play a role in the presidential race. Texas Gov. Rick Perry is signaling he may run for the Republican nomination. If he does, he's likely to ground his campaign in his state's outsized job growth.

Texas' big gains are partly a reflection of its population growth. But the recent job gains are outpacing the rate of population growth in Texas, the nation's second-largest state, with 25 million residents—about 8% of the U.S. population.

INTERACTIVE: SORTABLE CHART: STATE-BY-STATE LOOK AT EMPLOYMENT CHANGES

The state's payrolls have risen 2.9% since the end of the recession, third behind North Dakota and Alaska and far outpacing the USA's 0.4% growth, according to the BLS. Also, Texas' 8.2% unemployment rate is well below the nation's 9.2%.

"For one large state to grow (jobs) so much faster than the rest of the nation is very unusual," says Moody's economist Ed Friedman.

Economists point to an array of factors, including high energy prices that set off an

oil-drilling frenzy, rising exports and a conservative banking industry that helped the state sidestep the housing crash.

Yet while energy has been a spark—employment in natural gas, oil and other mining sectors rose by 45,000, or 23%, since the recession ended—growth has been broad-based. During the past two years, professional and business services added 74,000 jobs; education and health care gained 91,000; and leisure and hospitality grew by 29,000, according to BLS.

State officials cite a pro-business climate that Perry helped foster that's drawing scores of businesses from high-cost states—a trend that took on urgency for firms that got lean in the economic downturn.

The 10-year Texas governor is "really focused on creating an environment where people can risk their capital and get a return on investment, and that, in turn, creates jobs for Texans," says Lucy Nashed, spokeswoman for the state's economic development office.

Nashed notes Texas has no state or corporate income tax and keeps regulations at a minimum to allow businesses to grow quickly. She says Perry also has worked to develop a skilled workforce by requiring additional public school classes and pushing through tort reform to limit frivolous lawsuits. The state, meantime, has doled out more than \$600 million in grants and investments since 2003 to recruit out-of-state companies and help Texas firms expand.

DOES PERRY REALLY DESERVE CREDIT?

Yet some question Perry's role in the so-called Texas Miracle.

James Galbraith, a professor of government at the University of Texas-Austin, largely attributes the state's job growth to the energy and export booms. Texas, he notes, has never had an income tax. From 1990 to 2000, before Perry took office, Texas payrolls swelled 36%, compared with 21% for the nation.

"Rick Perry did not come and find a high-tax, high-service state and dismantle it," Galbraith says. "For something to contribute, there (has to be) a change. There's been a change in oil prices."

Others say the state's low tax burdens exact a high cost: fewer state services. Perry, for example, refused to raise taxes to close a \$27 billion budget gap last spring. Instead, the Legislature slashed more than \$4 billion in funding for public schools the next two years, a move that's likely to lead to tens of thousands of teacher layoffs.

"We're not preparing our children to compete in tomorrow's economy," says Scott McCown, head of Texas' Center for Public Policy Priorities.

Texas ranks 44th in the USA in per-student expenditures and 43rd in high school graduation rates, McCown says. Seventeen percent of Texans lived below the poverty level in 2009, compared with 14% for the nation. The state leads in the percentage of the population with no health insurance and was ninth in income inequality in the mid-2000s, the latest data available, according to McCown and the Economic Policy Institute.

McCown says Texas should not serve as a job-growth paradigm for the rest of the nation.

"If you're saying you want to look like Texas, you're saying you want to be poor and have less health care," he says.

The state's relatively low wages, particularly for low-skilled jobs, stems in part from its status as a right-to-work state with little unionization. That dampens consumer spending and limits economic growth, McCown says. In June, average hourly earnings for private-sector employees in Texas were about 5% lower than the U.S. average.

But Mark Dotzour, chief economist at Texas A&M's Real Estate Center, says the state's lower pay helps it compete in a global economy. "Either you choose to have low-wage jobs or you choose to have no jobs at all," he says.

The state's reasonable cost of living, he adds, makes it possible for many residents to live comfortably on lower salaries. The Dallas area ranks 10th in housing affordability among 82 metro areas with more than 1 million residents, while Houston is 15th, according to the Demographia International Housing Affordability Survey. That's partly because Texas has an abundance of cheap land—another draw for firms looking to relocate.

Other reasons for the state's robust job growth:

The energy boom. Oil prices have nearly tripled since early 2009. High prices spark more exploration and production. Meanwhile, technological breakthroughs have let companies extract natural gas embedded in shale deposits. Barnett Shale in Fort Worth is one of the USA's largest gas fields, and drilling began at the Eagle Ford Shale in South Texas in 2008. The number of oil and gas rigs in the state has jumped to 850 from 330 in July 2009, says Ana Orozco, economist for IHS Global Insight. Each rig employs a few dozen workers and leads to hiring by engineering firms, pipeline builders and other services.

Exports. Overseas shipments by Texas' strong computer, electronics, petrochemical and other industries rose 21% last year, compared with 15% for the nation, according to the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank. The state also benefits from its proximity to Latin American countries that are big importers of U.S. goods, Friedman says. The surge creates jobs for Texas manufacturers and ports.

No housing crash. Texas never had a housing boom but also avoided the bust that decimated consumer credit and home construction in much of the rest of the nation. While prices of single-family homes more than doubled from January 2000 to their mid-2000s peak in cities such as Los Angeles, Miami and Las Vegas, they rose less than 27% in the Dallas/Fort Worth market, according to the S&P/Case-Shiller Home Price index.

Meanwhile, Texas banks burned by the savings-and-loan crisis in the 1980s were less eager than those in other states to approve risky mortgages. And Texas law limits mortgage debt, including home-equity loans, to 80% of a home's value.

"People didn't use their houses like ATMs," says Dallas Fed Vice President Mine Yucel.

Texas still was hit by the recession. Annual permits for single-family homes declined 59% from their 2005 peak to 2010, but that's less than the nation's 73% plunge, according to Texas A&M. Similarly, employment fell 4% in the downturn; the USA's overall drop was 6.3%. Texas has recovered 380,000 jobs since its December 2009 low and is now just 54,000 shy of its 10.6 million peak.

Population growth. Texas' population grew by 4.3 million, or 21%, during the past decade, more than twice the national pace. About half the total was because of births, but Texas also gained 849,000 residents via state-to-state migration, second only to Florida.

Texas thus benefits from a virtuous cycle: More people are moving there for work, generating consumer demand that creates still more jobs. That's expanded the workforce, keeping the unemployment rate at 8.2%—ranked just 26th in the nation—despite the strong payroll advances.

One recent arrival is Ife Oyedokun, 26, who this month moved to the Austin area from Philadelphia, where he worked as a high

school counselor, to be closer to his family. Within two weeks he had a job as a rehabilitation specialist for a growing outpatient facility for the mentally ill.

"I was very surprised," he says. "With just how the economy is now, I figured three, four, five months" to find a job.

'HUNTING' FOR POSSIBLE RELOCATIONS

Companies also are feeling the pull.

Corporate giants including Fluor, Toyota and Medtronic recently moved headquarters or operations to Texas, and eBay, AT&T, Samsung and Cirrus Logic have expanded there. Samsung added about 700 jobs in Austin since last year, enlarging a plant that makes chips for smartphones.

Area business leaders, meanwhile, have aggressively courted out-of-state companies.

The Dallas Regional Chamber this month sent a letter to 50 Illinois corporations, urging them to consider a move to Texas. The mailing includes a side-by-side comparison of the two states that notes Illinois recently raised corporate and personal income taxes and highlights Texas' lower housing, labor and other expenses.

"States with heavy-duty business taxes, personal taxes or regulatory mind-sets define themselves as our targets," says Chamber CEO Jim Oberwetter. "That's just where we go hunting."

Texas has particularly tried to lure high-tech California companies to lower-cost technology corridors in Austin, Dallas and San Antonio. Medtronic, the Minneapolis-based medical device giant, has moved customer support for its diabetes unit from the Los Angeles area to San Antonio in the past 22 months, creating 750 jobs in Texas.

Jeff Ruiz, head of Medtronic's Texas operations, says the company was drawn by labor costs that are "significantly lower" than those in Los Angeles and a large, high-quality workforce. Ruiz also points to more affordable real estate and the lack of a state corporate tax, though he says the latter was a minor factor. The company, which also received \$14 million in incentives from the state—a figure Ruiz says was comparable with other offers—chose San Antonio from among more than 900 U.S. cities it evaluated. For some, the benefits are more basic.

Marketing firm Red Ventures this year opened a San Antonio office that's expected to grow to 250 employees from 60 by year's end, says spokeswoman Kylie Craig. Besides the region's ample talent pool, other draws were the city's non-stop flights to Red Ventures' other offices in Miami and Charlotte and its 7.3% unemployment rate.

In cities with high jobless rates, "We're having to sift through (many) unqualified applicants."

Then there's Texas' laid-back lifestyle and lower costs, assets that prompted Vermillion, a start-up developer of blood tests with 29 employees, to move from Fremont, Calif., to Austin about a year ago. "We found it very difficult to recruit people into California because of the cost of living, traffic, congestion," says CEO Gail Page.

The corporate relocations and expansions are having a ripple effect on restaurants, hospitals and other service businesses. Winstead, a Dallas law firm with about 270 lawyers statewide, has added 50 since last year to handle the extra workload from firms, such as Comerica Bank, that have moved to Texas the past few years, says Mike Baggett, Winstead's chairman emeritus.

And after cutting staff in 2009 and 2010, DeMontrond Automotive in Houston has hired about 20 employees the past few months in response to a 20% jump in revenue, says owner George DeMontrond. Houston lost 120,000 jobs in the recession but has gained about 50,000 the last seven months.

"I think people who have held off and not purchased large-ticket items because of uncertainty are a little bit more ready to do it," DeMontrond says.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

adoption of House Resolution 382, if ordered;

motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 440, by the yeas and nays;

motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 2244, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 671]

YEAS—237

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

Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)

NAYS—185

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Ciicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)

NOT VOTING—10

Baca
Bachmann
Coffman (CO)
Giffords

□ 1534

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Townes
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 186, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 672]

YEAS—236

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishchek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson

Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)

Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Ciicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)

Baca
Bachmann
Crawford
Giffords

Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—186

Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hochul
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

NOT VOTING—10

Gingrey (GA)
Hinchey
Hirono
Luján

□ 1540

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, due to my participation in a meeting with some of my constituents, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 672. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on this vote.

ESTABLISHING SPECIAL ENVOY FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE NEAR EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 440) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 20, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 673]

YEAS—402

Ackerman	Clay	Garrett
Adams	Cleaver	Gerlach
Aderholt	Clyburn	Gibbs
Akin	Coble	Gibson
Alexander	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Altmire	Cohen	Gohmert
Andrews	Cole	Gonzalez
Austria	Conaway	Goodlatte
Bachus	Connolly (VA)	Gosar
Baldwin	Conyers	Gowdy
Barletta	Cooper	Granger
Barrow	Costa	Graves (MO)
Bartlett	Costello	Green, Al
Barton (TX)	Courtney	Green, Gene
Bass (CA)	Cravaack	Griffin (AR)
Bass (NH)	Crawford	Griffith (VA)
Becerra	Crenshaw	Grimm
Benishek	Critz	Guinta
Berg	Crowley	Guthrie
Berkley	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Berman	Culberson	Hahn
Biggert	Cummings	Hall
Bilbray	Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Bilirakis	Davis (IL)	Hanna
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Harper
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Harris
Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Hartzler
Blackburn	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Bonner	Dent	Hayworth
Bono Mack	DesJarlais	Heck
Boren	Deutch	Heinrich
Boswell	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling
Boustany	Dicks	Herger
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Doggett	Higgins
Braley (IA)	Dold	Himes
Brooks	Donnelly (IN)	Hinojosa
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Hochul
Buchanan	Dreier	Holden
Bucshon	Duffy	Holt
Buerkle	Duncan (SC)	Honda
Burton (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Hoyer
Butterfield	Edwards	Huelskamp
Calvert	Ellison	Huizenga (MI)
Camp	Ellmers	Hultgren
Campbell	Emerson	Hunter
Canseco	Engel	Hurt
Cantor	Eshoo	Inslee
Capito	Farr	Israel
Capps	Fattah	Issa
Capuano	Finler	Jackson (IL)
Cardoza	Fincher	Jackson Lee
Carnahan	Fitzpatrick	(TX)
Carney	Fleischmann	Jenkins
Carson (IN)	Fleming	Johnson (GA)
Carter	Forbes	Johnson (IL)
Cassidy	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Castor (FL)	Fox	Johnson, E. B.
Chabot	Frank (MA)	Johnson, Sam
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Chandler	Frelinghuysen	Kaptur
Chu	Fudge	Keating
Cicilline	Gallely	Kelly
Clarke (MI)	Garamendi	Kildee
Clarke (NY)	Gardner	Kind

King (NY)	Napolitano
Kingston	Neal
Kinzinger (IL)	Neugebauer
Kissell	Noem
Kline	Nugent
Kucinich	Nunes
Lamborn	Nunnelee
Lance	Olson
Landry	Olver
Langevin	Owens
Lankford	Palazzo
Larsen (WA)	Pallone
Larson (CT)	Pascrell
Latham	Pastor (AZ)
LaTourette	Paulsen
Latta	Payne
Lee (CA)	Pearce
Levin	Pelosi
Lewis (CA)	Pence
Lewis (GA)	Perlmutter
Lipinski	Peters
LoBiondo	Peterson
Loeb sack	Petri
Lofgren, Zoe	Pingree (ME)
Long	Pitts
Lowe y	Platts
Lucas	Polis
Luetkemeyer	Pompeo
Lujan	Price (GA)
Lummis	Price (NC)
Lungren, Daniel E.	Quayle
	Sutton
	Terry
	Thompson (CA)
	Thompson (MS)
	Thompson (PA)
	Thornberry
	Tiberi
	Tierney
	Reyes
	Richardson
	Richmond
	Rigell
	Rivera
	Roby
	Roe (TN)
	Rogers (AL)
	Rogers (KY)
	Rogers (MI)
	Rohrabacher
	Rokita
	Rooney
	Ros-Lehtinen
	Roskam
	Ross (AR)
	Ross (FL)
	Rothman (NJ)
	Roybal-Allard
	Royce
	Runyan
	Ruppersberger
	Rush
	Ryan (OH)
	Ryan (WI)
	Sanchez, Linda T.
	Sanchez, Loretta
	Sarbanes
	Scalise
	Schakowsky
	Schiff

NAYS—20

Amash	Jones
Broun (GA)	King (IA)
Burgess	Labrador
Farenthold	McClintock
Flake	Mulvaney
Flores	Paul
Graves (GA)	Posey

NOT VOTING—10

Baca	Grijalva	Speier
Bachmann	Hinche y	Waters
Black	Hirono	
Giffords	Poe (TX)	

□ 1546

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORPORAL STEVEN BLAINE RICCIONE POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2244) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 67 Castle Street in Geneva, New York, as the “Corporal Steven Blaine Riccione Post Office”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 1, answered “present” 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 674]

YEAS—418

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