

113, answered “present” 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 681]

YEAS—298

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Miller (NC)
Alexander	Garamendi	Miller, Gary
Andrews	Gingrey (GA)	Moran
Bachmann	Gonzalez	Mulvaney
Bachus	Goodlatte	Murphy (CT)
Barletta	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Barrow	Gowdy	Myrick
Bartlett	Granger	Nadler
Barton (TX)	Graves (GA)	Neugebauer
Bass (NH)	Green, Al	Noem
Becerra	Griffin (AR)	Nunes
Benishkek	Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee
Berg	Grimm	Olson
Berkley	Guinta	Owens
Berman	Guthrie	Palazzo
Biggart	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Bilbray	Hall	Paul
Bilirakis	Hanabusa	Paulsen
Bishop (GA)	Harper	Pelosi
Black	Hartzler	Pence
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hayworth	Petri
Bonner	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Pitts
Boren	Herger	Polis
Boustany	Higgins	Posey
Brady (TX)	Himes	Price (GA)
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Broun (GA)	Hirono	Quayle
Brown (FL)	Hochul	Quigley
Buchanan	Holden	Rangel
Bucshon	Holt	Rehberg
Burton (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Butterfield	Hultgren	Ribble
Calvert	Hunter	Richmond
Camp	Hurt	Rigell
Campbell	Inslee	Rivera
Canseco	Israel	Roby
Cantor	Issa	Roe (TN)
Capito	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Carnahan	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Carney	Jones	Rohrabacher
Carter	Jordan	Rokita
Cassidy	Kaptur	Ros-Lehtinen
Castor (FL)	Kelly	Roskam
Chabot	Kildee	Ross (AR)
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Ross (FL)
Chandler	King (NY)	Rothman (NJ)
Cicilline	Kingston	Royce
Clarke (MI)	Kissell	Runyan
Clarke (NY)	Kline	Ruppersberger
Clyburn	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Coble	Lamborn	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Landry	Scalise
Cole	Langevin	Schiff
Connolly (VA)	Lankford	Schmidt
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schock
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Crawford	LaTourette	Schwartz
Crenshaw	Latta	Schweikert
Critz	Levin	Scott (SC)
Cuellar	Lewis (CA)	Scott (VA)
Culberson	Lewis (GA)	Scott, Austin
Cummings	Lipinski	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Sensenbrenner
Davis (IL)	Long	Serrano
DeGette	Lucas	Sessions
DeLauro	Luetkemeyer	Sewell
Denham	Luján	Sherman
DesJarlais	Lummis	Shimkus
Deutch	Lynch	Shuler
Diaz-Balart	Mack	Shuster
Dicks	Manzullo	Simpson
Dingell	Marchant	Sires
Doggett	Marino	Smith (NE)
Doyle	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Dreier	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Smith (WA)
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Southerland
Ellison	McCollum	Stark
Ellmers	McHenry	Stutzman
Emerson	McIntyre	Sullivan
Engel	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Farr	McMorris	Thornberry
Fattah	Rodgers	Tonko
Fincher	McNerney	Towns
Flake	Meehan	Tsongas
Fleischmann	Meeks	Upton
Fleming	Mica	Visclosky
Fortenberry	Michaud	Walberg
Frank (MA)	Miller (FL)	Walden

Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Webster

Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman

Wolf  
Womack  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NAYS—113

Adams  
Altmire  
Baldwin  
Bass (CA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carson (IN)  
Cleaver  
Coffman (CO)  
Conaway  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crowley  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
Dent  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Duffy  
Edwards  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Filner  
Fitzpatrick  
Forbes  
Foxy  
Fudge  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs

Gibson  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Gutierrez  
Hanna  
Harris  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck  
Herrera Beutler  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huelskamp  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Keating  
Kind  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kucinich  
Lance  
Latham  
Lee (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Lowey  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McKinley  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Napolitano

Neal  
Nugent  
Oliver  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Payne  
Pearce  
Peters  
Peterson  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Rahall  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rooney  
Roybal-Allard  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schilling  
Slaughter  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Turner  
Velázquez  
Watt  
Woodall  
Wu  
Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Amash

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman  
Austria  
Baca  
Brooks  
Chu  
Clay  
Flores

Gallegly  
Giffords  
Grijalva  
Hinchey  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Maloney  
Pompeo

Reed  
Rush  
Speier  
Terry  
Van Hollen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1340

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2693) to cut spending, maintain existing commitments, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2693

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Budget Control Act of 2011”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

## TITLE I—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 101. Discretionary spending limits.

Sec. 102. Senate budget enforcement.

## TITLE II—OTHER SPENDING CUTS

Subtitle A—Federal Pell Grant and Student Loan Program Changes

Sec. 211. Federal Pell Grant and student loan program changes.

Subtitle B—Farm Programs

Sec. 221. Definition of payment acres.

## TITLE III—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

Sec. 301. Establishment of Joint Select Committee.

Sec. 302. Expedited consideration of joint committee recommendations.

Sec. 303. Funding.

Sec. 304. Rulemaking.

## TITLE IV—DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS

Sec. 401. Debt ceiling disapproval process.

## TITLE I—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS AND ENFORCEMENT

### SEC. 101. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that includes any provision that would cause the discretionary spending limits as set forth in this section to be exceeded.

(b) LIMITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term “discretionary spending limits” has the following meaning subject to adjustments in paragraph (2) and subsection (c):

(A) For fiscal year 2012—

(i) for the security category \$606,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(ii) for the nonsecurity category \$439,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(B) For fiscal year 2013—

(i) for the security category \$607,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(ii) for the nonsecurity category \$440,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(C) For fiscal year 2014, for the discretionary category, \$1,068,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(D) For fiscal year 2015, for the discretionary category, \$1,089,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(E) For fiscal year 2016, for the discretionary category, \$1,111,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(F) For fiscal year 2017, for the discretionary category, \$1,134,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(G) For fiscal year 2018, for the discretionary category, \$1,156,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(H) For fiscal year 2019, for the discretionary category, \$1,180,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(I) For fiscal year 2020, for the discretionary category, \$1,203,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(J) For fiscal year 2021, for the discretionary category, \$1,227,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(2) AUTHORIZED ADJUSTMENT TO LIMITS.—

(A) ADJUSTMENTS FOR BUDGET SUBMISSION.—When the President submits a budget under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, OMB shall calculate and the budget shall include adjustments to discretionary spending limits (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the budget year and each out year equal to the baseline levels of new budget authority using up-to-date concepts and definitions minus those levels using the concepts and definitions in effect before such changes. Such changes may only be made after consultation with the committees on

Appropriations and the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate and that consultation shall include written communication to such committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before official action is taken with respect to such changes.

(B) ADJUSTMENTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—For the purposes of Congressional enforcement of the limits in this section, the Chairmen of the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and House of Representatives may adjust the discretionary spending limits in amounts equal to the adjustments made pursuant to subparagraph (A) as contained in the President's budget. Any adjustment made pursuant to this subparagraph shall not constitute a repeal or change to the limits contained in this section.

(C) ESTIMATES AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) LIMITS AND SUBALLOCATIONS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2), (3), or (4), or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon—

(i) for the purposes of enforcement of the discretionary spending limits in the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of that House may adjust the discretionary spending limits in this section, the budgetary aggregates in the concurrent resolution on the budget most recently adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose; and

(ii) following any adjustment under clause (i), the Committee on Appropriations of that House may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(B) OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—For the purposes of determining an end of the year sequester pursuant to subsection (f), when OMB submits a sequestration report under subsection (f)(7) for a fiscal year, OMB shall calculate, and the sequestration report and subsequent budgets submitted by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall include, adjustments to discretionary spending limits (and those limits as adjusted) for the fiscal year and each succeeding year through 2021 upon the enactment of a bill or resolution relating to any matter described in paragraphs (2), (3), or (4).

(C) ESTIMATES.—

(i) CBO ESTIMATES.—As soon as practicable after Congress completes action on any discretionary appropriation, CBO, after consultation with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall provide OMB with an estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority for the current year (if any) and the budget year provided by that legislation.

(ii) OMB ESTIMATES AND EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 7 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after the date of enactment of any discretionary appropriation, OMB shall make publicly available on the day it is issued and, on the following day, shall be printed in the Federal Register a report containing the CBO estimate of that legislation, an OMB estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority for the current year (if any) and the budget year provided by that legislation, and an explanation of any difference between the 2 estimates.

(II) DIFFERENCES.—If during the preparation of the report OMB determines that there is a significant difference between OMB and CBO, OMB shall consult with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate regarding that difference and that consultation shall include, to the extent practicable, written communication to those committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before the issuance of the report.

(D) ASSUMPTIONS AND GUIDELINES.—OMB estimates under subparagraph (C) shall be made using current economic and technical assumptions. In its final sequestration report, OMB shall use the OMB estimates transmitted to the Congress under this paragraph. OMB and CBO shall prepare estimates under this paragraph in conformance with scorekeeping guidelines determined after consultation among the House and Senate Committees on the Budget, CBO, and OMB.

(E) ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph, amounts provided by annual appropriations shall include any new budget authority for the current year (if any) and the advance appropriations that become available in the budget year from previously enacted legislation.

(2) OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—Other adjustments referred to in paragraph (1)(B) are as follows:

(A) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SSI REDETERMINATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations in a fiscal year of the first amount specified in subclauses (I) through (X) of clause (ii) for that fiscal year for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations under the heading "Limitation on Administrative Expenses" for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, or one or more initiatives that the Office of the Chief Actuary determines would be at least as cost effective as a redetermination of eligibility under the heading "Limitation on Administrative Expenses" for the Social Security Administration of up to an amount further specified in that subclause, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and aggregates for that fiscal year may be adjusted by the amount in budget authority not to exceed the additional appropriation provided in such legislation for that purpose for that fiscal year.

(ii) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(I) for fiscal year 2012, an appropriation of \$758,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$237,000,000;

(II) for fiscal year 2013, an appropriation of \$758,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$390,000,000;

(III) for fiscal year 2014, an appropriation of \$778,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$559,000,000;

(IV) for fiscal year 2015, an appropriation of \$799,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$774,000,000;

(V) for fiscal year 2016, an appropriation of \$822,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$778,000,000;

(VI) for fiscal year 2017, an appropriation of \$849,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$804,000,000;

(VII) for fiscal year 2018, an appropriation of \$877,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$831,000,000;

(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, an appropriation of \$906,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$860,000,000;

(IX) for fiscal year 2020, an appropriation of \$935,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$890,000,000; and

(X) for fiscal year 2021, an appropriation of \$963,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$924,000,000.

(iii) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subparagraph, the terms "continuing disability reviews" and "Supplemental Security Income redeterminations" mean continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act.

(iv) REPORT.—The Commissioner of Social Security shall provide annually to the Congress a report on continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations which includes—

(I) the amount spent on continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations in the fiscal year covered by the report, and the number of reviews and redeterminations conducted, by category of review or redetermination;

(II) the results of the continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations in terms of cessations of benefits or determinations of continuing eligibility, by program; and

(III) the estimated savings over they short-, medium-, and long-term to the Old-age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance, Supplemental Security Income, Medicare, and Medicaid programs from continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations which result in cessations of benefits and the estimated present value of such savings.

(B) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX ENFORCEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations in a fiscal year to the Internal Revenue Service of not less than the first amount specified in subclauses (I) through (X) of clause (ii) for tax activities for that fiscal year, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid), and provides an additional appropriation for tax activities, including tax compliance activities to address the Federal tax gap, of up to an amount further specified in that subclause, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and aggregates for that fiscal year may be adjusted by the amount in budget authority not to exceed the amount of additional appropriations for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap provided in such legislation for that fiscal year.

(ii) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(I) for fiscal year 2012, an appropriation of \$7,979,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$2,519,000,000 for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap;

(II) for fiscal year 2013, an appropriation of \$7,979,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$3,132,000,000 for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap;

(III) for fiscal year 2014, an appropriation of \$8,204,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$3,542,000,000 for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap;

(IV) for fiscal year 2015, an appropriation of \$8,444,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$3,975,000,000 for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap;

(V) for fiscal year 2016, an appropriation of \$8,710,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$4,486,000,000 for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap;

(VI) for fiscal year 2017, an appropriation of \$9,012,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$4,538,000,000 for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap;

(VII) for fiscal year 2018, an appropriation of \$9,330,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$4,585,000,000 for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap;

(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, an appropriation of \$9,667,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$4,626,000,000 for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap;

(IX) for fiscal year 2020, an appropriation of \$9,989,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$4,688,000,000 for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap; and

(X) for fiscal year 2021, an appropriation of \$10,315,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$4,754,000,000 for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap.

(iii) DEFINITION.—As used in this subparagraph, the term “additional appropriation for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap” means new and continuing investments in expanding and improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the overall tax enforcement and compliance program of the Internal Revenue Service and fully funding operational support activities at the Internal Revenue Service. New and continuing investments include additional resources for implementing new authorities and for conducting additional examinations, audits, and enhanced third party data matching.

(iv) APPROPRIATION.—The first amount specified in subclauses (I) through (X) of clause (ii) is the amount under one or more headings in an appropriations Act for the Internal Revenue Service that is specified to pay for the costs of tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap.

(v) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—The amounts further specified in subclauses (I) through (X) of clause (ii) are the amounts under one or more headings in an appropriations Act for the Internal Revenue Service for the amount of the additional appropriation for tax activities, including tax compliance to address the Federal tax gap, but such adjustment shall be 0 (zero) unless the appropriations Act under the heading “Operations Support” for the Internal Revenue Service provides that such sums as are necessary shall be available, under the “Operations Support” heading, to fully support tax enforcement and compliance activities.

(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations in a fiscal year of the first amount specified in subclauses (I) through (X) of clause (ii) for program integrity or fraud and abuse activities under the heading “Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Account” program for the Department of Health and Human Services for that fiscal year, and provides an additional appropriation for program integrity or fraud and abuse activities under the heading “Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Account” program for the Department of Health and Human Services of up to an amount further specified that subclause, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and aggregates for that year

may be adjusted in an amount not to exceed the amount in budget authority provided in such legislation for that purpose for that fiscal year.

(ii) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(I) for fiscal year 2012, an appropriation of \$311,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$270,000,000;

(II) for fiscal year 2013, an appropriation of \$311,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$299,000,000;

(III) for fiscal year 2014, an appropriation of \$326,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$314,000,000;

(IV) for fiscal year 2015, an appropriation of \$340,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$332,000,000;

(V) for fiscal year 2016, an appropriation of \$356,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$350,000,000;

(VI) for fiscal year 2017, an appropriation of \$373,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$352,000,000;

(VII) for fiscal year 2018, an appropriation of \$391,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$354,000,000;

(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, an appropriation of \$411,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$354,000,000;

(IX) for fiscal year 2020, an appropriation of \$430,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$356,000,000; and

(X) for fiscal year 2021, an appropriation of \$451,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$356,000,000.

(iii) DEFINITION.—As used in this subparagraph, the term “program integrity or fraud and abuse activities” means those activities authorized by section 1817(k)(3) of the Social Security Act and other related program integrity activities, including administrative costs, in the Medicare Advantage and the Medicare Prescription Drug Programs authorized in title XVIII of the Social Security Act, in section 1893 of the Social Security Act, in Medicaid authorized in title XIX of the Social Security Act, and in the Children’s Health Insurance Program (“CHIP”) authorized in title XXI of the Social Security Act.

(iv) REPORT.—The report required by section 1817(k)(5) of the Social Security Act for each fiscal year shall include measures of the operational efficiency and impact on fraud, waste, and abuse in the Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP programs for the funds provided by an adjustment under this subparagraph.

(D) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IMPROPER PAYMENT REVIEWS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations in a fiscal year of the first amount specified in subclauses (I) through (X) of clause (ii) for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews under the heading “State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations” for the Department of Labor for that fiscal year, and provides an additional appropriation for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews under the heading “State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations” for the Department of Labor of up to an amount further specified in that subclause, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and aggregates for that year may be adjusted by an amount in budget authority not to exceed the additional appropriation provided in such legislation for that purpose for that fiscal year.

(ii) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(I) for fiscal year 2012, an appropriation of \$60,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$10,000,000;

(II) for fiscal year 2013, an appropriation of \$60,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$15,000,000;

(III) for fiscal year 2014, an appropriation of \$61,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$19,000,000;

(IV) for fiscal year 2015, an appropriation of \$61,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$24,000,000;

(V) for fiscal year 2016, an appropriation of \$62,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$28,000,000;

(VI) for fiscal year 2017, an appropriation of \$63,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$28,000,000;

(VII) for fiscal year 2018, an appropriation of \$64,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$29,000,000;

(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, an appropriation of \$64,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$30,000,000;

(IX) for fiscal year 2020, an appropriation of \$65,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$31,000,000; and

(X) for fiscal year 2021, an appropriation of \$66,000,000, and an additional appropriation of \$31,000,000.

(iii) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subparagraph, the terms “in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments” and “unemployment improper payment reviews” mean reviews or assessments conducted in local workforce offices to determine the continued eligibility of an unemployment insurance claimant under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, title III of the Social Security Act, and applicable State laws, to ensure they are meeting their obligation to search for work as a condition of eligibility, and to speed their return to work.

(iv) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION.—The amounts further specified in subclauses (I) through (X) of clause (ii) are the amounts under the heading “State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations” for the Department of Labor for the amount of the additional appropriation for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews, but such adjustment shall be 0 (zero) unless the appropriations Act providing such additional appropriation also provides the full amount requested under the heading “State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations” for the Department of Labor for grants to States for the administration of State unemployment insurance laws in the budget submitted for that fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.—

(A) CAP ADJUSTMENT.—The discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and aggregates for that year may be adjusted by an amount in budget authority not to exceed the amount provided in such legislation for that purpose for that fiscal year, but not to exceed in aggregate the amounts specified in subparagraph (B) for any—

(i) bills reported by the Committees on Appropriations of either House or in the Senate, passed by the House of Representatives;

(ii) joint resolutions or amendments reported by the Committees on Appropriations of either House;

(iii) amendments between the Houses, Senate amendments to such amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or House amendments to such amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives; or

(iv) conference reports;

making appropriations for overseas deployments and related activities.

(B) LEVELS.—

(i) LEVELS.—The initial levels for overseas deployments and related activities specified in this subparagraph are as follows:

(I) For fiscal year 2012, \$126,544,000,000 in budget authority.

(II) For the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2021, \$450,000,000,000 in budget authority.

(ii) LEVELS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—For each fiscal year after fiscal year 2012, Congress shall adopt in the concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year an adjustment for overseas deployments and related activities, provided that Congress may not adopt an adjustment for any fiscal year that would cause the total adjustments for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 to exceed the amount authorized in clause (i)(II).

(iii) ACCOUNTING FOR OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.—In any report issued under subsection (f)(7), OMB shall state the total amount of spending on overseas deployments and related activities for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 and the estimated amount of budget authority adjustment remaining for that period.

(C) ADJUSTMENT FOR OFFSET OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENT COSTS.—The levels set in subparagraph (B) may be further adjusted by the amount of budget authority provided in legislation for additional costs associated with overseas deployments and related activities if the amount of budget authority above those levels is offset.

(4) ADJUSTMENTS FOR DISASTER FUNDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If, for fiscal years 2011 through 2021, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that Congress designates as being for disaster relief in statute, the adjustment shall be the total of such appropriations in discretionary accounts designated as being for disaster relief, but not to exceed the total of—

(i) the average funding provided for disasters over the previous 10 years, excluding the highest and lowest years; and

(ii) for years when the enacted new discretionary budget authority designated as being for disaster relief for the preceding fiscal year was less than the average as calculated in clause (i) for that fiscal year, the difference between the enacted amount and the allowable adjustment as calculated in clause (i) for that fiscal year.

(B) OMB REPORT.—OMB shall report to the Committees on Appropriations in each House the adjustment for disaster funding for fiscal year 2011, and a preview report of the estimated level for fiscal year 2012, not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act.

(d) LIMITATIONS ON CHANGES TO THIS SECTION.—Unless otherwise specifically provided in this section, it shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any bill, resolution (including a concurrent resolution on the budget), amendment, motion, or conference report that would repeal or otherwise change this section.

(e) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsections (a) through (d) shall be waived or suspended only—

(A) by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn; or

(B) if the provisions of section (f)(8) are in effect.

(2) APPEAL.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the measure. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sus-

tain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(f) END-OF-YEAR SEQUESTER FOR EXCEEDING DISCRETIONARY CAPS.—

(1) SEQUESTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 14 calendar days after the end of a session of Congress (excluding weekends and holidays) and on the same day as a sequestration (if any) under section 5 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, there shall be a sequestration to eliminate a budget-year breach, if any, within the discretionary categories as set by subsection (b).

(B) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS.—Any amount of budget authority for overseas deployments and related activities for fiscal year 2012 in excess of the levels set in subsection (c)(3)(B)(i), or for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 that would cause the total adjustment for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 to exceed the amount authorized in section (c)(3)(B)(II), that is not otherwise offset pursuant subsection (c)(3)(C)(i), shall be counted in determining whether a breach has occurred—

(i) for fiscal years 2012 and 2013, in the security and non-security categories by amounts in the same proportion as the total amount designated in that fiscal year for overseas deployments and related activities in security and non-security accounts, respectively; and

(ii) for fiscal years 2014 through 2021, in the discretionary category.

(C) EMERGENCY SPENDING.—

(i) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION IN STATUTE.—If, for any fiscal year, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that Congress designates as emergency requirements in statute pursuant to this subparagraph, the total of such budget authority in discretionary accounts designated as emergency requirements in all fiscal years from such appropriations shall not be counted in determining whether a breach has occurred, and shall not count for the purposes of Congressional enforcement.

(ii) DESIGNATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If an appropriations Act includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for the purposes of this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

(iii) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering an appropriations Act, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, the provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(II) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(aa) WAIVER.—Subclause (I) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(bb) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subparagraph shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subparagraph.

(III) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of subclause (I), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subparagraph.

(IV) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subclause (I) may be raised by

a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(V) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, an appropriations Act, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this subparagraph, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable under the same conditions as was the conference report. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(2) ELIMINATING A BREACH.—Each non-exempt account within a category shall be reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the baseline level of sequesterable budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to eliminate a breach within that category.

(3) MILITARY PERSONNEL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, with respect to any military personnel account, exempt that account from sequestration or provide for a lower uniform percentage reduction than would otherwise apply, provided that the President has notified Congress of the manner in which such authority will be exercised pursuant to paragraph (7)(A)(ii).

(B) REDUCTIONS.—If the President uses the authority to exempt any military personnel from sequestration under paragraph (7)(A)(ii), each account within subfunctional category 051 (other than those military personnel accounts for which the authority provided under subparagraph (A) has been exercised) shall be further reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the enacted level of non-exempt budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to offset the total dollar amount by which budget authority is not reduced in military personnel accounts by reason of the use of such authority.

(4) PART-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS.—If, on the date specified in paragraph (1), there is in effect an Act making or continuing appropriations for part of a fiscal year for any budget account, then the dollar sequestration calculated for that account under paragraphs (2) and (3) shall be subtracted from—

(A) the annualized amount otherwise available by law in that account under that or a subsequent part-year appropriation; and

(B) when a full-year appropriation for that account is enacted, from the amount otherwise provided by the full-year appropriation.

(5) LOOK-BACK.—If, after June 30, an appropriation for the fiscal year in progress is enacted that causes a breach within a category for that year (after taking into account any sequestration of amounts within that category), the discretionary spending limits for that category for the next fiscal year shall be reduced by the amount or amounts of that breach.

(6) WITHIN-SESSION SEQUESTRATION.—If an appropriation for a fiscal year in progress is enacted (after Congress adjourns to end the session for that budget year and before July 1 of that fiscal year) that causes a breach within a category for that year (after taking

into account any prior sequestration of amounts within that category), 15 days after such enactment there shall be a sequestration to eliminate that breach within that category following the procedures set forth in paragraphs (2) through (4).

(7) REPORTS.—

(A) SEQUESTRATION PREVIEW REPORT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 days before the date of the President's budget submission for CBO, and the date of the President's budget submissions for OMB, OMB and CBO shall issue a preview report regarding discretionary spending based on laws enacted through those dates. The preview report shall set forth estimates for the current year and each subsequent year through 2021 of the applicable discretionary spending limits for each category and an explanation of any adjustments in such limits under this section.

(ii) NOTIFICATION REGARDING MILITARY PERSONNEL.—On or before the date of the sequestration preview report, the President shall notify Congress of the manner in which the President intends to exercise flexibility with respect to military personnel accounts under paragraph (3).

(B) SEQUESTRATION UPDATE REPORT.—Not later than August 15 for CBO, and August 20 for OMB, OMB and CBO shall issue a sequestration update report, reflecting laws enacted through those dates, containing all of the information required in the sequestration preview reports. This report shall also contain a preview estimate of the adjustment for disaster funding for the upcoming fiscal year.

(C) FINAL SEQUESTRATION REPORT.—Not later than 10 days after the end of session for CBO, and 14 days after the end of session for OMB (excluding weekends and holidays), OMB and CBO shall issue a final sequestration report, updated to reflect laws enacted through those dates, with estimates for each of the following:

(i) For the current year and each subsequent year through 2021 the applicable discretionary spending limits for each category and an explanation of any adjustments in such limits under this section, including a final estimate of the disaster funding adjustment.

(ii) For the current year and the budget year the estimated new budget authority for each category and the breach, if any, in each category.

(iii) For each category for which a sequestration is required, the sequestration percentages necessary to achieve the required reduction.

(iv) For the budget year, for each account to be sequestered, estimates of the baseline level of sequesterable budgetary resources and the amount of budgetary resources to be sequestered.

(D) EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCES.—The OMB reports shall explain the differences between OMB and CBO estimates for each report required by this paragraph.

(8) SUSPENSION IN THE EVENT OF LOW GROWTH.—Section 254(i) and subsections (a), (b)(1), and (c) of section 258 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 with respect to suspension of this section for low growth only shall apply to this section, provided that those sections are deemed not to apply to titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 1103 of title 31, United States Code.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NONSECURITY CATEGORY.—The term “nonsecurity category” means all discretionary appropriations, as that term is defined in section 250(c)(7) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, not included in the security category defined in this Act, but does not include any appropriation designated for overseas de-

ployments and related activities pursuant to section (c)(3) or appropriation designated as an emergency pursuant to this Act.

(2) SECURITY CATEGORY.—The term “security category” includes discretionary appropriations, as that term is defined in section 250(c)(7) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, in budget functions 050 and 700, but does not include any appropriation designated for overseas deployments and related activities pursuant to section (c)(3) or appropriation designated as an emergency pursuant to this Act.

(3) DISCRETIONARY CATEGORY.—The term “discretionary category” includes all discretionary appropriations, as that term is defined in section 250(c)(7) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, but does not include any appropriation designated for overseas deployments and related activities pursuant to section (c)(3) or appropriation designated as an emergency pursuant to this Act.

(4) ADVANCE APPROPRIATION.—The term “advance appropriation” means appropriations of new budget authority that become available one or more fiscal years beyond the fiscal year for which the appropriation act was passed.

(5) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—The term “discretionary spending limits” means the amounts specified in this section.

(6) DEFINITIONS.—To the extent they are not defined in this section, the terms used in this section shall have the same meaning as the terms defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(h) SEQUESTRATION RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (g) and (k) of section 256 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall apply to sequestration under this Act.

(2) INTERGOVERNMENTAL FUNDS.—For purposes of sequestration under this section, budgetary resources shall not include activities financed by voluntary payments to the Government for goods and services to be provided for such payments, intragovernmental funds paid in from other Government accounts, and unobligated balances of prior year appropriations.

**SEC. 102. SENATE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

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

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

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES AND LEVELS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(c) SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD.—

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

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

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

(d) FURTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—

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

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

(e) EXPIRATION.—

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

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

## TITLE J—OTHER SPENDING CUTS

### Subtitle A—Federal Pell Grant and Student Loan Program Changes

#### SEC. 211. FEDERAL PELL GRANT AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM CHANGES.

(a) FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.—Section 401(b)(7)(A)(iv) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(7)(A)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II), by striking “\$3,183,000,000” and inserting “\$13,683,000,000”; and

(2) in subclause (III), by striking “\$0” and inserting “\$7,500,000,000”.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INTEREST SUBSIDIZED LOANS TO GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS.—Section 455(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INTEREST SUBSIDIZED LOANS TO GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of this part or part B, for any period of instruction beginning on or after July 1, 2012—

“(i) a graduate or professional student shall not be eligible to receive a subsidized Federal Direct Stafford Loan under this part;

“(ii) the maximum annual amount of Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans such a student may borrow in any academic year (as defined in section 481(a)(2)) or its equivalent shall be the maximum annual amount for such student determined under section 428H, plus an amount equal to the amount of Federal Direct Subsidized Loans the student would have received in the absence of this subparagraph; and

“(iii) the maximum aggregate amount of Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans such a student may borrow shall be the maximum aggregate amount for such student determined under section 428H, adjusted to reflect the increased annual limits described in clause (ii), as prescribed by the Secretary by regulation.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an individual enrolled in coursework specified in paragraph (3)(B) or (4)(B) of section 484(b).”.

(c) INAPPLICABILITY OF TITLE IV NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING AND MASTER CALENDAR EXCEPTION.—Sections 482(c) and 492 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1089(c), 1098a) shall not apply to the amendments made by this section, or to any regulations promulgated under those amendments.

## Subtitle B—Farm Programs

### SEC. 221. DEFINITION OF PAYMENT ACRES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(11) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8702(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C)”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) in the case of direct payments for the 2012 crop year, 59 percent of the base acres for the covered commodity on a farm on which direct payments are made.”.

(b) PAYMENT ACRES FOR PEANUTS.—Section 1301(5) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8751(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C)”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) in the case of direct payments for the 2012 crop year, 59 percent of the base acres for peanuts on a farm on which direct payments are made.”.

## TITLE K—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

### SEC. 301. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.—The term “joint committee” means the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction established under subsection (b)(1).

(2) JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE BILL.—The term “joint committee bill” means a bill consisting of the proposed legislative language of the joint committee recommended under subsection (b)(3)(B) and introduced under section 302(a).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a joint select committee of Congress to be known as the “Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction”.

(2) GOAL.—The goal of the joint committee shall be to reduce the deficit to 3 percent or less of GDP.

(3) DUTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) IMPROVING THE SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM FISCAL IMBALANCE.—The joint committee shall provide recommendations and legislative language that will significantly improve the short-term and long-term fiscal imbalance of the Federal Government and may include recommendations and legislative language on tax reform.

(ii) CONSIDERATION OF OTHER BIPARTISAN PLANS.—As a part of developing the joint committee’s recommendations and legislation, the joint committee shall consider existing bipartisan plans to reduce the deficit, including plans developed jointly by Senators or Members of the House of Representatives.

(iii) RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE COMMITTEES.—Not later than October 14, 2011, each committee of the House of Representatives and Senate may transmit to the joint committee its recommendations for changes in law to reduce the deficit consistent with the goals described in paragraph (2) for the joint committee’s consideration.

(B) REPORT, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 23, 2011, the joint committee shall vote on—

(I) a report that contains a detailed statement of the findings, conclusions, and rec-

ommendations of the joint committee and the CBO estimate required by paragraph (5)(D)(ii); and

(II) proposed legislative language to carry out such recommendations as described in subclause (I).

No amendment to the Rules of the House of Representatives or the Standing Rules of the Senate shall be in order in the legislative language required in subclause (II).

(ii) APPROVAL OF REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—The report of the joint committee and the proposed legislative language described in clause (i) shall require the approval of not fewer than 7 of the 12 members of the joint committee.

(iii) ADDITIONAL VIEWS.—A member of the joint committee who gives notice of an intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of final joint committee vote on the approval of the report and legislative language under clause (ii), shall be entitled to 3 calendar days in which to file such views in writing with the staff director of the joint committee. Such views shall then be included in the joint committee report and printed in the same volume, or part thereof, and their inclusion shall be noted on the cover of the report. In the absence of timely notice, the joint committee report may be printed and transmitted immediately without such views.

(iv) TRANSMISSION OF REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—If the report and legislative language are approved by the joint committee pursuant to clause (ii), then not later than December 2, 2011, the joint committee shall submit the joint committee report and legislative language described in clause (i) to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Majority and Minority Leaders of both Houses.

(v) REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE TO BE MADE PUBLIC.—Upon the approval or disapproval of the joint committee report and legislative language pursuant to clause (ii), the joint committee shall promptly make the full report and legislative language, and a record of the vote, available to the public.

(4) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The joint committee shall be composed of 12 members appointed pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) APPOINTMENT.—Members of the joint committee shall be appointed as follows:

(i) The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(ii) The minority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(iii) The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(iv) The minority leader of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(C) CO-CHAIRS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—There shall be 2 Co-Chairs of the joint committee. The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint one Co-Chair from among the members of the joint committee. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint the second Co-Chair from among the members of the joint committee. The Co-Chairs shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section.

(ii) STAFF DIRECTOR.—The Co-Chairs, acting jointly, shall hire the staff director of the joint committee.

(D) DATE.—Members of the joint committee shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section.



(E) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the joint committee. Any vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled not later than 14 calendar days after the date on which the vacancy occurs in the same manner as the original appointment. If a member of the committee leaves Congress, the member is no longer a member of the joint committee and a vacancy shall exist.

(5) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To enable the joint committee to exercise its powers, functions, and duties, there are authorized to be disbursed by the Senate the actual and necessary expenses of the joint committee approved by the Co-Chairs, subject to Senate rules and regulations.

(B) EXPENSES.—In carrying out its functions, the joint committee is authorized to incur expenses in the same manner and under the same conditions as the Joint Economic Committee as authorized by section 11 of Public Law 79-304 (15 U.S.C. 1024(d)).

(C) QUORUM.—Seven members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of voting, meeting, and holding hearings.

(D) VOTING.—

(i) PROXY VOTING.—No proxy voting shall be allowed on behalf of the members of the joint committee.

(ii) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—The Congressional Budget Office shall provide estimates of the legislation (as described in paragraph (3)(B)) in accordance with sections 308(a) and 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 639(a) and 601(f)) (including estimates of the effect of interest payment on the debt). In addition, the Congressional Budget Office shall provide information on the budgetary effect of the legislation beyond the year 2021 and the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation may provide information on the budgetary effect of the legislation relative to alternative fiscal scenarios. The joint committee may not vote on any version of the report, recommendations, or legislative language unless such estimates are available for consideration by all members of the joint committee at least 48 hours prior to the vote as certified by the Co-Chairs.

(E) MEETINGS.—

(i) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 45 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section, the joint committee shall hold its first meeting.

(ii) AGENDA.—The Co-Chairs shall provide an agenda to the joint committee members not less than 48 hours in advance of any meeting.

(F) HEARINGS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The joint committee may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, require attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, and documents, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths the joint committee considers advisable.

(ii) HEARING PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CO-CHAIRS.—

(I) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The Co-Chairs shall make a public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted not less than 7 days in advance of such hearing, unless the Co-Chairs determine that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

(II) WRITTEN STATEMENT.—A witness appearing before the joint committee shall file a written statement of proposed testimony at least 2 calendar days prior to appearance, unless the requirement is waived by the Co-Chairs, following their determination that there is good cause for failure of compliance.

(G) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon written request of the Co-Chairs, a Federal agency shall provide technical assistance to the joint committee in order for the joint committee to carry out its duties.

(C) STAFF OF JOINT COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Co-Chairs may jointly appoint and fix the compensation of staff as they deem necessary, within the guidelines for Senate employees and following all applicable Senate rules and employment requirements.

(2) ETHICAL STANDARDS.—Members on the joint committee who serve in the House of Representatives shall be governed by the House ethics rules and requirements. Members of the Senate who serve on the joint committee and staff of the joint committee shall comply with Senate ethics rules.

(d) TERMINATION.—The joint committee shall terminate on January 13, 2012.

**SEC. 302. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.**

(a) INTRODUCTION.—If approved by the majority required by section 301(b)(3)(B)(ii), the proposed legislative language submitted pursuant to section 301(b)(3)(B)(iv) shall be introduced in the Senate (by request) on the next day on which the Senate is in session by the majority leader of the Senate or by a Member of the Senate designated by the majority leader of the Senate and shall be introduced in the House of Representatives (by request) on the next legislative day by the majority leader of the House of Representatives or by a Member of the House of Representatives designated by the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

(b) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which the joint committee bill is referred shall report it to the House of Representatives without amendment not later than December 9, 2011. If a committee fails to report the joint committee bill within that period, it shall be in order to move that the House of Representatives discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. Such a motion shall not be in order after the last committee authorized to consider the bill reports it to the House of Representatives or after the House of Representatives has disposed of a motion to discharge the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a motion is adopted, the House of Representatives shall proceed immediately to consider the joint committee bill in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After the last committee authorized to consider a joint committee bill reports it to the House of Representatives or has been discharged (other than by motion) from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint committee bill in the House of Representatives. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House of Representatives has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to the joint committee bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The joint committee bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint committee bill and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint committee bill to its pas-

sage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the joint committee bill. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall not be in order.

(4) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(c) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN THE SENATE.—

(1) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—A joint committee bill introduced in the Senate under subsection (a) shall be jointly referred to the committee or committees of jurisdiction, which committees shall report the bill without any revision and with a favorable recommendation, an unfavorable recommendation, or without recommendation, not later than December 9, 2011. If any committee fails to report the bill within that period, that committee shall be automatically discharged from consideration of the bill, and the bill shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) MOTION TO PROCEED.—Notwithstanding rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order, not later than 2 days of session after the date on which a joint committee bill is reported or discharged from all committees to which it was referred, for the majority leader of the Senate or the majority leader's designee to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill. It shall also be in order for any Member of the Senate to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill at any time after the conclusion of such 2-day period. A motion to proceed is in order even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to. All points of order against the motion to proceed to the joint committee bill are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill is agreed to, the joint committee bill shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—All points of order against the joint committee bill and against consideration of the joint committee bill are waived. Consideration of the joint committee bill and of all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith shall not exceed a total of 30 hours which shall be divided equally between the Majority and Minority Leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate on the joint committee bill is in order, shall require an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn, and is not debatable. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal. All time used for consideration of the joint committee bill, including time used for quorum calls and voting, shall be counted against the total 30 hours of consideration.

(4) NO AMENDMENTS.—An amendment to the joint committee bill, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint committee bill, is not in order.

(5) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to the joint committee bill, the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint committee bill, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(6) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint committee bill shall be decided without debate.

(d) AMENDMENT.—The joint committee bill shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(e) CONSIDERATION BY THE OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint committee bill, one House receives from the other a joint committee bill—

(A) the joint committee bill of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint committee bill had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint committee bill received from the other House shall supplant the joint committee bill of the receiving House.

(2) REVENUE MEASURE.—This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint committee bill received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(f) RULES TO COORDINATE ACTION WITH OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) TREATMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint committee bill under this section, the joint committee bill of the House of Representatives shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

(2) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES IN THE SENATE.—If following passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate, the Senate then receives the joint committee bill from the House of Representatives, the House-passed joint committee bill shall not be debatable. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate shall be considered to be the vote on passage of the joint committee bill received from the House of Representatives.

(3) VETOES.—If the President vetoes the joint committee bill, debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

(g) LOSS OF PRIVILEGE.—The provisions of this section shall cease to apply to the joint committee bill if—

(1) the joint committee fails to vote on the report or proposed legislative language required under section 301(b)(3)(B)(i) by November 23, 2011; or

(2) the joint committee bill does not pass both Houses by December 23, 2011.

#### SEC. 303. FUNDING.

Funding for the joint committee shall be derived in equal portions from—

(1) the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the contingent fund of the Senate from the appropriations account “Miscellaneous Items”, subject to Senate rules and regulations.

#### SEC. 304. RULEMAKING.

The provisions of this title are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

### TITLE L—DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS

#### SEC. 401. DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS.

Subchapter I of chapter 31 of subtitle III of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 3101(b), by striking “or otherwise” and inserting “or as provided by section 3101A or otherwise”; and

(2) by inserting after section 3101, the following:

#### “§ 3101A. Presidential modification of the debt ceiling

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) \$1.2 TRILLION.—

“(A) CERTIFICATION.—If, not later than December 31, 2011, the President submits a written certification to Congress that the President has determined that the debt subject to limit is within \$100,000,000,000 of the limit in section 3101(b) and that further borrowing is required to meet existing commitments, the Secretary of the Treasury may exercise authority to borrow an additional \$1,200,000,000,000 subject to the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval enacted pursuant to this section. Upon submission of such certification, the limit on debt provided in section 3101(b) (referred to in this section as the ‘debt limit’) is increased by \$416,000,000,000.

“(B) RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Congress may consider a joint resolution of disapproval of the authority under subparagraph (A) as provided in subsections (b) through (f). The joint resolution of disapproval considered under this section shall contain only the language provided in subsection (b)(2). If the time for disapproval has lapsed without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval under this section, the debt limit is increased by an additional \$784,000,000,000.

“(2) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—

“(A) CERTIFICATION.—If, after the debt limit is increased by \$1,200,000,000,000 under paragraph (1), the President submits a written certification to Congress that the President has determined that the debt subject to limit is within \$150,000,000,000 of the limit in section 3101(b) and that further borrowing is required to meet existing commitments, the Secretary of the Treasury may exercise authority to borrow an additional amount equal to \$1,200,000,000,000 subject to the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval enacted pursuant to this section.

“(B) RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Congress may consider a joint resolution of disapproval of the authority under subparagraph (A) as provided in subsections (b) through (f). The joint resolution of disapproval considered under this section shall contain only the language provided in subsection (b)(2). After the time for disapproval has lapsed without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval under this section, the debt limit is increased by the amount authorized under subparagraph (A).

“(b) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for the \$416,000,000,000 increase in the debt limit provided by subsection (a)(1)(A), the debt limit may not be raised under this section if, within 55 calendar days after the date on which Congress receives a certification described in subsection (a)(1) or within 15 calendar days after the Congress receives the certification described in subsection (a)(2) (regardless of whether Congress is in session), there is enacted into law a joint resolution disapproving the President’s exercise of authority with respect to such additional amount.

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

“(A)(i) for the certification described in subsection (a)(1), that is introduced on Sep-

tember 6, 7, 8 or 9, 2011 (or, if the Senate was not in session, the next calendar day on which the Senate is in session); and

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

“(B) which does not have a preamble;

“(C) the title of which is only as follows: ‘Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President’s exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code on \_\_\_\_\_’ (with the blank containing the date of submission); and

“(D) the matter after the resolving clause of which is only as follows: ‘That Congress disapproves of the President’s exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 3101A(a) of title 31, United States Code.’.

“(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(1) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification described in subsection (a)(2), the Speaker, if the House would otherwise be adjourned, shall notify the Members of the House that, pursuant to this section, the House shall convene not later than the second calendar day after receipt of such certification.

“(2) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than 5 calendar days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution described in subsection (a). If a committee fails to report a joint resolution within that period, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar.

“(3) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution reports it to the House or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order, not later than the sixth day after introduction of a joint resolution under subsection (a), to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on a joint resolution addressing a particular submission. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

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

“(d) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN SENATE.—

“(1) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification under subsection (a)(2), if the Senate has adjourned or recessed for more than 2 days, the majority leader of the Senate, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate that, pursuant to this section, the Senate shall convene not later than the second calendar day after receipt of such message.

“(2) PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.—Upon introduction in the Senate, the joint resolution shall be immediately placed on the calendar.

“(3) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—



“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time during the period beginning on the day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (a) and for the certification described in subsection (a)(1), ending on September 14, 2011 and for the certification described in subsection (a)(2) on the 6th day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (a) (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

“(B) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration of the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(C) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution, the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall occur immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

“(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

“(e) AMENDMENT NOT IN ORDER.—A joint resolution of disapproval considered pursuant to this section shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

“(f) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint resolution, one House receives from the other a joint resolution—

“(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

“(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

“(2) TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint resolution under this section, the joint resolution of the House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

“(3) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the joint resolution in the Senate, the Senate then receives the companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

“(4) CONSIDERATION AFTER PASSAGE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If Congress passes a joint resolution, the period beginning on the date the President is presented with the joint resolution and ending on the date the

President takes action with respect to the joint resolution (but excluding days when either House is not in session) shall be disregarded in computing the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1).

“(B) VETOES.—If the President vetoes the joint resolution—

“(i) the period beginning on the date the President vetoes the joint resolution and ending on the day on which the Congress receives the veto message with respect to the joint resolution (regardless of whether Congress is in session) shall be disregarded in computing the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1); and

“(ii) debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

“(5) VETO OVERRIDE.—If within the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1), Congress overrides a veto of the joint resolution with respect to authority exercised pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the limit on debt provided in section 3101(b) shall not be raised, except for the \$416,000,000,000 increase in the limit provided by subsection (a)(1)(A)(i).

“(6) SEQUESTER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If within the 55 calendar days of receiving the certification described in subsection (a)(1), Congress overrides a veto of the joint resolution with respect to authority exercised pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a), OMB shall, immediately, sequester pro rata amounts from all discretionary and direct spending accounts as defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)) (as in effect September 30, 2006) equal to \$416,000,000,000. No reduction of payments for net interest (all of major functional category 900) shall be made under any order issued under this paragraph.

“(B) APPLICATION.—Section 255 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not apply to this section, except that payments for military personnel accounts (within subfunctional category 051), TRICARE for Life, Medicare (functional category 570), military retirement, Social Security (functional category 650), veterans (functional category 700), and net interest (functional category 900) shall be exempt.

“(g) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection and subsections (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) are enacted by Congress—

“(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

“(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.”.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, is it true that a bill considered under suspension of the rules denies the minority party the right to offer any amendments or even a motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A motion to suspend is not liable to amendment from the floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Is it true that a bill considered under suspension of the rules requires a two-thirds supermajority vote in order for a bill to pass?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XV, a motion to suspend the rules may be adopted by two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Is it also true, Mr. Speaker, that a bill considered under suspension of the rules does not pass if it receives a simple majority vote but not two-thirds of the vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Does this mean that Speaker BOEHNER's bill to raise the debt limit and destroy Medicare would have failed if it were considered under suspension of the rules yesterday?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I think this is the first time that I have offered a Reid proposal in the House of Representatives.

One might ask why it is we are here doing this. It's very apparent to me why it is that we are here doing this, and that is we want to ensure that next Tuesday we see an increase in the debt ceiling so the Social Security checks go out, we bring about spending reductions, and we maintain the credit rating of the United States of America and do all the other things that I believe both Democrats and Republicans, alike, want to have take place.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have passed from this House two measures

within the last 2 weeks, the Cut, Cap, and Balance measure, and just last night, the Boehner proposal, which, as we all know, stemmed from a bipartisan meeting that he had exactly 1 week ago this afternoon in his meeting with Senator REID right down along the hall. Unfortunately, Mr. REID no longer supports the proposal that we passed last night, and Senator REID has said on several occasions that his plan is the only plan that can pass both Houses of Congress.

Now, 5 minutes ago, Senator MCCONNELL once again asked Senator REID to bring up this plan that Senator REID said was the only one that could pass both Houses of Congress, and Senator REID said no.

Thursday night, I introduced this measure of Senator REID's and was asked, in the Rules Committee yesterday, by Mr. MCGOVERN, whether or not we would bring it up and I said we didn't plan to. But the fact is Senator MCCONNELL, having made the request now at least twice in the other body to have it brought up, asked us to raise this measure here, and that's exactly what we are doing.

Now, if we look at where it is that we are headed, we all want to have a bipartisan compromise that will ensure that on Tuesday we see that increase in the debt ceiling take place and do these other things. That's what the Speaker of the House and the Democratic leader of the United States Senate, along with Leader MCCONNELL and Leader PELOSI, discussed a week ago today.

And as Speaker BOEHNER said from the well last night, this was an agreement which was supported by Senator REID, but things have changed. Things have changed; we know that. But there is one thing that has not changed, and that is we have to act as quickly as possible. We need to come up with a compromise.

And you know what? Since Senator REID happens to believe that his measure is the only one that can pass both Houses of Congress, we are going to let him know, when we defeat it here in the House of Representatives, that it is not the plan that can gain broad support in the House and the Senate. And so for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we are bringing this up.

We, I believe, should have an opportunity for every Member of this House to go on record on this issue, and I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this proposal so that we can come together with an important, bipartisan compromise to achieve the goal that we all say that we share.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this process has become a joke. It is a disgrace. It's an insult to the American people.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, now is the time to act like grown-ups. This is the time

to put our country before your political party. This is time to put our country before the Tea Party. This is the time to do what's right.

Today, you are bringing up the latest version of the Reid plan under not only a closed rule, but under the most restrictive process we have in the House, usually reserved for noncontroversial bills. There is a \$2.5 trillion bill being brought up under the same process that you bring up bills naming post offices—20 minutes of debate, no amendments allowed. We are not even allowed to offer a motion to recommit. To win, you need a two-thirds supermajority. Under this process, your own bill would have failed. That's right, if your bill were brought up under this procedure, your bill would have lost last night.

Mr. Speaker, the only bill we should consider on the House floor is one that has been agreed to by the House and Senate leaders and the President of the United States.

So why are we doing this today? Let's be honest. You are doing it to score some cheap political points.

I would like to remind the Speaker of the House that he is the Speaker of not just the Republican Party, but that he is the Speaker of the whole House. Now is the time to bring us together, not tear us apart.

□ 1350

Maybe the Reid bill is the one that can unite us because it achieves tremendous savings without decimating Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security. But Mr. Speaker, to bring it up under this process is cynical, and it demeans the House of Representatives.

I would say to the Republican leadership: Enough political stunts. Our country is facing a terrible economic crisis, a crisis that you created and one that you can avoid, but we've run out of time. Now is the time for leadership, not bad political theater. Now is the time to behave like legislators. Please rise to the occasion.

The Reid bill is not the bill I would have written. It's not the truly balanced approach that I would have hoped for. There are no revenues in this bill. But I think it's the best approach that is on the table right now, and I'm willing to compromise. So I will vote "yes" on this bill. I'm willing to put my country first.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend from Redlands, California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the remarks of my colleague from California as well as his colleague from the Rules Committee, I

wouldn't be making these remarks. I will begin with a quote:

"The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that 'the buck stops here.' Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better."—Senator Barack H. Obama, March, 2006.

By 2009, Senator Obama had become President Obama. In the 2 years since he became President, Federal spending has increased by over \$500 billion a year. In the past 2 years, he has added nearly \$4 trillion to our national debt. Now President Obama is in favor of increasing the national debt limit. When, oh when, will the real Barack Obama stand up?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, our neighbors, our friends sent us here to be responsible and to come to the aid of our country at a time of crisis. Our country is at such a time now.

Our people confront uncertainty and fear, and they're looking to us for the courage to compromise and act to prevent default and to prevent gridlock and irresponsibility.

Yesterday, we learned that investors in American stocks lost more than \$400 billion when just a few days ago Speaker BOEHNER said he could not compromise with President Obama. Notwithstanding the remarks of my friend from California, the chairman of the Rules Committee, who talks about a bipartisan compromise, I tell my friend, you have not moved a single centimeter towards compromise with our side of the aisle, not a single centimeter.

And what do we see in the United States Senate, my friends? We see a majority leader of the United States Senate who has a President with him. So, yes, you control one-third, and you control over 40 percent so you can stop things from happening in the Senate, but the people aren't looking to us for what we can stop; they're looking to us for what we can do, for what we can do to make our country healed at this point in time.

So what has Senator REID done with this bill that you introduced—guaranteed to fail. This is the second time you have put a bill on the floor to extend the debt limit guaranteed to fail. It is a pattern, frankly, I say to you, my friends, and it's a pattern that the American public ought not to countenance.

What Senator REID has done is he has taken the view of Speaker BOEHNER

and Leader CANTOR and said we need a long-term solution. And then he has compromised, not notwithstanding the fact that all of us on this side believe that the wealthiest among us should help take us out of this crisis and not rely on the most vulnerable among us. And so there is no revenue in Senator REID's bill, notwithstanding that an overwhelming number of us on this side of the aisle believe that's good policy, and I know that some of you on your side of the aisle believe that as well.

Senator REID has set up a process so that we can continue to look at what we know we need to look at, bringing our deficit and debt down, for which we are all responsible, my friends.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. And so we confront this moment of responsibility. I believe my side of the aisle will overwhelmingly say yes, not because they like this bill, but because they believe it is a compromise that can work because it takes so much of the demands that you have made on your side of the aisle. But if you came to Congress expecting perfection, if you came to Congress expecting only that you do it your way and no other way, you will be disappointed, as all of us are disappointed, because it cannot happen that way. Our Founding Fathers brought us from many places with many perspectives to try to heal our country and provide for the general welfare.

Let us avoid default. Let us set ourselves on a path of compromise. My friends on the Republican side of the aisle, we are going to vote, for the most part, for this bill. We do not believe it's perfect, but we believe it's possible. America expects us to do that.

The summer soldiers and the sunshine patriots will retreat at this time of crisis. Do not do that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to yield my friend an additional 15 seconds.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will say that I was prepared to engage in a colloquy with my good friend from Maryland and explain to him that if Senator REID believes that this is a great compromise, why will he not respond to Senator MCCONNELL's repeated requests to bring it up in the United States Senate?

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to our Presidential candidate, our good friend from Stillwater, Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, throughout this debate over guaranteeing insane, never before seen in the history of this country levels of spending, President Obama has coolly stood on the sidelines, his armed crossed, very simply castigating Republicans for not giving him a \$2.4 trillion blank

check. Meanwhile, the only plan that the President has put forward is his February budget, which in itself contained yet one more \$1.5 trillion deficit.

The President has no plan. Only the Republicans have offered plans. Now is the time for the President to show leadership, and the only leadership that he is showing is one that's saying tsk, tsk, tsk, trying to bring us to the brink when in fact we're trying to be responsible and bring this to a successful conclusion.

We call on the President of the United States to finally engage in the process.

□ 1400

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just remind the gentlelady that no one on the Democratic side ever walked out of a meeting.

At this point, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I have been here almost 29 years. This is a disgraceful moment. This country wants compromise. What you're doing with this bill is to undermine the chances of compromise. That's what you're doing. You're trying to throw a monkey wrench in the Reid bill before it can even leave the station. That's what you're doing. You're trying to make sure that the Senate cannot work its will.

Why isn't this bill being brought up? Because Senator REID wants to sit down with Senate Republicans and work out a compromise, and you're bringing up this bill to make sure that this will never happen. This is a disgraceful moment, Mr. DREIER. It is a disgraceful moment.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I yield time to my friend from Michigan? Am I allowed to yield time to my friend from Michigan?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. DREIER, you have already spoken. What you are doing here is—

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 15 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Look, Mr. DREIER, it is very clear what you are doing here. Mr. REID wants to sit down and work with Mr. MCCONNELL. What you are trying to do is to make sure that a signal is sent to the Senate, don't bother.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me say that the action that we are about to take here today is going to help with the process of seeing Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID work together.

Mr. LEVIN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. DREIER, that is pernicious nonsense.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The Chair will remind the Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I will not only address you, I won't point my finger at you as I address you.

Let me say, Madam Speaker, that Senator MCCONNELL has just minutes ago asked Senator REID to bring the Reid proposal to the floor of the United States Senate. And a decision has been made by Senator REID not to bring the measure up.

On at least two occasions, Senator MCCONNELL has asked, since Senator REID has said that his proposal is the only one that can pass both Houses of Congress, Senator MCCONNELL has asked us to show what we all know, and that is that there is not going to be a majority of support in the House of Representatives for his proposal.

And then when that happens, we look forward to the discussions that will take place with Speaker BOEHNER, Senator REID, Leader MCCONNELL, and Leader PELOSI.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a hardworking new Member of Congress.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, we need to cut spending now. We need to control spending in the future. But the American people understand that our foremost constitutional duty here in Congress is to make sure that America is safe.

Former Secretary Gates said that further cuts to our military will mean that there are certain things our military won't be able to do and places they won't be able to go.

This proposal, the Reid-Obama plan, proposes cutting defense spending by \$859 billion over 10 years compared to the President's fiscal year 2011 budget. Yet the President and Senator REID have not told us what places we won't be going and what missions we won't be doing. This is irresponsible. I can't support this proposal.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. This Republican ploy is too clever by half. At the very same time Republican Senators are filibustering against bringing up this proposal in the Senate, the House Republicans are insisting on bringing it up here so they can vote it down. While it is imperfect and imbalanced, this Reid proposal protects educational opportunities for college students, it protects retirement security through Medicare and Social Security, and it provides

more important resources for public services than the reactionary House Republican budget.

With House Republicans still at fault for refusing to seek any type of middle ground, the Reid bill is the least worst alternative to avoid default.

As desperate as they were last night to cobble together a handful of votes to pass a partisan Boehner bill, they are even more desperate to defeat this reasonable middle ground because they insist it must have two-thirds of the votes of this body.

Let us join Democrats in unity to approve this proposal.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to remind my friend from Texas that the measure that we voted on last night stemmed from the bipartisan agreement that was put together one week ago this afternoon right down the hall.

With that, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Jefferson, Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If you look at the Reid bill, it doesn't even start to address the problem. With all of its budget gimmicks and shell games, I think most people recognize that if you had an honest conversation, you would know it doesn't even start to tackle the spending problem.

Now, hardworking American families back home know the problem in America is not that we have corporate jet owners and millionaires and billionaires; the problem is that Washington spends too much money. You don't solve that problem by sending more money up to Washington to spend even more. And so when the President talks about a balanced approach, what he really means is more job-killing tax hikes.

Families back home know what we really need is a balanced budget amendment to put accountability back in place in Washington to control this rampant, out-of-control spending in Washington and to finally attack the real problem, and that's Washington spending. I oppose the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, this agreement offers the calm, reasonable compromise the country wants. Most Americans don't want to let the debt ceiling expire. This bill solves that problem.

Most Americans say, You know what? You probably can cut about 5 percent in most government programs. Not everybody believes that, but that's what this bill does.

Most Americans say that there ought to be some other way to look at difficult entitlement programs and other issues. The bill sets up a process to do that.

What the bill does is recognize the difference between the two parties and puts that difference aside. The majority party wants to make radical changes in Medicare and Social Security; we do not.

We believe that the wealthiest Americans should pay their fair share to solve this problem. The majority party does not. The bill leaves that disagreement aside and focuses on the areas of agreement.

You know, American troops on patrol are not asking under what conditions they should do their duty this afternoon. They're understanding their duty, and they're doing it—and so should we. Pass this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), a hardworking new Member of the class of 87 people who came in here to change this place.

Mr. TIPTON. Thank you, Mr. DREIER. When we hear our colleague from Texas say “this is the least worst alternative,” and that's our best choice? I think the American people demand and deserve better. It is time that we put people before politics and partisanship aside so that we can have progress for the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. As an American, I stand here united with America voting “yes” on this bill to save Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Budget Control Act of 2011,” the Reid Bill, which is a legitimate attempt to resolve our debt-ceiling crisis unlike the previous debt-ceiling bills introduced by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, which has attempted to resolve our budget ceiling crisis by demanding sharp cuts to domestic programs that ask average Americans to make life-changing sacrifices while not asking America's wealthiest individuals and most profitable corporations to contribute their fair share.

We must work together to save the American people and do what's right. We are working under one flag and one nation; there are times in which we are 50 states, and times when we exist as a single, united, nation. One single state did not defend the nation after the attacks on Pearl Harbor. One state, on its own, did not end segregation and establish Civil Rights. There are times when the stakes are too high, when we simply must unite as states and act as one. We must today work under one flag and one nation to protect our economy and our people.

We need to change the tone here in Congress. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said it best when he stated recently before the House Committee on Financial Services, “We really don't want to just cut, cut, cut.” Chairman Bernanke further stated “You

need to be a little bit cautious about sharp cuts in the very near term because of the potential impact on the recovery. That doesn't at all preclude—in fact, I believe it's entirely consistent with—a longer-term program that will bring our budget into a sustainable position.” The Reid plan offers the compromise that the American people want, demand and need. I stand here with so many of my colleagues calling for the protection of Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and other programs that protect the interests of the American people.

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

This plan will result in a \$1.2 trillion increase in the debt limit, \$416 billion of which would automatically occur when the President submits a written certification to Congress that the debt ceiling needs to be increased. The remaining \$784 billion in borrowing authority would be subject to a congressional resolution of disapproval, and Congress would have 55 days to act to reject the increase. Under this bill, after that initial increase, the President would be authorized to seek another \$1.2 trillion increase once the debt limit is within \$150 billion of the debt ceiling, with the entire \$1.2 trillion subject to a congressional resolution of disapproval within 15 calendar days.

The plan I support today establishes statutory caps on discretionary spending that would apply for ten years. These caps would operate similarly to caps established with bipartisan support in the 1990s. If Congress exceeds the caps, across-the-board cuts would enforce the limits. Further additional savings in FY 2012 by security spending would be capped at \$606 billion, or \$3 billion below this year's level. Security spending would be \$19 billion below the Republican budget. This plan finds even more savings by limiting funding for ongoing wars (the so-called “Overseas Contingent Operations”) that could be provided outside the discretionary spending caps.

Some of my Republican colleagues have been critical of the Reid bill's proposed savings on war funding. However, winding down the wars, which this year will cost about \$160 billion, will produce very real savings, as both the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office acknowledge. In fact, the Republicans endorsed this approach when they voted for the House GOP budget earlier this year.

My home state of Texas ranks 43rd in education, and last (50th) in the nation in people over 25 who only have a high school education. This bill will protect the hopes and dreams of people who are striving to improve those numbers. It safeguards Pell Grants and maintains the current maximum grant at \$5,550. Our country has such a firm belief in education, so much so that we as a people have provided free education to all students until the 12th grade, but after that moment with high school diploma in hand a higher education should not become a battle between the haves and the have nots in our society.

This plan would end graduate and professional students' eligibility for subsidized Stafford loans, as proposed in the President's FY 2012 budget.

Graduate and professional students would be able to receive unsubsidized federal student loans, and would continue to be eligible to apply for deferment, forbearance, or other loan repayment assistance. The \$18 billion in savings are used to address projected shortfalls in the Pell Grant through FY 2013.

Madam Speaker, the bill will reduce waste, fraud and abuse by promoting efforts to improve enforcement in several areas. The anti-fraud efforts promoted by the Reid bill include: continuing Disability Reviews and SSI redeterminations; Internal Revenue Service tax enforcement; health care fraud and abuse control; and Unemployment Insurance improper payment reviews. According to CBO, these steps would save \$11 billion over 10 years.

The Boehner proposal plan and all the plans proposed by my Republican colleagues they have all just cut, cut, cut without taking into full consideration the serious cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Their bills have essentially been a rehearsed version of the same bills that President Obama promised to veto and the Senate vowed to reject. It asks cuts from domestic spending while demanding nothing in revenue from the nation's wealthiest. The proposals offered by my Republican colleagues has been nothing more than a ransom note, irresponsibly raising the debt ceiling for only a few months so that in just a short period of time, the American public will be hit again for \$1.6 trillion in cuts from Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans benefits. Anyone who believes that those plans will not result in a serious cut to Social Security should consider this . . . Social Security represents 20 percent of all federal spending, making it unrealistic to think such large cuts in mandatory spending will not affect Social Security benefits. The Reid plan, before us today protects Social Security.

I believe that the plan before us is an example of shared sacrifice. It removes the entire burden off the backs of seniors, the middle class and our nation's most vulnerable citizens. The Reid plan will not result in dramatic reductions in safety net programs for vulnerable Americans, such as food stamps and unemployment and disability insurance. This would be and should be unacceptable, and each is avoidable if corporations and the wealthy are required to shoulder a fair share of this burden.

There has been a theme this Congress of focusing on cutting programs that benefit the public good and for the most at need, while ignoring the need to focus on job creation and economic recovery. This bill places us back on the right track. We should be focused on paying our nation's bills and resolving our differences.

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

(WIC) Program that provides nutritious food to more than 990,000 mothers and children in my home state.

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

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

Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors, including the 2.9 million Texans who received Medicare in 2010.

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

Childhood hunger continues to be a real and persistent problem in the Houston/Harris County area. The number of people participating in the Food Stamp Program in Texas has increased by 82 percent since 2000. However, only 60 percent of those eligible for food stamps in Texas participate in the program.

In Harris County, only 75 percent of children approved to receive free lunch participated, and only 39 percent of children approved to receive free breakfast took advantage of the benefit. Participation numbers are similarly low for those students approved to receive reduced-price lunch and breakfast. During summer months, participation in these federal nutrition programs drops significantly. In Texas the summer participation rate was only 8.1 percent of low income children.

In 2008, when the recession first hit, 22.9 percent of Texas children were living in poverty, the fifth worst rate in the nation. As a result of the economic downturn that began in late 2008 in Texas, and parents losing their jobs, the child poverty rate increased to 24.4 percent in 2009. That is 163,000 more children falling into poverty, or 1.6 million Texas children overall.

Many people assume that Texas was not hit as hard by the recession as other states because our unemployment rate is still below the national average. While our unemployment rate is low compared to the U.S. (8.2 versus 9.8 percent, respectively, in November 2010), it is still nearly double where it stood in November 2007 (4.4 percent). In fact, Texas' unemployment rate has been around 8 percent for the last 16 months, which is extremely high given Texas' recent history.

Nearly one in three Texas children has no parent with a full-time, year-round job, making them particularly vulnerable.

When a household falls into poverty, children are exposed to increased parental distress, inadequate childcare arrangements, and poor nutrition. In past recessions, it took many years for employment and incomes to re-

bound, and low-income families rebound more slowly than others.

72 percent of Texas' working families in poverty have at least one parent without health insurance.

Public benefits such as health care or nutrition assistance help families bridge the gaps in difficult economic times and are critical in reducing the effects of a recession. Cutting these supports will hurt child and family well-being and damage the Texas economy by taking money out of the private economy for critical local businesses such as grocery stores and medical providers.

The supplemental nutrition program, WIC, helps low-income pregnant women, new mothers, infants, and young children eat well and stay healthy. WIC provides nutrition education, nutritious foods, referrals to health and human services, breastfeeding support, and immunizations (at some clinics).

More than 802,000 Texas children ages 0–4 (40 percent) received support through WIC. When you look at infants alone, 67 percent received WIC supplements, compared to only 35 percent of children aged 1–4.

The program has grown by more than 176,000 kids between 2000 and 2009, with an increase of 66,000 children from 2007 to 2009 alone.

During the recession, more families needed greater assistance with basic expenses. SNAP (formerly Food Stamps) provided benefits to over 3 million Texans, more than half of which are children (ages 0–17).

In January 2011, more than 2 million Texas children received assistance from SNAP, an increase of nearly 700,000 kids since January 2008. Furthermore, because of added funds from the ARRA, monthly benefits rose 13.6 percent, giving added assistance to families at a time when they needed it most.

The dramatic rise in applications for SNAP initially overwhelmed the already beleaguered state workers who enroll families in these federal benefits. In November of 2009, 43 percent of SNAP applications were not being processed within the federally mandated 30-day time period, leaving hundreds of thousands of families each month waiting for food assistance.

More than 2.8 million Texas children participate in the school lunch program, and close to half of them also receive breakfast. More than \$1.3 billion of federal funding is used to support these programs during the school year. Many counties in Texas also run summer nutrition programs so that kids who depend on school lunches have access to good nutrition when school is closed for the summer.

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

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

As we continue to discuss the necessity of increasing our debt ceiling, I have heard the

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

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the federal government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

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

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

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

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

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

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

to default on its debt obligations if the debt ceiling is not raised.

This unnecessarily places the American public and the economy between a rock and a hard place. Either Congress sides completely with the radical agenda of the Tea Party, which irresponsibly pulls the chair out from under the average American while polishing the throne of the wealthiest.

This detour into a spending debate is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present.

Moreover, the impending crisis would have already occurred were it not for the extraordinary measures taken by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, including the suspension of the investment in securities to finance the Civil Service retirement and Disability Fund, as well as the redemption of a portion of those securities already held by that fund.

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

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

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

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

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

The markets have made it clear that a short-term extension and REID's plan is a long term solution which averts serious consequences.

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

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

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

Texas has the unfortunate distinction of leading the nation as the highest percentage of residents uninsured. More than 5.8 million Texans—including 1.5 million children—lack health insurance. Texas' uninsured rates, 1.5 to 2 times the national average, create significant problems in the financing and delivery of health care to all Texans. One in every four Texans lacks health insurance coverage, and that number is one in every three in large cities like Houston and Dallas. According to the Gallup poll, an average of 26.8 percent of Texas residents was uninsured.

With only 75% of the residents being insured, this means that one in four residents within the state is unprotected and could be in financial stress in case of a medical emergency. This extremely high percentage of residents lacking health insurance coverage is one of the biggest challenges the Texas Department of Insurance and Department of Health face.

Here's an idea that wouldn't cost Texas a dime but would save millions of dollars every year: Remove all barriers restraining nurses from practicing to the full extent of their education and training. No state needs primary care providers more than Texas, which has a severe shortage. Texas ranks last in access to health care and in the percentage of residents without health insurance. Of Texas' 254 counties, 188 are designated by the federal government as having acute shortages of primary care physicians. Of that number, 16 counties have one and 23 have zero. If every nurse practitioner and family doctor were deployed, we still couldn't meet the need. Texans are desperate for health care.

I have worked effortlessly with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to gain bipartisan support for successful passage of an



amendment to the landmark healthcare reform bill that made sure no hospital is forced to shut its doors or turn away Medicare or Medicaid patients. Existing physician-owned hospitals employ approximately 51,700 individuals, have over 27,000 physicians on staff, pay approximately \$2,421,579,312 in payroll taxes and \$512,889,516 in other federal taxes, and have approximately \$1.9 billion in trade payables. With approximately 50 physician-owned hospitals, Texas leads the nation in the number of physician-owned hospitals. The Texas economy could lose more than \$2.3 billion and more than 22,000 jobs without these important hospitals.

American families spend almost twice as much on health care—through premiums, paycheck deductions and out-of-pocket expenses—as families in any other country. In exchange, we receive quality specialty care in many areas. Yet on the whole, Americans do not get much better care than countries that spend far less. Americans do not live as long as people in Canada, Japan, and most of Western Europe. This should clearly indicate that health care reform was needed. The landmark bill signed by President Obama will provide coverage to millions of people who currently lack it.

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

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

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

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents in their home districts who would be helped by this bill. I urge my colleagues to return to the world in which the vast majority of Americans live in; a world in which our shared destiny is determined by reasonable minds and good faith efforts to compromise. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned that defaulting could "throw the financial system into chaos," and "destroy

the trust and confidence that global investors have in Treasury securities as being the safest liquid assets in the world."

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

There is in these difficult times no tea party, no Democratic Party, no Republican Party. There is only one party—there is only one party—the party that is the embodiment of one nation—America and we should stand for Americans and one America—I vote "yes" to save America from default and to honor the full, faith and credit.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, this is not a Nation of Tea Party people. It is not a Nation of Democrats or Republicans. It is a Nation of all of us.

And what the Reid plan presents, it represents the Tea Party, the Republicans and the Democrats and the President of the United States. This is what the American people expect us to do. That is what has made this country great. At critical times, we've come together and we have compromised. We're protecting Medicare. We're protecting Social Security. We're protecting Medicaid, as the people of this country want.

And yet, as the Republicans and the Tea Party want, there are no tax increases in this. And as the President of the United States has asked us, there will be a second task in the year 2013.

□ 1410

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, the time is present. It is time for us to do the American thing: Stand up for the American people and let us compromise in the best interests of all of us so this Nation will not go into default.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself 15 seconds.

Madam Speaker, I think it's very important to note that yesterday and today we are continuing to hear that under the Boehner proposal cuts in Medicare and Social Security would take place, when in fact both the Boehner and Reid proposals have virtually identical plans to put into place a joint select committee that would in fact report back to this institution.

With that, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my very good friend, a member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, I think it's important for everyone to know the reason the House is considering this bill today is to put up another guardrail to show what the House cannot do. It's important in any compromise to understand what can and cannot be done.

The new constitutional conservative majority in the House will not pass the

Reid bill because of its devastating cuts to our U.S. military. The House is going to find a way to compromise with the Senate, but it is not going to include massive cuts to the military. As we've established, it's not going to include tax increases. It looks like it's going to include some select committee that's going to make recommendations to the Congress.

We're going to find a way to make sure that American companies do not hit the brick wall of running out of the ability to borrow. But this is one of the most important debates, one of the most important votes we'll have in our brief time here in Congress is to make sure that we're protecting our kids and grandchildren from a crushing unaffordable level of debt. So we're working hard to find what the limits are of what the House and the Senate will do.

We've got to have this vote today to show what the House will not do. And we're not going to cut the military, as the Reid bill would.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 15 seconds.

Madam Speaker, make no mistake about it. From day one, this Republican majority has put Medicare on the chopping block. And the Boehner proposal would decimate Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security as we know it.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would point out to my good friend from Texas, Madam Speaker, as a constitutional conservative, he should recognize that the Constitution, itself, was a series of compromises.

Our Nation and economy is being pushed closer and closer to default. Hardliners on the right—extremists by any other name—have refused to compromise. We are putting in jeopardy the payment of the Social Security obligations and paying the members of our military. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff yesterday couldn't even answer in the affirmative that he was confident that those payments could be made if we default. We're putting in jeopardy the full faith and credit of our Nation.

Yesterday, seniors in my district called my office in tears, wondering whether we would default and what those consequences would mean for them. These are real people who live on Social Security to survive.

We have many strongly held views on both sides of the aisle. I don't like everything in the Reid proposal before us, but compromise is critical. I recognize that I can't have everything 100 percent my way. Democrats have been at the compromise table for months with an empty chair on the other side of the table. It is time for Republicans to warm that seat across from us.

Mr. DREIER claims that Republicans have brought the Reid proposal to the floor to show that it doesn't represent

a bill that can pass the House, yet the process is a sham. The bill has been brought up under a rule that requires a two-thirds vote of this House for passage, which they know cannot happen.

What are Republicans afraid of? They're afraid that a fair process might show just how much support there is for this proposal.

Where are the cooler heads in the Republican Caucus? Where are they? They appear not to exist. Your caucus seems to be held hostage by extremists and have driven the moderates from the room and from the discussion. Allowing extremists to take over is doing harm to our country.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you.

President Obama and House and Senate Democrats have said we are willing to support cuts even to programs we would normally fight to preserve. Republicans in response have doubled down in a Groundhog Day move that has pushed dead-on-arrival proposals that jeopardize our economy by bringing us closer to the brink of chaos.

At the end of the day, the stewardship of our economy is our responsibility.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to our good friend, a hardworking new Member of this institution, the gentlewoman from Camas, Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Speaker, the reason we came here, this caucus is here, the new freshmen are here, is because the American people said, Enough. They said, You're spending too much of our money. And that's what this conversation is about today.

The President stood on the floor across the Rotunda a couple of years ago and said, It's a failure of leadership to raise the debt ceiling. Well, guess what? I came here never expecting to raise the debt ceiling, but I've now compromised. I've twice voted to raise the debt ceiling to cover spending from a failed stimulus, from a health care bill that ends Medicare as we know it. I voted twice for solutions. And that's compromise for me.

When I ran for this seat, I told the people that I serve, I'm not extreme; I am mad. I'm mad that Washington, D.C., thinks you are their piggy bank.

That's what this debate is about. We end it today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 10 seconds, Madam Speaker, just to remind the gentlelady that she has voted time and time and time again to decimate Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, and we're not going to stand by and let them do that.

At this point I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I think the American people just heard a new definition

of compromise: Paying your bills is a compromise. The American family can't wake up one morning and say, Boy, it's a compromise to pay for what I've already incurred. It's a compromise to pay my mortgage. That's a new one for the American people. And it's part of a reckless pattern that we've seen emerging here.

First our Republican colleagues walked out of the Biden talks. Twice they walked out of talks with the President of the United States. Then, when the Republican leader in the Senate put forward a proposal, they ridiculed it. Then, Thursday night, in this very House, they said "no" to the proposal by the Republican Speaker of this House until he amended—the same Speaker who said we need to have an adult moment.

Here's the concluding paragraph of today's Wall Street Journal: Republicans are not looking like adults to whom we can entrust the government.

The American people are looking for that adult moment. If you're not willing to compromise on critical things for the country, you are not fit to govern. And that is why Senator REID put forward a compromise proposal. He doesn't like his own proposal. He would be the first to tell you that. But you know what it did? It met the criteria our Republican colleagues put forward—\$2.4 trillion in cuts. And even if you take out the war savings, more guaranteed cuts, according to CBO, than the Boehner proposal the other night. It also incorporates McConnell's proposal.

Here's what it doesn't do. It doesn't end the Medicare guarantee. It doesn't cut Social Security. And it doesn't protect tax breaks for special interest corporations.

What we're seeing here is people are holding the American economy hostage. You have to stop playing kamikaze pilot with the future of the American people in order to extract a hundred percent of demands for budgets your way. Compromise is necessary. And that is what Senator REID put forward, a compromise proposal.

Let's show we can govern together.

□ 1420

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself 5 seconds to again say to my colleagues that the measure we voted on last night stemmed from a bipartisan compromise that was put together in this very Capitol one week ago today.

With that, Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Urbana, Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let's just cut to the numbers and what this bill does. We've got a \$14 trillion debt. This is going to raise the debt ceiling \$2.4 trillion. It's going to achieve a savings of \$18 billion in the first year.

So just think of it the way the American people would see things. You've got a kid who has maxed out the credit

card at \$14,000. The kid goes to the bank, and the bank says, Okay. Here's what we're going to do. We're going to give you 2,400 more dollars on the credit card, but you have to promise us, over the next year, you're going to spend \$18 less than you planned on spending.

That's what this bill does. This bill doesn't even come close to starting to solve the problem. That's why we're against it, and that's why it should be defeated.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 5 seconds.

My colleague from California keeps on saying that the Boehner bill was bipartisan. I'll remind him that not one single Democrat voted for that bill because Democrats do not want to decimate Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

At this time, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I assume that some think that the American people are gullible, but this is not a coincidence or happenstance. We've got a Republican majority that took us from trillions in surplus to trillions in deficit, added a \$7 trillion prescription drug plan, unfunded wars, and then refused any additional revenue. In choking off our country's ability to pay its debt, now they want to walk us towards default. This is a special place in the shadows of the history books for a group of people who in order to gain power are willing to sacrifice America's leadership in this world.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who will tell me where in the Boehner bill it says that we want to cut Medicare, Social Security or any of the other items that they continue to attack. I would be happy to yield to anyone who can point me to where in the Boehner bill it says that. I am happy to yield to anyone.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. In the balanced budget amendment that you have and in the Ryan proposal, you have all of it going after Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. DREIER. With that, I am happy to yield 30 seconds to my good friend from Aurora, Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, the President of the United States, Barack Obama, has said to the Congress that we need to put America first and get this debt limit done. I agree with that. I agree that we need to put America first and put politics aside.

Last weekend, a bipartisan proposal emerged with Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader REID, Senator REID, coming to an agreement, but the President of the United States got ahold of Senator REID and said, Absolutely not.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds, Madam Speaker.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. The reason he rejected the agreement was because it didn't have enough money to get him through the election of November 2012. The President's campaign consideration is not putting America first. We need to put America first and vote down the Reid proposal.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire of the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Maybe the gentleman from California might want to yield to Mr. VAN HOLLEN; but at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I did ask a few minutes ago and expended time by asking anyone to yield. We have a lot of Members here who want to be heard. Mr. MCGOVERN has time if he would like to yield it.

I yield 15 seconds to my friend from Maryland, and maybe Mr. MCGOVERN will yield him 15 seconds. Then we can hear what Mr. VAN HOLLEN has to say.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

If you look at the Boehner proposal, it says we've got to cut \$1.8 trillion. The Speaker of the House has already said that you can't have any revenue as part of that, that you can't close one corporate loophole. In fact, he said that the majority would override any proposal, so the only other way to get it mathematically is to start slashing Medicare and to start going after Social Security.

Mr. DREIER. In reclaiming my time, my point has been made very eloquently by the gentleman, and I very much appreciate it. I thank my friend for his contribution.

Madam Speaker, at this point, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

As we used to say in the courtroom, the facts are that there are no facts. The truth of the matter is that the only people who are cutting \$500 billion from Medicare are the Democrats in their proposal, but that's not my point.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. No, the gentleman will not yield. Let me make my point, and then I'll be off.

The issue here is really one of compromise. I come here as a freshman, as somebody who is looking at this for the first time. When we came in and worked on the bill, the Boehner proposal, the frustration for me was knowing going in that evening that I'd already been made aware that this leadership, the leadership of the party on the other side, had whipped their mem-

bers so not a single member was ready on the other side to sit and talk to anyone on this aisle. The whip was there: You will not vote. You will not talk.

We were not able.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Just to be very clear, what we did was eliminate the overpayments to some of the Medicare Advantage plans. Listen, we used much of those savings to close the prescription drug doughnut hole. In your budget, you took the whole \$500 billion, but you reopened the prescription drug doughnut hole at the same time you were eliminating the Medicare guarantee. That's the difference.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself 5 seconds to say that I thank the gentleman for, once again, pointing out the fact that there is nothing in the Boehner proposal that does anything to cut Social Security or Medicare.

Madam Speaker, with that, I am happy to yield 15 seconds to a new Member from Zeeland, Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate my colleague from California for yielding.

Earlier, we heard from a colleague from Florida, on the other side of the aisle, who was talking about the Constitution and about the intent of it. Ladies and gentlemen, this is about controlling our spending and accountability with the American people. It might not be in this bill, and it might not be in other bills, but eventually, we have to realize we need to put institutional brakes on our spending because we cannot control our spending in this institution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. This is about protecting Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid.

I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, our assistant leader, Mr. CLYBURN.

□ 1430

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the clock is ticking, the American people are anxiously waiting for responsible leadership, and the Republicans here in Congress are continuing to play political games.

Last night the United States Senate rightly defeated the Boehner bill on a bipartisan vote. That partisan bill was the product of the Republicans' "my way or the highway" approach that held all Americans hostage to exact a ransom payment for Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security beneficiaries.

Now we must find a commonsense compromise. That's why I will vote for the Reid bill today. The Reid bill saves America's economy from the devastation that would result from defaulting on our fiduciary obligations.

Throughout the deliberations on this self-inflicted debt crisis, my bottom line has been to protect Social Secu-

rity, Medicare, and Medicaid. This plan contains real spending cuts and deficit reduction to begin putting our Nation's fiscal house in order. It meets the Speaker's requirement that spending be cut by an amount at least as large as the debt ceiling increase. And it does so while protecting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid beneficiaries. It also safeguards Pell Grants that provide low-income young people the opportunity to go to college and to work to achieve the American Dream.

We must take responsible action now to avert this crisis and move to significant measures to create jobs and generate economic growth.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tupelo, Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. Thank you, Mr. DREIER.

We've heard from our friends on the other side "we want compromise." The American people expect solutions.

This Harry Reid plan offers no real solutions to the out-of-control spending problem. This Harry Reid plan offers no solutions to the broken Washington mess that got us here. So I will vote "no."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire about the time on both sides, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Wantage, New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor, as the previous speaker has said, to say this side of the aisle is committed to reaching a solution and not just a deal to this problem. We are committed to reaching out across the aisle and across the other side of this House to reach a compromise.

We have already compromised on the level of cuts going even further. We have already compromised on the level of the caps, raising the caps to make it even easier in that regard as well. We have also already compromised from where we started with regard to a balanced budget amendment, holding true to the idea that we should, as all Americans also agree, eventually pass a change to the Constitution and require a balanced budget amendment.

But at the end of the day, although we will compromise on cuts and we will compromise on caps and we will compromise on moving forward on a balanced budget amendment, let it be clear, as God is my witness, we will not compromise on our principles; our principles of defending the Constitution and defending Americans and making sure that our posterity does not have this excessive debt on it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Here we're on the brink of economic disaster and we're wasting time with symbolic political theater at its worst.

We want compromise and solutions and to protect Medicare on the Democratic side. Why don't you try working with Democrats? The American people want us to meet in the middle. They don't want this nonsense.

The debate now focuses only on spending cuts, without closing tax loopholes, and that still isn't enough for some. No wonder The Wall Street Journal said the Republicans don't look like adults to whom voters can entrust the government.

The Democrats want to compromise in the middle, and if the President needs to pull the 14th Amendment, I think he should do that because the Republicans have shown they don't want compromise at all.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Newburgh, Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, here we are on the verge of a financial meltdown, and my friends on the other side of the aisle are worried about politics. They are here today worried about protecting the President from having to do his job: lead.

The Republicans in the House are leading. We have passed two bills that would end this crisis, and the Senate hasn't voted on them; they've tabled them.

We're here to lead. We need leadership and we are providing it.

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

Mr. DREIER. At this time I'm happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ashland, Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Speaker, the American people are sick of these kinds of conversations.

My friends across the aisle voted to rob \$500 billion out of Medicare for ObamaCare. They instituted the IPAB Board that's going to ration care for our seniors.

We brought a proposal to this House that was going to root out all loopholes in nooks and crannies where businesses hide their money, and they all voted "no."

The American people are looking for real solutions. And you know what? This Harry Reid bill is full of budget gimmicks that don't get the job done.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Biloxi, Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, the American people entrusted each Member of Congress with extraordinary power. That's the power to cast votes as their voice in Congress and provide solutions to America's problems. Most

of all, they expect us to lead during times of crisis.

House Republicans have led. House Republicans have provided plans and solutions to America's debt crisis. House Republicans have used their voice as Representatives of their district to end the debt limit crisis and begin balancing the budget. We've done our job; it's time the Senate does theirs.

Leader REID and President Obama are all that stand between the American people and a responsible resolution to this debt crisis. I say to our colleagues in the Senate, we were sent here not to punt on difficult decisions.

Vote "no" on the Reid plan.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article that appeared in The Wall Street Journal today entitled "The Debt-Limit Hobbits."

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 30, 2011]

#### THE DEBT-LIMIT HOBBITS

Political logic and perhaps even common sense seem to be prevailing within the House GOP after Thursday's debt-ceiling vote was postponed—at least among most of the caucus. The shame is that the debt-limit absolutists have weakened Speaker John Boehner's hand in negotiating a final bill with Senate Democrats.

At the most practical level, Mr. Boehner's plan is better than the one Harry Reid supports in the Senate. This remains true of the revisions Mr. Boehner released yesterday, though the irony is that it is less credible and weaker politically than the previous version. The concession the holdouts demanded, and got—a balanced budget amendment—ensures that it cannot pass the Senate. The best but unlikely scenario is that the bill otherwise remains intact.

In the years for which claims of spending restraint are most credible—fiscal 2012 and 2013—the Boehner bill would cut \$25 billion and \$47 billion from the outlays that the Congressional Budget Office projected in March. Off the same baseline, the plan would cut \$756 billion through 2021 in return for an initial \$900 billion in new borrowing. The topline figure of \$1.2 trillion in cuts that everyone cites comes by comparing the Boehner plan to CBO's "budgetary authority" estimate from January, which is far less realistic but is also the platform used in the negotiations led by Joe Biden.

Some will deride \$72 billion in cuts over the next two years as nickels and dimes, and it's true it is nowhere near commensurate to the scale of the spending problem. But it's also incremental progress, which is how the American political system usually changes, and a larger real reduction in government than any time since 1995.

For comparison's sake, Paul Ryan's budget blueprint that the House passed in April would cut \$74 billion in outlays over 2012-2013 and \$746 billion in total over the next 10 years. Accomplishing roughly the same thing via the Boehner plan, with no new tax increases, while controlling only one-half of one branch of government, would be a major GOP achievement.

The plan also includes domestic spending caps, enforced with an automatic sequester for 10 years. Such caps could be overridden by a future Congress, but they make it harder and help to create a culture of fiscal discipline.

Another benefit is that the Boehner bill would require a second debt-limit increase of \$1.6 trillion next year, with conditions. Curb-

ing the size and growth of government is a constant struggle, and the Boehner plan creates another opening for further progress.

By contrast, the Reid plan raises the debt ceiling by \$2.7 trillion now, which effectively closes off debate until after the 2012 election. All told, it cuts spending by \$2.2 trillion compared to the March CBO budgetary authority baseline—though with multiple gimmicks that include \$1.044 trillion in "savings" from winding down the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan that will happen anyway.

Amid this "baseline" confusion, we wish House Republicans had used this debate to reform Washington's fiscal hall of mirrors. Baseline budgeting is a rigged game, with spending increasing automatically each year above the rate of inflation. Anything below that inflated baseline is then called a "cut." Even Democratic Governor Andrew Cuomo took on these automatic spending formulas when he set out to tame the New York budget.

Instead of such a useful reform, a GOP faction is fixated on a balanced budget amendment. After Thursday's stall, the new Boehner plan will only authorize the second tranche of debt if two-thirds of both chambers pass such an amendment and send it to the states for ratification. This will not happen.

These columns drew much notice after John McCain quoted our July 27 "tea party hobbits" line on the Senate floor. Senator (sic) Sharron Angle responded that "it is the hobbits who are the heroes and save the land." Well, okay, but our point was that there's no such thing as a hobbit. Passing a balanced budget amendment this year is a similar fantasy. Yet outfits like the Club for Growth used the amendment as an excuse to flip from opposing the Boehner plan to supporting it. Maybe it should be the Club for Futile Fiscal Gestures.

The main result of this pointless crusade has been to damage Mr. Boehner's leverage and push the final debt-limit increase in Mr. Reid's direction. The Speaker may now have to seek the tender mercies of Nancy Pelosi to get a final bill through the House, and who knows what her price will be.

The debt-limit hobbits should also realize that at this point the Washington fracas they are prolonging isn't helping their cause. Republicans are not looking like adults to whom voters can entrust the government.

I would advise the gentleman from California that our leader is prepared to close for us. I will take 15 seconds and then introduce our leader.

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

□ 1440

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I implore rational Republicans to join Democrats in passing the Reid bill. I appeal to your sense of responsibility, to your sense of duty, to your country. Have the courage of your convictions to do what's right. Don't be paralyzed by the threats and intimidating tactics of the Tea Party or other extreme groups. Stand up to protect Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California, the Democratic leader, and a defender of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I applaud him for his superb leadership of this bill today. I recognize the great leadership of Mr. VAN

HOLLEN as the ranking member on the Budget Committee and he and Mr. CLYBURN representing the values of the American people at the negotiating table for this.

I rise in support of the Reid legislation and urge my colleagues to support it because it protects Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare, because it is fair.

But I want to use my time in the following way.

I listened very carefully and very attentively to our Speaker yesterday when he spoke, and he used the term the bill is not perfect, but we did "our level best." "Our level best." One might infer from that that this process is on the level.

How can it be on the level if we're bringing a \$2½ trillion bill to the floor under suspension the same way we might bring the naming of a post office? It's \$2½ trillion, 20 minutes on each side.

Members have said, on both sides of the aisle, this is a very important debate. Well, if it is, why is it brought under suspension, which requires a two-thirds vote, guaranteeing that it will not prevail? Not on the level.

The word "level," of course, enters into is this a level playing field? Is it on the level for America's seniors to pay more for Medicare for fewer benefits while we give tax subsidies to Big Oil? Is it on the level for us to throw people out of nursing homes by reducing Medicaid so we can give tax breaks to corporations sending jobs overseas? Is it on the level for us to make young people and their families pay more for their college education so we can give tax breaks to the high end? Is it on the level to bring a Boehner bill to the floor that makes all of those cuts, undermines Social Security, eliminates Medicare, and that does not charge one red cent to people who have benefited so much from the greatness of our country?

Is it our best? Is it our best to drag this out for all this time to keep in suspense as to whether we would honor our constitutional responsibility to pay our debts? The Constitution says the national debt has to be recognized.

And recognize we did, President after President, 32 times in recent memory—including when President Bush was President; at that time, even though many of us did not agree with the war in Iraq, did not agree to the tax cuts for the wealthiest people in our country to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars, did not agree to the giveaway to the pharmaceutical industry. We didn't agree with that policy. That's how we got into debt, turning around from the surplus direction we were going in with President Clinton whose last four budgets were in balance or in surplus. We didn't agree how President Bush took us into debt, but we never, never stood in the way of honoring the full faith and credit of the United States.

Why, then, would we, this one time with this President, decide that we

would put up barriers so extreme like changing the Constitution in order to lift the debt limit as a mathematical requirement?

Of course, we must all reduce the deficit. But is it our best to say we're going to use the debate to reduce the deficit to destroy to the public space?

Look at the appropriations bills they're bringing before us. Destroying the public space of clean air, clean water, food safety, the education of our children, the financial security of our seniors through Medicare and Medicaid. That's what they are doing.

If we are just reducing the deficit here, we have come to those conclusions. We have to do it. We know how to do it.

But if they want to take it to the next step of destroying the public sector, we cannot go to that place when it affects the air our children breathe, the water they drink, the food they eat, the education they receive, the safety of the neighborhoods in which they live.

The Speaker also said that the bill was not perfect. Well, no bill is perfect. But I think I disagree in one respect. I think this bill is perfect in its absurdity. His bill was perfectly absurd. It's perfectly absurd, again, to say to our President, after 32 times lifting the debt ceiling: We're going to change the game for you, Mr. President.

It's perfectly absurd for them to say that the bill they brought to the floor, the Boehner bill that they brought to the floor, was in agreement of the four leaders of the House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans. Either you don't know what you're talking about or it's a perfect absurdity.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I will not yield to you.

It is very, very important that we all take a deep breath. We have important work to do, an important decision to make. Senator REID has given us a direction to go. No cuts in benefits for Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security beneficiaries.

I wish that we had revenues in there so that those who had benefited from the greatness of the last 50 years of bipartisan progress for the American people would be able to make their contribution, but there is not one red cent of revenue while we're saying kids should pay more for their student loans.

So it's time to end this theater of the absurd. It's time for us to get real. It's time for us to get real and listen to the wisdom of the American people. They have said to us that they support, in overwhelming numbers, a bipartisan, balanced approach, in overwhelming numbers that we should all pay our fair share. And they all agree that we should get this over with so we can get back to work putting the American people back to work by creating jobs.

The Speaker chose, when he didn't have the votes, instead of reaching out in a bipartisan way to see how we could

work together, he chose to go to the dark side. I repeat, he chose to go to the dark side by putting forth a bill that he, himself, told his members would sink in the Senate, and I add, lead to default.

We cannot default. We're the greatest country that ever existed in the history of the world. We're the United States of America.

So let's go from the dark side to the bright side of the American people. Vote "yes" on the Reid bill.

□ 1450

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Speaker, I believe in civil discourse, and I want to say that on several occasions in the past 45 minutes, members of my staff have urged me to have the words taken down that have been offered by Members on the other side of the aisle, and I chose not to. In the name of civility, I chose not to because we have a very serious issue that needs to be addressed, and it's before us, and we need to make sure that in the next several hours, we effectively address it.

Since 1962, on 75 different occasions, we have seen the United States Congress increase the debt ceiling. We keep hearing about the urgency that exists today. Well, I'll tell you what's urgent: If we don't change the course that we've been on the last 4 years, with an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending, we are not going to have resources for any of the things that my colleagues have talked about. What we need to do and the message that has been sent is that for the first time ever, we are going to change business as usual.

Now I'm going to say something that I probably shouldn't at the very end here. There are some good things in Senator REID's proposal. I believe that the idea of establishing a joint select committee of our colleagues who will come together and make recommendations and force an up-or-down vote in both Houses of Congress is a positive thing. But I will say this: I don't believe that continuing down the road towards increasing the debt ceiling without the kinds of checks that are necessary is the right thing for us to do. Last night's agreement that we voted on here was, in fact. It stemmed from the bipartisan talks that took place right down this hall.

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

Mr. DREIER. Vote "no" on the Reid proposal.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Bipartisan Budget Control Act, H.R. 2693. Unlike Speaker BOEHNER's bill, which has already been defeated in the Senate, this is the compromise bill that is needed to avert a default and protect our fragile economy.

Congress needs to step up and start governing. Yet, the Republican majority appears uninterested in anything that has not been vetted by the radical wing of their party or designed to embarrass the President. Today is

no exception. Rather than holding a real vote on this bill, it is being brought up under suspension of the rules in order to guarantee failure. This is a procedure we use to name post offices and congratulate sports teams. It is not how we handle serious issues and it is shameful that Republicans are holding a non-serious vote when our nation is three days away from a default.

Make no mistake, this is not the legislation I would have written. It relies on cuts to domestic spending that will hurt the poor and the middle class. It includes no revenues, not even ending the egregious tax subsidies for big oil companies and corporate jet owners. However, the legislation does not cut Medicare and Social Security and protects both from automatic cuts in the future. It also saves \$1 trillion by winding down the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, which have been major drivers of our debt. Finally, unlike the failed Boehner bill, this legislation provides certainty and stability by extending the debt ceiling through next year and ensuring that we will not be on the brink of default once again in a few months.

The long-term fiscal health of our country can only be improved if we make the investments necessary to create jobs and if we put revenues on the table. Unfortunately, House Republicans refused to consider the balanced approach that the American people wanted. Instead, they have driven us to the edge of default and the economic calamity that would result. Now is the time to act to end this crisis. This is not a perfect bill, but it is a responsible solution to the current crisis urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today, the House of Representatives considered and rejected the proposal placed by Senate Majority Leader REID before the Senate. While this is not remotely the solution we need, I voted in favor because this is the best the Republicans in the Senate will allow. It is imperative that Congress keep the hope alive that we will avert default on our nation's obligations. This bill is likely the last and best proposal we will see.

Speaker BOEHNER stated on the House Floor that he was "sticking his neck out a mile," as he negotiated with the President on this issue. If he truly was sincere about this, Congress easily could have found a bipartisan solution to avoid the debt-ceiling crisis and start down a path of fiscal sustainability. I must point out that this crisis is wholly artificial and manufactured, and that the Speaker easily could have avoided it, had he chose to.

While I voted yes today, at some point there are worse outcomes. This action, and Congress's failure to find a longer-term compromise, is a looming cloud over our finances. Repeatedly facing similar self-manufactured crises will further damage the economy and family savings. The sad fact is we did not have to take this path in the first place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2693, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2693 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2062, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 246, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 682]

AYES—173

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

NOES—246

Adams	Black	Cantor
Aderholt	Blackburn	Capito
Akin	Bonner	Carter
Alexander	Bono Mack	Cassidy
Amash	Boren	Chabot
Austria	Boustany	Chaffetz
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Coble
Bachus	Braley (IA)	Coffman (CO)
Barletta	Brown (GA)	Cole
Barrow	Buchanan	Conaway
Bartlett	Bucshon	Cravaack
Barton (TX)	Buerkle	Crawford
Bass (NH)	Burgess	Crenshaw
Benishek	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Berg	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Biggett	Camp	Denham
Bilbray	Campbell	Dent
Bilirakis	Canseco	DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Ribble
Dold	Kline	Rigell
Dreier	Labrador	Rivera
Duffy	Lamborn	Roby
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Roe (TN)
Duncan (TN)	Landry	Rogers (AL)
Ellmers	Lankford	Rogers (KY)
Emerson	Latham	Rogers (MI)
Farenthold	LaTourette	Rohrabacher
Fincher	Latta	Rokita
Fitzpatrick	Lewis (CA)	Rooney
Flake	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Fleischmann	Loeback	Roskam
Fleming	Long	Ross (AR)
Flores	Lucas	Ross (FL)
Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Royce
Fortenberry	Lummis	Runyan
Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)
Franks (AZ)	E.	Scalise
Frelinghuysen	Mack	Schilling
Gardner	Manzullo	Schmidt
Garrett	Marchant	Schock
Gerlach	Marino	Schrader
Gibbs	Matheson	Schweikert
Gibson	McCarthy (CA)	Scott (SC)
Gingrey (GA)	McCaul	Scott, Austin
Gohmert	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McCotter	Sessions
Gosar	McHenry	Shimkus
Gowdy	McIntyre	Shuster
Granger	McKeon	Simpson
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Griffin (AR)	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Griffith (VA)	Meehan	Southerland
Grimm	Mica	Stearns
Guinta	Miller (FL)	Stivers
Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Hall	Miller, Gary	Sullivan
Hanna	Mulvaney	Terry
Harper	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (PA)
Harris	Myrick	Thornberry
Hartzler	Neugebauer	Tiberi
Hastings (WA)	Noem	Tipton
Hayworth	Nugent	Turner
Heck	Nunes	Upton
Hensarling	Nunnelee	Visclosky
Herger	Olson	Walberg
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Walden
Huelskamp	Paul	Walsh (IL)
Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen	Webster
Hultgren	Pearce	West
Hunter	Pence	Westmoreland
Hurt	Peterson	Whitfield
Issa	Petri	Wilson (SC)
Jenkins	Pitts	Wittman
Johnson (IL)	Platts	Wolf
Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Womack
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	Woodall
Jones	Posey	Wu
Jordan	Price (GA)	Yoder
Kelly	Quayle	Young (AK)
King (IA)	Rehberg	Young (FL)
King (NY)	Reichert	Young (IN)
Kingston	Renacci	

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman	Clay	Maloney
Baca	Galleghy	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Giffords	Speier
Brooks	Hinchey	
Chu	Lofgren, Zoe	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1513

Messrs. NUNES, MCKINLEY, TIP-TON, and GRIFFITH of Virginia changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, JACKSON of Illinois, FILNER, and MURPHY of Connecticut changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 682, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."



## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, for the purpose of asking about the schedule for the rest of the weekend and the upcoming week.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

Madam Speaker, the House will now meet in pro forma session only tomorrow. Therefore, no votes are expected in the House on Sunday. Given the critical fiscal and economic situation, however, Members should be prepared to return to Washington quickly if needed. We may only be able to assure a few hours' notice, at most.

Lastly, I would say to the gentleman that the House will be in legislative session on Monday, and first votes are expected as early as noon.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information, and I yield back the balance of my time.

## MATTHEW A. PUCINO POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2062) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Meetinghouse Lane in Sagamore Beach, Massachusetts, as the "Matthew A. Pucino 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; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Sunday, July 31, 2011, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2665. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0012; FV11-946-2 FIR] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2666. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Watermelon Re-

search and Promotion Plan; Redistricting and Importer Representation [Document Number: AMS-FV-10-0093] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2667. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment [No.: AMS-LS-10-0086] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2668. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown In California; Increase in Desirable Carryout Used To Compute Trade Demand [Docket No.: AMS-FV-11-0013; FV11-989-1 FR] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2669. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Reapportionment [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0092] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2670. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Change in Late Payment and Interest Requirements on Past Due Assessments [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0016; FV11-955-1 FR] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2671. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2010-2011 Marketing Year [Docket Nos.: AMS-FV-09-0082; FV10-985-1A FIR] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2672. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0115; FV11-932-1 FIR] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2673. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Suspension of Handling Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0019; FV11-916/917-5 FIR] received July 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. ADAMS:

H.R. 2712. A bill to ensure that all of Brevard County, Florida, is treated as a HUBZone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 2713. A bill to limit investor and homeowner losses in foreclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2714. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow the

transport, purchase, and sale of pelts of, and handicrafts, garments, and art produced from, Southcentral and Southeast Alaska northern sea otters that are taken for subsistence purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should ensure that the United States does not default on its debt by making every effort to negotiate passage of an increase in the statutory debt ceiling or, all such efforts failing, should use his authority under section 4 of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution to pay all debts of the United States as they come due; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

99. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 11-040 supporting the concept of the "Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act" and expressing opposition to any proposed expansion of wild horse HMAs within Colorado and to the creation of any wild horse preserves on public lands in Colorado; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY  
STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. ADAMS:

H.R. 2712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States;

The Congress shall have the power . . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution, giving Congress the authority to establish uniform bankruptcy laws.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 436: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 721: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1848: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2030: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2359: Mr. MICHAUD.