

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th commemoration of the city of Birmingham's pivotal role in the civil rights movement. We are declaring 2013 as the Year of Birmingham in order to honor the historic events that occurred in our city in 1963. The city of Birmingham serves as a reminder to the rest of the world that, out of despair, there is hope and that justice does, indeed, prevail.

My good friend Congressman SPENCER BACHUS and I, along with the entire Alabama delegation, plan to ask this august body to bestow, on a bipartisan basis, its highest civilian honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, to the four little girls who tragically lost their lives during the 1963 bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church. We believe it is befitting that during this year, 2013, we posthumously pay tribute to Addie Mae Collins, Cynthia Wesley, Carole Robertson, and Denise McNair, for they have truly paid the ultimate sacrifice.

They are, indeed, emblematic of so many citizens of Birmingham who lost their lives for the cause of freedom. They represent all of those citizens and all of those who fought so hard and courageously, black and white, to make sure that we in this Nation hold up its ideals of equality for all.

I ask that this august body work with SPENCER BACHUS and the entire Alabama delegation to bipartisanly support and bestow upon them the Congressional Medal of Honor.

NO BUDGET, NO PAY

(Mrs. BLACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, as a charter member of the Fix Congress Now Caucus and as an early supporter of No Budget, No Pay, I am very excited that this legislation will be voted on in the House later today.

We on the House Budget Committee work hard to pass a responsible budget each year, but the Democrat-controlled Senate refuses to do the same. In fact, it has been nearly 4 years since the Senate has passed a budget. Since that time, the Federal Government has racked up annual deficits exceeding \$1 trillion; and, in total, more than \$5 trillion has been added to our national debt in just 4 years. If we stay on our current path of record deficits, big government and unfunded entitlement programs, Greece's present will be America's future.

A massive debt crisis is surely not the future we want for our children or our grandchildren. Fiscal responsibility and accountability in the Halls of Congress cannot wait. Today, we

will take an important step in the House to force the Senate to either do its job or face the consequences. It's simple: no budget, no pay.

GUN CONTROL

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, after the massacre of 20 children and six educators in Connecticut, we've heard the predictable rantings of people who are convinced beyond all reason and evidence that the Federal Government intends to take their guns away.

I am sad that they have succumbed to the fear-mongering of the National Rifle Association and others who really only want to sell more guns. It's more than sad. Frankly, it's dangerous when a government leader stoops to the same fear-mongering for political purposes.

Last week, Senate Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL's campaign sent out an email titled, "Watch out. They're Coming for Your Guns." Among the email's dishonest claims was this blatant distortion:

President Obama is spelling out the 23 different executive orders he will take to get your guns.

Those 23 executive actions are so modest that even gun rights activists have said they have no problem with them. In fact, many of them reflect proposals made by the NRA.

Even if we give Senator MCCONNELL the benefit of the doubt as to whether he actually knew what his campaign manager was putting out, he is responsible, as we all are, for what our employees do in our name. I call on Senator MCCONNELL to apologize to his supporters, some of whom are my constituents, for stoking totally irrational and unjustifiable fear.

□ 0920

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 325, NO BUDGET, NO PAY ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 39 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 39

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 325) to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until May 19, 2013, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final

passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 39.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Today's debate is about one very simple but profoundly important goal, Mr. Speaker, and that is restoring our vibrant economy by reducing the crippling weight of the growing debt caused by our Federal Government.

In the coming months, we face a string of deadlines that will force Congress and the administration to address the fundamental challenge of our trillion-dollar deficit and its mounting effect on our economy and jobs in America. We've already exceeded \$16 trillion in debt, and Republicans find this debt level absolutely unacceptable and that is why we are here today. By contrast, President Obama seems to be perfectly comfortable with the idea of reaching \$23 trillion, which is where we'll be at the end of his second term if we continue his policies in that direction.

While \$16 trillion in debt is stifling our economy, \$23 trillion would crush it. It would crush the dreams and hopes and aspirations of our great Nation and the people who will certainly follow us, our children and our grandchildren. That's why, today, we're considering this rule and the underlying bill in order to reverse this course. Our great Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, and our majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, are pleased that this bill is on the floor today to discuss not just this important activity with our Members of Congress, but to let the American people know we are serious about what needs to be done to save this country from this crippling debt.

We will use the upcoming weeks and the looming deadlines before us as a means to enacting a more meaningful and lasting reform so that we can begin to grapple with this skyrocketing debt. At the same time, today's rule and the underlying bill will allow us to turn up pressure on the Senate to join the

House in offering real solutions. Together, these actions will help to reignite our engines to grow our economy and to restore discipline and accountability to our Federal budget.

The first of the looming deadlines we face is the debt ceiling limit. The underlying bill would temporarily suspend this limit so that we have the opportunity to craft comprehensive reforms without risking default on the debt that our Nation has incurred. Risking default would be counterproductive to our Republican agenda of restoring economic growth, getting our fiscal house in order, and ensuring that we do not burden future generations with intolerable debt.

We will not risk the full faith and credit of the United States, but neither will we compromise a long-term extension of this debt ceiling without slashing wasteful Federal spending, enacting meaningful entitlement reform, and ending the era of trillion-dollar deficits. By taking this temporary action, we are keeping the focus where it needs to be: resolving the coming debates on sequestration, the expiring continuing resolution, and the fiscal year 2014 budget through fiscal discipline and entitlement reform. Suspending the debt ceiling until May 19 provides the House and the Senate with much-needed time to pass a budget and then consider how best to deal with the sequester.

The underlying bill also takes action to ensure that the Senate becomes an active partner, which we want and need and the American people, I think, expect, in our efforts to reform Federal spending. For nearly 4 years, the Senate has failed to meet its most basic obligation: passing a budget. During this time, the Senate has collected its own paychecks despite being derelict in its most important duty.

In the private sector, there are consequences for failing to do one's job. This resolution will impose the same accountability on Members of Congress that private sector workers face. Oh, yes, and we're putting that same obligation on the House as we would want them to accept in the Senate. That is, if you don't get your work done, you don't get paid.

The power of the purse is the most fundamental duty the Constitution places upon Congress. For far too long, this power has not been wielded with the discipline and accountability necessary to do so responsibly and sustainably. There are a host of challenges that must be addressed, but the entire process begins with a joint budget resolution. As long as the Senate is unwilling or unable to do its job, our efforts in the House to deliver real solutions to the American people will continue to be impeded.

Some have questioned whether the action we are taking is constitutional. The 27th Amendment of the Constitution prohibits legislation that varies the salary of Members of the current Congress. This provision was intended

to prevent Members of the House and the Senate from giving themselves a pay raise without first standing before the voters.

This bill upholds both the letter and the spirit of the 27th Amendment. It would not change a Member's rate of compensation in any way; they just don't get to collect it until they do their jobs. And until they get their work done, we simply cannot adopt a permanent extension to that debt ceiling.

This body will work to ensure that the Senate performs the most basic of tasks to pass a budget, and we'll do our job also. We will continue to work for meaningful entitlement and spending reforms to take us beyond our current cycle of crisis and deadlines in favor of long-term solutions. As we do all of this in order to invigorate our economy and put our Nation back to prosperity for ourselves and for future generations, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, the new chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say to my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican colleagues, that they ought to vote against this rule. The bill before us today was not the product of deliberation in either the Ways and Means Committee or the House Administration Committee. There were no hearings. It was brought before the Rules Committee last night, and not a single amendment was made in order. This is a closed rule.

□ 0930

So if my friend from Texas wants to usher in a new policy of openness in this Congress, we should have had this rule open so that Members could have an opportunity to express themselves and to have their viewpoints made known. But, again, it is a completely closed rule.

So this rule should be defeated. It should go back to the Rules Committee. We ought to come back with something that allows this Chamber to be able to do its deliberation.

And Mr. Speaker, we ought to be here today to raise the debt ceiling, not because we like the idea of raising the debt ceiling, but because that's the right thing to do. It is the right thing to do for our country and for our economy.

It is the right thing to do for the businesses of this country, so that they have some certainty that we will not default on our debts. And if they had that certainty, they would then invest

in our economy and help create more jobs and help create more opportunity for people.

You know, one of the things I have heard from Republicans and Democrats who I've bumped into at all types of occasions, they may have differences on our tax policy, they may have differences on our economic policy, but the one thing that everybody seems to agree on is that Congress ought to provide certainty. And this is anything but certainty, because what we are doing today, thanks to the Republican leadership, is to bring a short-term extension of the debt ceiling to the floor, which means that they have decided, once again, to play partisan politics with the debt ceiling.

This is a bad idea. This is not the way a mature governing body ought to behave. We ought to do our job.

Next month the United States will hit the debt ceiling and, without action, the United States will default on its debts. Now, the last time the Republican leadership played this dangerous game of economic Russian roulette, they threatened the full faith and credit of the United States for the first time in our history. For some reason they seem hell-bent on doing it again.

We need to be clear about one thing. The debt limit is not about new spending, it's not about increasing the deficit. The debt limit is simply the way Congress pays for things that we have already bought, things like the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, by the way, that my friends on the other side continue to insist that we don't pay for; it just goes on a credit card. Things like the Medicare prescription drug benefit that was not paid forward that my friends on the other side of the aisle championed, things that the Republicans have voted for over and over and over again.

Now, we can and we should have an open and thoughtful debate about our spending priorities and our deficit. That is what we're supposed to do. But playing games with the debt limit, threatening to default, should not be an option. But that's just what the bill before us does. It, once again, kicks the can down the road.

Now, instead of passing a clean, long-term debt ceiling bill, one that could ensure that America doesn't default on its debt and obligations, the Republicans have chosen to bring a bill up that would put us right back in the same place that we're in now in May, 3 months from now.

So what's next, Mr. Speaker? A 3-week extension of the debt ceiling? Three days? Three hours?

My Republican friends go on and on about how the business community needs and deserves certainty from Washington, but treating the full faith and credit of the United States like just another political talking point is no way to create certainty.

How ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the Republican Party, the party that took

a record surplus and turned it into a record deficit, the party that put two major wars on the Nation's credit card, the party that refused to pay for two rounds of tax cuts and a massive, expansive prescription drug benefit, now wants to pay its bills. Now wants to pay its bills.

The same group of people that got us into this mess are now telling us that they want to get us out of this mess. The fact is, on the issue of the deficit and on the issue of the debt, my friends on the other side of the aisle, I do not believe, have any credibility.

You know, there's an old show business saying, Mr. Speaker: you got to have a gimmick. And my Republican friends never cease to disappoint me. They always have a gimmick. They believe in government by gimmicks. And this No Budget, No Pay bill is another gimmick.

Let's kind of play this out. What their bill says is if the House doesn't pass a budget bill by April 15, we don't get paid. If the Senate doesn't pass a budget bill by April 15, they don't get paid.

Now, I have no doubt that they have the votes to ram whatever they want through the House of Representatives, and I expect that they will bring us yet another budget bill that has the same extreme, excessive spending cuts in programs that benefit the middle class and poor that they brought before us last year. So I think they will bring a bill to the floor.

And let's say the Senate does bring a budget bill to the floor and they pass it. This bill does not require that there be a conference report that is voted on by both the House and the Senate as a condition of whether or not Members get paid.

So, again, this is not a solution. What this is just more political gamesmanship. You pass something in the House that may be totally irreconcilable, something that will never be able to be conferenced with the Senate. Senate, you pass whatever you want, it doesn't have to be conferenceable with the House, and there we are. And there we are, 3 months from now, in the same position that we are in now.

You know, the way this should be done, and I know this is a radical idea, but the way this should be done is the leadership of the Republican side should speak with the leadership of the Democratic side, and let's see if we can kind of agree on a way to proceed. There ought to be serious discussions.

I'll also point out for my colleagues and for those who are watching, there were a couple of occasions over the last year and a half where Speaker BOEHNER came very close to coming to agreement with the White House on a bigger deal. And on those two occasions the Speaker walked away and said no after he came very close to saying yes.

Why did he say no?

It had nothing to do with the Senate not having passed a budget resolution. It had everything to do with the fact

that when the Speaker came back and talked to his Republican rank-and-file Members, they all said no. They said no. It doesn't cut Medicare enough. It doesn't cut Social Security enough. It doesn't cut food stamps enough. It doesn't cut education enough. It doesn't cut job creation enough.

There are people on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, who are using this not as an opportunity to balance our budget, but they're using this as an opportunity to gut government, to end the public sector. They see this as their opportunity. And as a result, we have this uncertainty. And as a result, the American people pay the price. As a result, this economy is not recovering as quickly as it needs to be.

I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, this closed rule. This is not the way we should begin this session.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, enough of the gimmicks. It's time to get serious about doing the people's business, and this is not doing the people's business.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD an article from The Washington Post dated January 22, 2013.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to now discuss, if I can, this Washington Post article which is out today, which says the Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID praised House leaders for moving ahead with a bill that would give the government borrowing authority into the future.

He further said that he not only is very glad that we're going to send a clean debt ceiling bill, but that he felt like it would be good for the Senate to be able to take up this action.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what we're trying to do is to empower those things that we know this institution, the House and the Senate—where we work closer together, where we both do our work.

And yesterday, the gentleman representing the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RYAN, who's also PAUL RYAN, the chairman of the House Budget Committee, in testimony said that he intended to make sure that he would produce a bill exactly supporting what we are trying to do here today, and would bring that to the floor, and would be faithful in doing that.

Look, maybe people are upset that we're putting their pay at risk. Maybe people are upset because it wasn't their idea. But the bottom line is that PAUL RYAN, JOHN BOEHNER, ERIC CANTOR, the Rules Committee, yesterday said we think it's a good bill, and we were joined by HARRY REID, the Senate Majority Leader.

When the Senate Majority Leader can agree with Republicans about a great direction to go that will empower the Senate and join with them in trying to make sure that we get our job done, I think that's a rare day. I think that's a good day when we can work to-

gether, when we can bring legislation that the Senate openly welcomes and, might I add, the President of the United States, President Obama, would sign this legislation. And he said so in the Statement of Administration Policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 22, 2013]

REID SAYS HE'S PLEASED WITH HOUSE GOP'S 'CLEAN DEBT CEILING BILL'

(By Rosalind S. Helderman)

Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) praised House leaders Tuesday for moving ahead with a bill that would give the government borrowing authority into May, without demanding deep spending cuts in return.

He said Democrats will discuss in coming days how to deal with a House provision, attached to the bill, that would require the Senate to adopt a budget for the first time in four years or see their pay docked. He said he would be meeting with the Senate Budget Committee Chairwoman Patty Murray (D-Wash.) to discuss the Republicans' "no budget, no pay provision."

"I'm very glad that they're going to send us a clean debt ceiling bill," Reid told reporters. "The other stuff on it, we'll approach that when we need to. But I'm glad we're not facing crisis here in the matter of a few days."

The government hit the \$16.4 trillion debt ceiling in December. The Treasury Department has been using extraordinary measures to extend the limit but has said that if Congress doesn't act to raise the limit by the end of February, the United States will be unable to meet its spending obligations and will default.

Republicans had been threatening to refuse to raise the limit unless Democrats offered deep entitlement cuts in return. They announced a new strategy Monday: Suspend the debt ceiling until May 19, while pressuring the Senate to adopt a budget. The House will vote on the temporary lifting of the debt ceiling on Wednesday.

Reid stopped short of saying the Senate would adopt the measure without changes if it passes the House on Wednesday. But by characterizing the House bill as a "clean" increase in the nation's borrowing limit—a longtime demand of the White House and Democrats—he suggested its passage in the Senate will not be difficult.

"I'm happy they sent us a debt ceiling not tied to entitlement cuts and dollar-for-dollar [cuts]," Reid said. "That's a big step in the right direction. The other stuff on it, Sen. Murray is going to be the spokesperson on that for the next 24 hours or so. We'll see how she wants to proceed."

The result of the House action, he said, was to buy time: "We have many months to work through this," he said.

Reid's review was far more positive than that of House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-Md.), who blasted the GOP measure as a diversion tactic to reporters Tuesday. If House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) has support from fellow Republicans, however, he can pass the bill Wednesday without the votes of House Democrats.

□ 0940

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

I'm glad the gentleman from Texas agrees with HARRY REID. I hope he agrees with HARRY REID on more things in the future. But the fact of the matter is this show business before us does nothing other than postpone this

debate on the debt ceiling for 3 months. It doesn't require a finished product. It does not require that we actually have something that amounts to a deal that goes to the President's desk. The House will pass their extreme budget, like they always do. The Senate will probably do something. And then nothing else is required. There's no requirement for a deal in order to get your pay.

This is show business. And what we should be doing is providing certainty to the business community that we're not going to default on our obligations in 3 months. And we ought to come together and figure out a way to be able to get this budget in balance without destroying the social safety net in this country. Again, the problem has always been—and let's be clear about this—as much as I get frustrated with the Senate, the problem on this is not the Senate. The problem is the rank-and-file Republicans in the House Republican Conference who, every time the Speaker of the House goes to them with a deal, they say, No. They always say it doesn't cut deep enough, it doesn't eliminate programs that help the poor, it doesn't eliminate programs that help the middle class, it doesn't eliminate programs that help create jobs. Because the ultimate goal of so many on the other side is not about a balanced budget. They don't care about balanced budgets. They're the ones who took this balanced budget that Bill Clinton had and turned it into one of the worst deficits and debt in our country. They don't care about that. They care about eliminating the public sector. That's what this is about. Three months? Please. Three months? What kind of certainty is that?

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding to me. And I want to continue what he was saying, despite the fact I've got a greet speech here. But it's terribly important, I think, that we try to make the point one more time that process here is turned upside down and is totally meaningless. So JOHN BOEHNER and PAUL RYAN and HARRY REID and the Rules Committee all agree. That leaves out about 500 more people who have been sent here from the districts to represent what the people who live there think.

This is not the first time this has happened. A couple of weeks ago, on the fiscal cliff, we had a thing that came up from nowhere called Plan B. JOHN BOEHNER liked that. I guess PAUL RYAN liked that. I'm not sure what HARRY REID thought about that. The Rules Committee thought it was okay. But the fact of the matter is that that bill was written while the Rules Committee was in session. There are 13 of us on the Rules Committee. We love the enormous power that we've got.

But I don't believe any of us ever suspected that the Rules Committee was going to supersede all of the committees in the House of Representatives. There's been no committee action on any of this.

In addition, I want to make the point, again, that despite what we tried to do, we said, Nobody's talked about this. There's been no discussion on this. Let's have an open rule. Let's let not just the people on our side but the people on the Republican side who've had no input here as well, let's open it up and have a real debate and see what's going on here.

What is going on here? What's going on here, as my colleague points out, is a circus of dubious constitutional validity, frankly. Some people may say what they're doing is okay. Other people say, Absolutely not. We certainly should have had that decision before we got this far. What will the Senate do with it? Heavens to Betsy, I don't know. They have to have 60 votes over there before they can get to anything. It is the only legislative body in the world where 60 is the majority, not 51, as it is in every other legislature.

So we've just reached, I think, a new low today. I am very depressed by the fact that the Constitution of the United States, which is very specific, that the rules of the Congress, which are extremely specific, are meaningless here. We have all these people on the committees, people with expertise, and wonderful staff. We can draw on resources from all over probably the world, not just America. But we've got plenty of them here just a block away. All the people we can talk to, all the people we can ask, What is the meaning of this? What will it do to the economy of the United States of America? Are we on the right track? Should we be doing something different? Do we need a debt limit law?

What are we doing? Why can't we have those kinds of discussions in this Congress ever again? It's as though if we give them time to think about it and everybody has a chance to weigh in on it, then maybe we won't be able to move this the way we would like to and play another "gotcha" game, which is really what it comes down to.

I don't care if The Washington Post loves it. They're probably so pleased to see the fact that people believe there's something in the fact that HARRY REID said he liked it, which is not anything that's been heard here lately, and that they thought they would like it as well. But I don't know what it is, and I don't think any of the rest of my Members did. And we certainly did not yesterday in the Rules Committee. We did not have the benefit of the knowledge of any of the other Members of the Congress or the committee process, which could have answered the questions for us that came up yesterday.

In fact, all of us know where this came from. Charles Krauthammer wrote a column in The Washington Post. They maybe like that a whole

lot, as well. That's where this came from. He said, Hey, there's a good idea. Instead of going to the committees of the Congress of the United States, where people of knowledge are seated, they decided let's just throw it together over the weekend at a retreat and we'll take it back next week. We're only going to work a couple of days so let's rush it through and get it through and maybe by the time we get to 3 months, something will have straightened out. Or, more likely, Mr. Speaker, in 3 months we will have thought of another way that we can kick the can down the road.

Now it's important to note that this is not an extension of debt limit. It is a suspension of debt limit. That makes a difference, I think, as well, but we didn't get a chance to discuss that part of it either. We did away with all notions of regular order. I really thought the Plan B, as I'd said earlier—and I don't want anybody to miss this—that bill was being written while the Rules Committee was meeting. I know that all students of government, all the colleges and universities in this country, they're out there teaching people how America runs, how carefully and wonderfully put together it was by the Founding Fathers, how our Constitution is our guiding light. We just celebrated that. Because without doubt, the President's inaugural speech, based so closely on the Declaration of Independence and talking about the Constitution, made us understand that that is what we are here to uphold. And indeed we all held up our hands and swore we would uphold it.

But when it comes to a piece of legislation like this—and this is the same as I said last night in the Rules Committee—it's just lurching around and jerking around and coming up with any kind of crazy gimmick we can think of and making smart remarks. But I will tell you that kicking the can down the road for 3 more months is not a solution. It gives us some breathing room. But I don't have any reason in the world to believe from past performance that the future is going to be any clearer for us.

Until the leaders of the House can start to include the fellow Members in the majority—because they have been cut out as well—and the minority in the legislative process, the regular order will be little more than a dream. And today's bill drops the majority's insistence that increasing the debt limit be matched by cuts to Medicare or reductions to education funding. That's a step forward. But it doesn't answer our questions.

My Democrat colleagues and I are eager to participate in the legislative process for which we came to Washington. And the American people are certainly eager—if not eager, maybe desperate would be a better word—to see an end to the dysfunction in this Congress. I hope that at some point the majority will realize that a completely partisan approach, which is what we've

had, is a dead end. That meaningful solutions can only come from negotiation and compromise with those on the other side of the aisle who do have some good ideas. And when the majority comes to that realization, my Democrat colleagues and I will happily join in the effort to craft the serious legislative answers our country needs, our constituents deserve, and the world expects of us.

The bill before us today isn't a serious solution—it is a gimmick of dubious constitutional validity. The legislation is the product of a weekend retreat, and contains all the seriousness one would expect from such origins.

For the last year, the majority has alternatively taken the full faith and credit of our Nation hostage and put forth extreme proposals that do nothing to reduce our deficit in a balanced way.

In the process they have done away with any notion of regular order. Just weeks ago, a so-called "Plan B" to the fiscal cliff was being written at the same time the Rules Committee was meeting—thus forcing us to debate a bill no one had ever seen.

Now we meet to debate a bill that failed to go through a single committee hearing before landing on the Rules Committee desk yesterday afternoon.

Under the process forged by the majority, the Rules Committee has become the place where legislation is unveiled by the majority and brought to the floor 24 hours later, with no input from their colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

This is about as far away from regular order as it gets. Until the leaders of the House start including their fellow members of the majority and minority in the legislative process, regular order will be little more than a dream.

Mr. Speaker, today's bill drops the majority's insistence that any increase in the debt limit be matched by cuts to Medicare or reductions to education funding. This is certainly a noteworthy step forward.

But kicking the can down the road for three months is not the solution that the American people deserve. If today's legislation had been crafted in the halls of Congress, with input from both sides of the aisle, I believe that we could be voting on a serious measure to prevent a debt-limit crisis and reduce our deficit starting today.

My Democratic colleagues and I are eager to participate in the legislative process, and the American people are eager to see an end to the dysfunction in Congress.

I hope that at some point the majority will realize that a completely partisan approach is a dead end. Meaningful solutions can only come from negotiation and compromise with those on the other side of the aisle.

When the majority comes to that realization, my Democratic colleagues and I will happily join in the effort to craft the serious legislative answers that our country needs and our constituents deserve.

□ 0950

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman, the ranking member of the committee, who was very faithful and sat through not only the hearing yesterday, but offered her feedback to our speakers who came to the Rules Committee representing the

House Administration Committee and representing the Ways and Means Committee. I thought that her questions and her tone were very appropriate.

I think that yesterday the two Republican lead Representatives—the gentlewoman from Michigan, CANDICE MILLER, representing the House Administration Committee; and the gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RYAN—adequately not only spoke about, Mr. Speaker, a five-page bill—five pages that we could not only understand, but offer the idea, regardless of who came up with the idea, that represents what I hope will be and believe will be more than 218 votes and I think will be bipartisan. These ideas don't just belong to somebody and we can't share them—they belong to the American people—about a way to move forward, avoiding conflict, working together, coming up with ideas that you can express with great confidence that we believe will work.

Yesterday, during the hearing, we also had some thoughtful conversation.

I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the Rules Committee designee to Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding.

I used to come to this podium, Mr. Speaker, and say I'm just a House freshman, but this is what I think about things. I'm now a House sophomore. It's been 2 years and 1 month since I arrived here; and if you told me 2 years ago when I arrived that we were going to be bringing five-page pieces of legislation to this floor for up-or-down votes by this body, I wouldn't have believed it because I've watched the way this House has operated for over a decade.

I see these bills—and Mr. Speaker, you've seen them too—these bills that folks have to carry down here on a dolly, those bills that they drop them down here on the rostrum with just a thump. Folks can't read those bills; folks can't analyze those bills; folks can't digest those bills. But this one that we have today deals with an incredibly complicated topic, the debt ceiling, an incredibly controversial topic—how it is that the House and the Senate get their business done—and yet we bring it in five pages that every Member of this body has had a chance to read and digest, every Member of this body.

We had a hearing on it in the Rules Committee yesterday. And here on the floor today we're going to debate this bill not just with one committee of jurisdiction, with the Ways and Means Committee getting time, but with two committees of jurisdiction, the Ways and Means Committee getting time and the House Administration Committee getting time.

You know, it's unusual, Mr. Speaker, that we have a bill that the Speaker of the House has decided to bring forward, that the majority leader of the Senate

has praised the Speaker for bringing forward, and that the White House has said it doesn't have any objection to. That's unusual. Candidly, it makes me a little suspicious. That's the way it's been around here. I think my colleagues on the Rules Committee would agree. So often we get so used to the controversy that if we can't fight about something, we start to wonder what's wrong, what's wrong that we can't fight about something. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have that opportunity to fight. We don't have that roadmap yet. Of course, the House has laid out its budget roadmap year after year after year after year. Certainly, the 2 years I've been here, the House has done its job—much to the credit of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—and passed a budget. This year, rumor has it the Senate is going to do the same thing.

This bill certainly puts an incentive in place for both the House and the Senate to get their job done, but how is it that we're going to tackle those tough decisions that my friend from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, talked about, those really difficult financial decisions, talking about those obligations we have in the future that we have absolutely no plan or means to pay for. How are we going to grapple with those decisions? Well, I'll tell you, I wish we had gotten a big deal in the debt ceiling debate of August of 2011. We got a step in the right direction, but we didn't get it all done. I wish we had gotten it in the Joint Select Committee. We didn't get it done. I wish we had gotten it in the fiscal cliff debate of last year. We didn't get it done.

But I believe—maybe it's just a hope, Mr. Speaker—but I believe that if the Senate has the courage to lay out its path for America—its path for America's budget and dealing with America's obligations—and if the House has the courage to lay out its vision for America, its vision of dealing with America's obligations, that we're going to find that opportunity to come together to make those decisions that have to happen.

Now, I hope I'm not speaking out of school, Mr. Speaker, but I had a chance for some constituents in town—some of my business leaders, some of the great entrepreneurs from my district, they're in town. I took them by to meet with Speaker JOHN BOEHNER. I'll tell you, I come from one of the most conservative districts in the United States of America; Speaker JOHN BOEHNER is not always the most popular name in my district. But I brought them by to meet him because I wanted them to hear from him directly and he said this to them, he said: We have real opportunities in divided government, real opportunities to come together and do the big things that matter; that only in divided government can you bring together the best ideas from both sides and put everybody's fingerprint and stamp of approval on them and do

those things that really make a difference for America. And my goal is to do those things while I'm leading this, the people's House.

I take him at his word, Mr. Speaker. And if giving this 90-day extension so that budgets can be passed gives him that opportunity, I'll do it.

A colleague of mine yesterday said, "That stuck with me." He said, "I've had people I respect a whole lot less ask me for a whole lot more."

I have great respect for our Budget Committee chairman, PAUL RYAN. I have great respect for our Rules Committee chairman, PETE SESSIONS. I have great respect for the Speaker of the House. If they tell me another 90 days is going to give us that opportunity to do those big things I think we on both sides of the aisle want to do, I'm there.

I support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I hope folks will support the underlying bill.

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

I want to tell the gentleman from Georgia that I appreciate his many, many, many, many years working here in Washington, not only as a Member of Congress, but his many years as a congressional aide. So you have a perspective here based on many, many years of service in Washington. But I would just say that if someone were to tell me that the Republican leadership were to bring yet another closed rule to the floor, I'm sad to say that I'd respond: I'm not surprised.

This is a closed rule. This is a bill—whether it's five pages or a hundred pages, it doesn't make any difference—that did not come out of a committee process. The Ways and Means Committee didn't hold hearings or a markup. The House Administration Committee didn't hold hearings or a markup. This did, as my colleague from New York said, basically come out of your retreat, and you hand a bill to all of us here. What's even more startling is that you do not allow anybody, Democrats or Republicans, to amend it. Completely closed. Completely closed.

Look, I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—especially the freshmen who campaigned on the platform of openness and transparency—you vote for this rule, you're the problem. You're the problem if you vote for this rule. So I would again urge my colleagues, just on the process alone, this is not the way that we should proceed.

The other thing I would remind my friends who are saying that somehow this is going to produce a result, this doesn't require a result. This requires the House to once again pass its budget—which, as we all know from last year's experience, represents the extreme of the extreme; I mean, it's irreconcilable with the Senate—and the Senate can pass whatever they want, but it doesn't require a finished product. What the American people want is a finished product, not a gimmick to

kick the can down the road for 3 months. Yeah, everybody is happy we're not going to default today. But 3 months, that's it? I mean, I think we can do a heck of a lot better than this.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, at the end of the day when we vote today, we will simply be voting to kick the can down the road—which every Member of this House has told their constituents they no longer wanted to do—but we will kick the can down the road on the question of the debt limit of the United States and whether or not the full faith and credit of the United States will stand behind the bills that we owe the rest of the world, the businesses and our companies, individuals, people's retirement plans. That's all this bill does. Under some sort of camouflage about withholding pay, what have you, they kick the can down the road.

You know, Americans are starting to realize that the economy is starting to recover after the devastation of the housing scandals, of the Wall Street scandals. Small businesses are starting to hire; spending over Christmas was reasonably good; the stock market is at a 5-year high; the housing market is coming back; builders are in fact building new homes because of the demand in housing.

□ 1000

All of a sudden, enter the Congress of the United States and it says that we're going to put the full faith and credit of the United States of America on a 90-day leash. We're going to take the greatest economy in the greatest country with the greatest responsibility in the world and we're going to put them on a 90-day leash.

How does a great country respond on a 90-day leash? We know how it responded last time the world saw this happen. We got downgraded in the credit rating. That drove up the borrowing cost of the United States. That drove up the borrowing cost of corporations. That drove up the borrowing cost of counties and cities—the counties and the cities that we represent. And we're told again that should we falter on the credit debt of the United States, that we can expect a downgrade and we can expect a further downgrade in cities and counties all over the country, and somehow we're supposed to believe that this is a good plan.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. What this plan does is hold the jobs of

America's families and working people all across this country hostage. It holds them hostage to the passage of this legislation, and it holds them hostage 90 days from now.

This bill says if you don't vote for the Ryan budget—because we know the votes are on the other side of the aisle to pass the Ryan budget—then we go back to putting the credit of the United States at risk. The last time the American people looked at the Ryan budget they rejected it overwhelmingly. Do you remember the election of November, just a couple of months ago? They rejected those cuts in Medicare, those cuts in Medicaid, and the tax cuts for the wealthy.

Yet all of this is being put back on the table by holding the debt limit hostage, holding the credit hostage, and holding American jobs hostage. So if you don't vote for that budget, then they get to play with the debt limit again. They get to play with the debt limit again.

We have got big lifts to make between now and then, folks. We have sequestration, we have tax reform, and we have a budget to write. Let's just get down to business and do it. Just do it. Don't play with the credit of this country. Don't play with people's pension plans. Don't play with the interest rates that corporations have to pay to borrow. Don't play with the interest rates that your local municipalities have to pay to borrow for projects in their districts.

This has got to stop. If you really believe that America is a great country, if you really believe that we're an international power, then we ought to start acting like one, and the Congress of the United States ought to start acting like it. And 90-day extensions on the creditworthiness of the United States is not the picture you paint when you're an international power.

It has to stop. It has to stop. We cannot continue to go through this and put all of this at risk and put this recovery that is, in fact, happening at risk because of the actions of the majority here in this House, once again, to fool with the credit.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Do you want to shut down the government? Have at it. I was here when it happened before. You'll find all your constituents up close and personal. You'll get to know them. That's a lot different. That's a lot different action. You want to go off with sequestration? You don't like the cuts that come up with its substitute? Fine. We voted for sequestration. You told the American people with your votes you were prepared to have sequestration if we didn't do the job. So you've got a lot of tough votes to make. Don't try to avoid them by holding the creditworthiness of the United States at risk.

It has got to stop, and it should stop today on the floor of the House of Representatives. We should say to the world that we are prepared to have this country pay the bills. The deficits have been incurred by our actions. It has got to stop today with a "no" vote against this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, as always, this floor is open to people who have ideas. I'd like to say to the American people and to my colleagues that are listening that the Republican leadership has decided to bring this bill to the floor today. We have no clue exactly what date the United States actually needs to make sure that we pass this bill to avoid not paying our bills. The Secretary of the Treasury is in active notification with our leadership and the leadership of the Senate and perhaps all Members because of his openness to speak about this in the press.

We don't know when that day is, and because we don't know when that day is, that's a good reason to begin working on ideas to see whether we can even pass this bill. I think we're going to. I think it's going to be a bipartisan bill. I don't think everybody necessarily has the same concerns that the gentleman from California spoke of, but what we're trying to do is work together. Conservative Republicans in our party do support this bill. I support this bill as a conservative Republican. Our Speaker, as a conservative Republican, supports this bill.

What it's about is avoiding the problems of chaos, avoiding the problems of doing things at the last minute, avoiding the problems of not addressing the issue, and avoiding the problems where the marketplace loses confidence in what we're doing.

Chairman PAUL RYAN, chairman of our Budget Committee, a bright young leader for our country, forthrightly brought this idea to our conference and has sold it. It's the right thing to do. We are trying to do here today the right thing, talking with the American people, letting people see that we're moving forward to avoid conflict and avoid problems.

So it was accomplished with this 5-page bill, a 5-page bill which we will then have two committee chairmen, PAUL RYAN representing the Ways and Means committee, perhaps DAVE CAMP, the chairman of the committee, and CANDICE MILLER of House Administration, work through meticulous, thoughtful ideas that really are not difficult to get because it's a 5-page bill.

We think we're doing the right thing, we think we've got the votes, and we think it's going to provide this country and the Senate and this administration, us all working together, the right thing. So if you want to oppose it, I get that. I can understand the positions held. But passing the bill will be a positive thing. It will offer working-together relationships with the Senate. It is supported and not opposed by the

President, and I think that gives us an opportunity to put a good foot forward in this new Congress rather than one where we're fighting, disagreeing, and can't get our act together.

The American people demand that we get things done. The American people are asking, hey, when possible, can you guys work together? Yes, we can. Today is the day where we can say, Mr. Speaker, people from Nebraska, people from Texas, people from Ohio, people from all over this country, can you work together? We're trying to find a way, and I'm proud of that. And with great respect to anybody who would disagree with that, we're going to stand behind our product today with a money-back guarantee—a money-back guarantee: if we don't get our job done, we're not going to take the pay.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. Let's be clear. This House is not open to new ideas. If it was, we would not be coming to the floor with a bill that is a completely closed rule so that Members cannot offer their ideas in the form of amendments.

Secondly, their gimmick even has a gimmick to it. They say that if the Senate doesn't act or the House doesn't act on a budget, they don't get paid. Really what they do is they get paid at the end of the year. So their pay is not taken away.

This is show business. Instead of show business and instead of gimmicks, we ought to be coming to the House floor in a bipartisan way trying to figure out how to solve some of these budgetary problems. I regret very much that this is the best we can do, kicking the can down the road for 3 months.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

□ 1010

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address Congress' failure to pass a responsible budget.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 310, the standalone and original No Budget, No Pay Act, I'm pleased to see the 113th Congress begin to address our core obligations to pass a responsible budget that not only honors the promises that we have made to our parents and grandparents, but also secures a prosperous future for our children and grandchildren.

We can do this, but we must do so in a bipartisan way. The great Speaker of the House, the Honorable Tip O'Neill, was able to work with President Ronald Reagan to revamp our Tax Code and strengthen Social Security. The Honorable Speaker Newt Gingrich was able to work with President Bill Clinton to not only balance our budget, but to create a budget surplus.

We can do this, but we must do so in a bipartisan fashion, taking the best ideas from both sides of the aisle, finding common ground, and moving forward.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman very much from Massachusetts, and I thank my friend from Texas.

I would hope that all of us would commit to doing our job. And I know that my good friend recognizes that the Constitution in article I, section 8, requires the Congress to have the power to collect taxes and duties and to pay the debts, but also to be concerned about the general welfare.

Really what the administration says is that they support a long-term increase in the debt ceiling. And the reason why the people of the United States have not heard of this controversy is because the normal course of business constitutionally is for the Congress to consult with the Treasury, the Treasury to consult with the Congress, and the debt ceiling is raised in a manner that protects the general welfare of the American people.

But now we have a proposal that is driven by polling and brinksmanship. This is not the way to run a country. I heard a comedian some years ago say, What a great country. We are a great country. I love America. The Constitution emphasizes the greatness of this Nation, but we don't play politics with something that is the ordinary course of business.

Spending cuts is the responsible way to govern, but it is to govern in a way that we sit at the table of reconciliation and we don't break the backs of seniors who utilize Medicare and Social Security and veterans benefits. What we do is we sit at the table and we understand how to deal with the oncoming issue of the deficit. How do we do that? We do it with growth. But the Constitution has nothing in here that suggests, under this article, that we are to do brinksmanship and do 2 weeks or 3 weeks or to May. What happens in May, a crisis where we can't pay our military? The debt ceiling is paying the debt, and I am troubled by the fact that we would use this tactic.

I want bipartisanship. In fact, someone who raises issues about the vulnerable, like myself, has worked with my Republican friends. I look forward to do it. I'm an American. I believe in the Constitution, but you do not raise the debt ceiling in increments. The administration says, We won't stop it, but we want a long-term increase so that we can begin the rebuilding of this Nation. Growth, the Constitution, that's what we should be talking about, making America better.

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

The gentlewoman from Houston, Texas, is absolutely correct. We do need long-term growth of our economy. We need jobs. We need job creation. We need to be able to reduce the debt of this country.

The President is well aware, we're well aware here in Congress that each

of the years that the President has been our President he increased spending. He wants a massive tax increase, and we have a deficit. We have a deficit of \$1.3 trillion each of these years.

We're trying to work together. We're trying to, as the President said as he addressed a luncheon just an hour after he was sworn in, that he wants to learn from some of the things that he's done and he wants to do better. Some of doing that better is a chance to perhaps reassess: Did I do the right thing the first time? Did I do the right thing when I continue to raise taxes and demand that we do that?

Higher taxes diminish jobs and opportunity and growth in this country, and that's why we are trying to suggest openly, Mr. President, let's grow some jobs. Let's do the things I think that are more in line with what President George W. Bush did, who is referred to as No. 43 in Dallas, Texas. No. 43 had 60 straight months of economic growth, with the underpinning of reducing taxes so that Americans would go and work harder and see the incentive for creating jobs and would want to buy into the philosophy that the harder that we work, our country benefits. The underpinnings of Social Security, of Medicare, of Medicaid, systems that are very important to our country; reducing the number of people who have to receive government assistance is what happens when you have job growth; protecting the long-term interests of this country and growing the American Dream.

The gentlewoman from Houston is absolutely correct. And the methodology towards getting there is not higher taxes, and it is not higher spending. It is giving more freedom and opportunity. It is having a reduced size of government, not a bigger government. It is giving people an opportunity to have fewer rules and regulations, not more rules and regulations.

So the process that the Republican Party believes in deeply is the rights of individuals, freedom and opportunity, and reducing the size of government, which gives more people opportunities to empower their freedom and opportunity for their American Dream.

It's part of what we're doing here today. I think we believe and I think it works. Look at Texas and you will see where we have job growth, job creation, a healthier economy than other places in the country, and an opportunity to say we want more of it for all of America.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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. Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that anyone in America is sitting around today saying, I hope Congress sets up another fiscal cliff; I hope they put us in a position again where no one knows what's going to happen the next couple of months.

We ought to listen, but that's what we are doing with this bill. We should listen to the President who said this:

Unfortunately, Congress consistently brings the government to the edge of default before facing its responsibility. This brinkmanship threatens the holders of government bonds, those who rely on Social Security and veterans benefits. Interest rates would skyrocket, instability would occur in financial markets, and the Federal deficit would soar. The United States has a special responsibility to itself and the world to meet its obligations.

We should listen to this President.

Ronald Reagan said this in 1986. In 1986, the Congress listened to him, extended the debt ceiling, and acted responsibly. So should we. This legislation sets up another fiscal cliff, another financial nightmare, another problem for the American people that we should avoid.

I urge all Members to vote "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, as I have no additional speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. We have a gimmick before us that withholds pay if we don't pass a budget, but not if you don't get a deal. It doesn't matter whether the budget is irreconcilable or partisan. Here is the other gimmick. It doesn't really withhold anybody's pay. It just delays when you get the check.

The problem is not the United States Senate, I want to tell my friends. It is my friends on the other side of the aisle who do not want a deal, who want instead to basically annihilate and eviscerate the public sector. I say to my friends, if you want to balance the budget, pay for your wars, pay for your tax cuts, pay for your giveaways to the very wealthy in this country. What is before us is not a solution.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no," to not kick the can down the road, to deal with the problems as we see them right now. And I also urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, those especially who call for transparency, vote "no" on this closed rule. This is a closed rule. Nobody has an opportunity to offer any other ideas. This is not the way we should be dealing with budget issues. Vote "no" on this closed rule.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1020

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

I appreciate my colleagues—the gentleman, Mr. MCGOVERN; the ranking member of the committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER; and those Democrat Members who came down to express themselves. I also appreciate the Republicans who came down to talk about this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, what we're doing is debating a bill, H.R. 325, that ensures

that the obligations of the United States are taken care of. We're not trying to stand in the way. Even the United States Senate majority leader said, Great job, House. Thank you very much. We can work with this bill. We can work with you.

Members of my party have said we think this is a responsible way to begin the process to avoid having to make difficult decisions at the very end. We've laid out a process. Yesterday, the gentleman from Wisconsin, our young leader, PAUL RYAN, who is the chairman of the House Budget Committee, was asked in testimony, Will you produce your end of the bargain that is in here? Will you take care of your part with the knowledge that we're counting on that?

The Senate has said, as to their part of the bargain, whether they pass this bill or not, they can step up to the responsibility. Those leaders have said, Yes, we think we can.

It's not perfect. By golly, I'm not sure what "perfect" is anymore because "perfect" may not get passed in this House, but the fair and proper way to handle things is so the American people have confidence in what we're doing, so the markets have confidence in what we're doing, and so the budget is handled. All of these things are placed in a systematic order so that our Members, the Members of this body, can go home and communicate with people as to here is what we think is going to happen next.

Avoiding problems is what Speaker BOEHNER and our great majority leader, ERIC CANTOR, are trying to do. They are bringing legislation to this floor that adequately begins the process before we get in trouble. It's a 5-page bill. It's ordered up exactly as the doctor would have wanted—in English, where you can understand it, where it doesn't take a legal degree or for you to have to be in the House for 30 years to figure out what we're trying to say.

What we're trying to say is right here, and that is for the House and the Senate to work together. We do a budget. We lay out to the American people what we're trying to do. We work with the President, and we tell this administration and the government what we're doing. The American people can have confidence in this.

I support this. In fact, as chairman of the Rules Committee, I am asking for our Members and all Members of this body to please see this as a responsible way to deal with the problems that are immediately in front of us but before it becomes a crisis, before it becomes something that we cannot deal with as effectively, and bringing the American people along.

I also want to thank the President of the United States, President Obama, because President Obama said he could live with this.

I want to congratulate Senator HARRY REID, the Senate majority leader. Yes, I'll say that here on the floor because he says it's the right thing to

do, and thank you for passing us a clean bill that will give them the authority and the responsibility to do what they really want to do—not playing hardball, not throwing rocks. As a matter of fact, Senator HARRY REID said, A clean bill—a good thing. Now it's up to them. It's up to them to take up their activities that are for us, and it's up to this House of Representatives.

So, as we finish this, PAUL RYAN, the young leader of the Ways and Means Committee, DAVE CAMP, and others will be here debating these ideas. Immediately after that, you will see that CANDICE MILLER, the House Administration chairwoman, will come and talk with this House and the American people about the responsibility that she has to ensure that what we do is correct and proper. Then this body will have a chance to vote “yes” or “no,” and that will be an authority and a responsibility once again for PAUL RYAN, as the chairman of our Budget Committee, and for those members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats, to do their work, get it done and to produce a bill. We will then comply, but if we don't: no work, no pay. That's something the American people can understand. It's simple. It goes back to 1607: no work, no food.

Members of Congress need to understand we've got to get our job done, so I'm proud of what we're doing here today. I can stand behind this product and proudly say that I think this will pass the smell test of the American people and that it's something they can understand and something they will look forward to. Watch us as we do our job.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, isn't it true that no matter what happens with this bill that Members will get paid no matter what?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot respond to that. It is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 39, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 193, not voting 6, as follows:

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Elmerts
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—232

Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo

NAYS—193

Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis

Cárdenas
DeLauro

Lipinski
Loebach
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markley
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley

NOT VOTING—6

Huffman
Rohrabacher
Rush
Young (AK)

□ 1050

Messrs. HOLT and RUIZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BACHUS, WILSON of South Carolina, and WHITFIELD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 190, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

AYES—234

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek

Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)

Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy

Chabot	Hultgren	Radel	Kildee	Miller, George	Schneider	Barton	Grayson	Pittenger
Chaffetz	Hunter	Reed	Kilmer	Moore	Schrader	Beatty	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Coble	Hurt	Reichert	Kind	Murphy (FL)	Schwartz	Becerra	Guthrie	Pocan
Coffman	Issa	Renacci	Kirkpatrick	Nadler	Scott (VA)	Bentivolio	Hahn	Polis
Cole	Jenkins	Ribble	Kuster	Napolitano	Scott, David	Bera (CA)	Hall	Pompeo
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	Langevin	Neal	Serrano	Bilirakis	Hanabusa	Price (NC)
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Rigell	Larsen (WA)	Negrete McLeod	Sewell (AL)	Bishop (GA)	Harper	Quigley
Conaway	Jordan	Roby	Larson (CT)	Nolan	Shea-Porter	Bishop (UT)	Harris	Rangel
Cook	Joyce	Roe (TN)	Lee (CA)	O'Rourke	Sherman	Black	Hastings (WA)	Rice (SC)
Cooper	Kelly	Rogers (AL)	Levin	Owens	Sinema	Blackburn	Heck (WA)	Richmond
Costa	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)	Lewis	Pallone	Sires	Blumenauer	Hensarling	Roby
Cotton	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Lipinski	Pascrell	Sllaughter	Bonamici	Himes	Roe (TN)
Cramer	Kingston	Rohrabacher	Loeb sack	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)	Bonner	Hinojosa	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita	Lofgren	Payne	Speier	Boustany	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kline	Rooney	Lowenthal	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)	Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Culberson	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen	Lowey	Perlmutter	Takano	Braley (IA)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Daines	LaMalfa	Roskam	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Peters (CA)	Thompson (CA)	Bridenstine	Hurt	Rokita
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Ross	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (MS)	Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rooney
Denham	Lance	Rothfus	Maloney, Sean	Pocan	Tierney	Broun (GA)	Jackson Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Dent	Lankford	Royce	Lynch	Polis	Titus	Brown (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Roskam
DeSantis	Latham	Runyan	Maloney, Carolyn	Price (NC)	Tonko	Brownley (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Ross
DesJarlais	Latta	Ryan (WI)	Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Tsongas	Buchanan	Kaptur	Rothfus
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Salmon	Markey	Rahall	Van Hollen	Bucshon	Kelly	Royce
Duffy	Long	Scalise	Matheson	Rangel	Veasey	Bustos	Kildee	Ruiz
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Schock	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond	Vela	Butterfield	Kilmer	Runyan
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert	Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez	Calvert	King (IA)	Ruppersberger
Ellmers	Lummis	Scott, Austin	McCollum	Ruiz	Visclosky	Camp	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Farenthold	Maffei	Sensenbrenner	McDermott	Ruppersberger	Walz	Campbell	Kingston	Salmon
Fincher	Marchant	Sessions	McGovern	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman	Cantor	Kinzing (IL)	Scalise
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Shimkus	McIntyre	Sánchez, Linda T.	Schultz	Capito	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Fleischmann	Massie	Shuster	McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters	Capps	Kline	Schneider
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Simpson	Meeks	Sarbanes	Watt	Carney	Kuster	Schock
Flores	McCaul	Smith (NE)	Meng	Schakowsky	Welch	Carson (IN)	Labrador	Schrader
Forbes	McClintock	Smith (NJ)	Michaud	Schiff	Wilson (FL)	Carter	LaMalfa	Schwartz
Fortenberry	McHenry	Smith (TX)			Yarmuth	Cartwright	Lamborn	Schweikert
Fox	McKeon	Southerland				Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (VA)
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Stewart				Castro (TX)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, Austin
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Stivers				Chabot	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Gardner	Rodgers	Stockman				Chaffetz	Levin	Sensenbrenner
Garrett	Meadows	Stutzman				Chu	Lipinski	Serrano
Gerlach	Meehan	Terry				Cicilline	Loeb sack	Sessions
Gibbs	Messer	Thompson (PA)				Clay	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Gibson	Mica	Thornberry				Clyburn	Long	Sherman
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)	Tiberi				Coble	Lowenthal	Shimkus
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Tipton				Cohen	Lucas	Shuster
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Turner				Cole	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Gosar	Moran	Upton				Collins (GA)	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Smith (NE)
Gowdy	Mullin	Valadao				Collins (NY)	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Smith (NJ)
Granger	Mulvaney	Wagner				Connolly	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Walberg				Cook	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Graves (MO)	Neugebauer	Walden				Cooper	Lummis	Southerland
Griffin (AR)	Noem	Walorski				Cramer	Maffei	Speier
Griffith (VA)	Nugent	Weber (TX)				Crenshaw	Maloney, Sean	Stewart
Grimm	Nunes	Wenstrup				Culberson	Marino	Stivers
Guthrie	Nunnelee	Westmoreland				Daines	Massie	Stockman
Hall	Olson	Whitfield				Davis (CA)	Matheson	Stutzman
Hanna	Palazzo	Williams				Davis, Danny	McCarthy (CA)	Swalwell (CA)
Harper	Paulsen	Wilson (SC)				DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Takano
Harris	Pearce	Wittman				DelBene	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Hartzler	Perry	Wolf				DesJarlais	McClintock	Thornberry
Hastings (WA)	Peterson	Womack				Diaz-Balart	McHenry	Tiberi
Heck (NV)	Petri	Woodall				Doggett	McIntyre	Tierney
Hensarling	Pittenger	Yoder				Doyle	McKeon	Tipton
Herrera Beutler	Pitts	Yoho				Duckworth	McKinley	Titus
Holding	Poe (TX)	Young (FL)				Duncan (SC)	McMorris	Tonko
Hudson	Pompeo	Young (IN)				Duncan (TN)	Rodgers	Tsongas
Huelskamp	Posey					Ellison	McNerney	Upton
Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)					Ellmers	Meadows	Van Hollen

NOES—190

Andrews	Cohen	Gallego	Kildee	Miller, George	Schneider	Barton	Grayson	Pittenger
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Garamendi	Kilmer	Moore	Schrader	Beatty	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Bass	Conyers	Garcia	Kind	Murphy (FL)	Schwartz	Becerra	Guthrie	Pocan
Beatty	Courtney	Grayson	Kirkpatrick	Nadler	Scott (VA)	Bentivolio	Hahn	Polis
Becerra	Crowley	Green, Al	Kuster	Napolitano	Scott, David	Bera (CA)	Hall	Pompeo
Bera (CA)	Cuellar	Green, Gene	Langevin	Neal	Serrano	Bilirakis	Hanabusa	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Grijalva	Larsen (WA)	Negrete McLeod	Sewell (AL)	Bishop (GA)	Harper	Quigley
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Gutierrez	Larson (CT)	Nolan	Shea-Porter	Bishop (UT)	Harris	Rangel
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Hahn	Lee (CA)	O'Rourke	Sherman	Black	Hastings (WA)	Rice (SC)
Bonamici	DeGette	Hanabusa	Levin	Owens	Sinema	Blackburn	Heck (WA)	Richmond
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Hastings (FL)	Lewis	Pallone	Sires	Blumenauer	Hensarling	Roby
Braley (IA)	DelBene	Heck (WA)	Lipinski	Pascrell	Sllaughter	Bonamici	Himes	Roe (TN)
Brown (FL)	Deutsch	Higgins	Loeb sack	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)	Bonner	Hinojosa	Rogers (AL)
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Holmes	Lofgren	Payne	Speier	Boustany	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Bustos	Doggett	Hinojosa	Lowenthal	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)	Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Butterfield	Doyle	Holt	Lowey	Perlmutter	Takano	Braley (IA)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Capps	Duckworth	Honda	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Peters (CA)	Thompson (CA)	Bridenstine	Hurt	Rokita
Capuano	Edwards	Horsford	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (MS)	Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rooney
Carney	Ellison	Hoyer	Maloney, Sean	Pocan	Tierney	Broun (GA)	Jackson Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Carson (IN)	Engel	Huffman	Lynch	Polis	Titus	Brown (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Roskam
Cartwright	Enyart	Israel	Maloney, Carolyn	Price (NC)	Tonko	Brownley (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Jeffries	Markey	Quigley	Tsongas	Buchanan	Kaptur	Rothfus
Castro (TX)	Esty	Johnson (GA)	Matheson	Rahall	Van Hollen	Bucshon	Kelly	Royce
Chu	Farr	Johnson, E. B.	McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Veasey	Bustos	Kildee	Ruiz
Cicilline	Fattah	Jones	McCollum	Richmond	Vela	Butterfield	Kilmer	Runyan
Clarke	Foster	Kaptur	McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez	Calvert	King (IA)	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Keating	McGovern	Ruiz	Visclosky	Camp	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Clyburn	Gabbard	Kennedy	McIntyre	Ruppersberger	Walz	Campbell	Kingston	Salmon
			McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman	Cantor	Kinzing (IL)	Scalise
			Meeks	Sánchez, Linda T.	Schultz	Capito	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
			Meng	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters	Capps	Kline	Schneider
			Michaud	Sarbanes	Watt	Carney	Kuster	Schock
				Schakowsky	Welch	Carson (IN)	Labrador	Schrader
				Schiff	Wilson (FL)	Carter	LaMalfa	Schwartz
					Yarmuth	Cartwright	Lamborn	Schweikert
						Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (VA)
						Castro (TX)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, Austin
						Chabot	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
						Chaffetz	Levin	Sensenbrenner
						Chu	Lipinski	Serrano
						Cicilline	Loeb sack	Sessions
						Clay	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
						Clyburn	Long	Sherman
						Coble	Lowenthal	Shimkus
						Cohen	Lucas	Shuster
						Cole	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
						Collins (GA)	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Smith (NE)
						Collins (NY)	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Smith (NJ)
						Connolly	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
						Cook	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
						Cooper	Lummis	Southerland
						Cramer	Maffei	Speier
						Crenshaw	Maloney, Sean	Stewart
						Culberson	Marino	Stivers
						Daines	Massie	Stockman
						Davis (CA)	Matheson	Stutzman
						Davis, Danny	McCarthy (CA)	Swalwell (CA)
						DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Takano
						DelBene	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
						DesJarlais	McClintock	Thornberry
						Diaz-Balart	McHenry	Tiberi
						Doggett	McIntyre	Tierney
						Doyle	McKeon	Tipton
						Duckworth	McKinley	Titus
						Duncan (SC)	McMorris	Tonko
						Duncan (TN)	Rodgers	Tsongas
						Ellison	McNerney	Upton
						Ellmers	Meadows	Van Hollen
						Engel	Meng	Vargas
						Eshoo	Messer	Vela
						Esty	Mica	Wagner
						Farenthold	Miller (FL)	Walden
						Farr	Miller (MI)	Walorski
						Fattah	Miller, Gary	Walz
						Fleischmann	Moran	Wasserman
						Fleming	Mullin	Schultz
						Flores	Mulvaney	Waters
						Forbes	Murphy (FL)	Watt
						Fortenberry	Nadler	Waxman
						Foster	Neugebauer	Weber (TX)
						Frankel (FL)	Noem	Webster (FL)
						Franks (AZ)	Nugent	Welch
						Fudge	Nunes	Wenstrup
						Gabbard	Nunnelee	Westmoreland
						Gallego	O'Rourke	Whitfield
						Garamendi	Olson	Williams
						Garcia	Palazzo	Wilson (FL)
						Garrett	Pascrell	Wilson (SC)
						Gerlach	Payne	Wolf
						Gibbs	Pearce	Womack
						Gingrey (GA)	Perlmutter	Yarmuth
						Goodlatte	Perry	Yoho
						Gosar	Peters (CA)	Young (FL)
						Gowdy	Petri	Young (IN)
						Granger	Pingree (ME)	

NOT VOTING—7

Rush
Vargas
Webster (FL)

Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1059

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 27, I was unavoidably detained off of the House floor. Therefore, I was unable to cast my vote on H. Res. 39 providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 325). Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 291, nays 129, answered “present” 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—291

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei

Bachmann
Bachus
Barber

Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)