

many awards, including the International Conservation Award from the Federation of Fly Fishers and the Director's Achievement Award from the California Department of Fish and Game.

Mr. Jennings is an outspoken guardian of the San Joaquin Delta, and I admire his tireless dedication to protecting water quality in our environment. Bill Jennings reminds us of the importance of taking action to safeguard our treasured natural resources for generations to come.

It's been an honor to know Mr. Jennings, and it's encouraging to know that people like Mr. Jennings are out there working on our behalf.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, while America has the world's most generous immigration policy, we simply lack the resources to accept all the world's immigrants into America. The President and Senate Gang of Eight push an amnesty bill that, per The Heritage Foundation, costs American taxpayers a 50-year net tax loss of \$6.3 trillion. That's a net tax loss of \$126 billion per year—enough to eliminate sequestration.

In April 2013, a Pew Center poll revealed that 20 percent of all Mexicans—that's 22 million Mexicans—say they want to illegally immigrate to America if they can get away with it.

America cannot afford to open these massive floodgates anymore than we can afford an amnesty plan that rewards illegal conduct while adding \$6.3 trillion to America's already dangerous and exploding national debt—a debt, I might add, that is already doing significant damage to America's economy and national security.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF WALTER "FINCH" KWIECINSKI OF DULUTH, MINNESOTA

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

Mr. WALZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and sacrifice of Walter "Finch" Kwiecinski of Duluth, Minnesota.

Walter's story is the story of his generation and should make each of us reflect on the sacrifices that were made to allow us the precious gift of democracy and self-government.

Born in 1914 on a farm near Duluth, Minnesota, to Polish immigrants, Walter enlisted in the Army at Fort Snelling, Minnesota, on February 6, 1941. After basic training, he was sent to Fort Mills on Corregidor Island in the Philippines.

Walter manned a 12-inch mortar on Battery Way and fought valiantly to

repel the Japanese invasion of Bataan and Corregidor. Standing until the very end with his unit sustaining 77 percent casualty rates, Walter fought on until May 6, 1941, when Corregidor fell and General Wainwright cabled these words to President Roosevelt:

There is a limit of human endurance, and that point has long passed.

Walter was taken prisoner by the Japanese and survived hellish conditions in POW camps and transport on the "hell ships" to be slave labor in Japan. His family presumed him dead. He was liberated in August 1945 and returned home December 5, 1945.

He then humbly set about going back to work as a mechanic. Marrying Mary Anne Krebs, he raised a beautiful family and lived a life of dignity. Yesterday, May 8, marked the 25th anniversary of Walter Kwiecinski's death. We should all be thankful for his life.

□ 0920

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 202, I call up the bill (H.R. 807) to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 202, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 807

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Full Faith and Credit Act".

SEC. 2. PAYMENT OF PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST ON PUBLIC DEBT AND SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—*In the event that the debt of the United States Government, as defined in section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, reaches the statutory limit, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in addition to any other authority provided by law, issue obligations under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, to pay with legal tender, and solely for the purpose of paying, the principal and interest on obligations of the United States described in subsection (b) after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

(b) *OBLIGATIONS DESCRIBED.*—*For purposes of this subsection, obligations described in this subsection are obligations which are—*

(1) *held by the public, or*

(2) *held by the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Disability Insurance Trust Fund.*

(c) *OBLIGATIONS EXEMPT FROM PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.*—*Obligations issued under subsection (a) shall not be taken into account in applying the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, to the extent that such obligation would otherwise cause the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, to be exceeded.*

(d) *REPORT ON CERTAIN ACTIONS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—*If, after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury exercises his authority under subsection (a), the Secretary shall thereafter submit a report each week providing an accounting relating to—*

(A) *the principal on mature obligations and interest that is due or accrued of the United States, and*

(B) *any obligations issued pursuant to subsection (a).*

(2) *SUBMISSION.*—*The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.*

(3) *TERMINATION.*—*The report requirement under paragraph (1) shall cease to apply after the date of the enactment of the first increase in the limitation in section 3101(b), United States Code, after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 113-52, if offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 807.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act. This legislation credibly and permanently removes the threat of default on a U.S. debt payment and ensures that Social Security benefits are paid in full and on time.

The bill is really quite simple: it requires the Treasury Department to issue debt not subject to the statutory limit to make principal and interest payments. And here are the facts about who holds that debt: American families and businesses hold the overwhelming majority of U.S. debt—teacher pension funds, individual Americans, our military retirement fund, and the list goes on and on. So by ensuring that Treasury has the ability to honor our debt obligations, we are in fact ensuring Americans will be paid.

This legislation is the first step in protecting our credit rating. Two major credit rating agencies—Standard and Poor's and Moody's—have indicated that they differentiate between debt and other payments when determining whether or not to review our credit rating. To that end, this bill specifically addresses the default on U.S.

debt obligations that these agencies have identified.

Additionally, Standard & Poor's was crystal clear as to why it downgraded the U.S. credit rating following the debt negotiations in the summer of 2011, and I quote:

The downgrade reflects our opinion that the fiscal consolidation plan that Congress and the administration recently agreed to falls short of what, in our view, would be necessary to stabilize the government's medium-term debt dynamics.

In plain English, they downgraded the U.S. credit rating because we have not addressed the primary drivers of our debts and deficits.

It's nearly 2 years later, and neither the President nor congressional Democrats have offered a serious plan that would address the problems that caused the downgrade in the first place. This legislation places that responsibility on the Obama administration and encourages the President to be more involved with taming our debt, something Republicans have long called for.

Some critics of this legislation have claimed that it opens the door for Treasury to issue new debt for new spending or that it is simply raising the debt limit by another means. This is categorically false. This bill does not increase the debt limit. Instead, under this legislation, Treasury loses the authority to issue debt above the limit if doing so creates any room under the existing old debt limit.

Treasury may not issue new debt above the statutory limit again until the limit is reached. Additionally, any new debt issued to pay principal and interest is not exempt from the statutory limit unless issuing the new debt would cause Treasury to exceed the statutory limit.

The American people agree, and that support transcends party lines. A majority, 55 percent, support requiring the government to pay the principal and interest on the debt before it pays for other government expenses. Support for the proposal is strong among Republicans, 65 percent; Independents, 53 percent; while Democrat voters are split evenly between favor, 46, and opposed, 47.

Clearly, we cannot default on our debt. The consequences of doing so could be very serious. A default would at the very least hinder an already stagnant economic recovery, and, in a worst-case scenario, lead the country back into a recession.

□ 0930

Failure to make a debt payment will increase our borrowing costs and threaten our ability to make any of the other payments we owe. If signed into law, this legislation would prevent such an unacceptable situation.

The President and Congress must work to reduce the growing burden of our debt and deficits, but we must do so without imposing more tax increases on hardworking families and

job creators. There are bipartisan policies we can enact to reduce wasteful Washington spending and preserve Social Security and Medicare for future generations.

The Ways and Means Committee has already begun to examine those policies and will continue to do so over the coming months. In the meantime, we must act to make it clear to the American people and the world economy that the U.S. will not default on a debt payment. The legislation before us accomplishes that important goal, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I wanted to state the facts here so everybody understands them. We have called this—as the Speaker has, in essence—Paying China First, and so many others, except for Social Security beneficiaries, come last, come next, if at all. And here's the reason: of the prioritized debt covered by this bill, 47 percent is foreign owned, and China bondholders are the largest ones of that foreign ownership.

So, essentially, what this bill says is, okay, let's pay China and the other foreign bondholders first, not American troops, not disabled veterans, not physicians, providers who treat Medicare patients, not small businesses holding contract obligations from the United States, school lunch programs secondary, medical research, Pell grants, taxpayers due refunds, and, interestingly, other Federal trust funds holding Treasury bonds, Medicare, deposit insurance, et cetera, et cetera. That's the fact. That's the fact.

So why do this? Well, it is said let's do this because of the importance of paying the bonds in terms of our economy and in terms of our bond rating.

Let me just say a word about bond rating. Here's what Fitch has said:

It is not assured that the Treasury would or legally could prioritize debt service over its myriad of other obligations, including social security payments, tax rebates, and payments to contractors and employees. Arrears on such obligations would not constitute a default event from a sovereign rating perspective, but very likely prompt a downgrade even as debt obligations continued to be met.

It was interesting that S&P, who already downgraded us, said this:

Still, sudden cuts that shave off, say, 6 percent of the GDP-to-spending ratio would cause economic panic and could affect ratings.

So, why is this being done when a former Bush administration economist said the result is “a bloody mess,” or another Bush administration official said “prioritization is impossible.” Is the government really going to be in the position of withholding benefits, salaries, and rent contract payments in order to pay off Treasury bondholders?

So why is this being done? It's not going anywhere in the Senate. The President opposes it. I think the reason, apparently, it's being done is to

satisfy some within the Republican caucus or maybe to try to provide some leverage in terms of bargaining with the Democrats.

This is playing with fire, though, with the economy of this country. Those who vote for playing with this fire are going to burn themselves. But I think most significantly, they're going to burn the economy of the United States of America.

I've tried to figure out who the Pied Piper is of this proposition. It's hard to figure it out. But those who followed that Pied Piper in the Republican ranks, those who vote for it essentially are moving towards the cliff following that Pied Piper; but, worse off, it places this country once again and its economy in danger of going over the cliff. This is not only a mistaken idea, it's really a rotten one. Let's vote “no.”

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Since the gentleman raised the question of who holds our debt, this chart shows that the vast majority of our debt is held by Americans. That's a fact. Thirty percent of the debt is held by citizens, pension funds, and you go down the list. Two-thirds of our debt is held by Americans. We need to make sure that Americans are paid first.

With that, I would yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, as I meet with my constituents back home, they tell me loud and clear their concerns about our record debt and deficits. We are nearly \$17 trillion in debt. That comes out to about \$53,000 per person.

My constituents back home get it. They've had to make tough choices to live within their means and they expect Washington to do the same.

My Republican colleagues and I have been committed to getting our fiscal house in order, growing our economy, and getting America back to work. In fact, we passed a budget that balances in 10 years. On the other hand, the President's and the Senate Democrats' budgets never balance—ever.

Hardworking taxpayers and their children and grandchildren deserve better. We need to leave them a stronger and more secure America, not a mountain of debt.

Madam Speaker, the bill we are considering today, the Full Faith and Credit Act, would require Treasury to make good on debt payments. The bill also enables Treasury to pay Social Security benefits to seniors, survivors, and those with disabilities and their families. Madam Speaker, let me say that again. Under this bill, seniors will get their checks, and those on disability will get their checks.

Back in 1996, we passed similar legislation to H.R. 807. Then Social Security was getting more in revenues than it was paying out in benefits, so full

Social Security benefits could be paid without hitting the debt limit.

Today, there aren't enough revenues to pay Social Security benefits. To make up the difference, Treasury has to redeem the debt it owes Social Security by borrowing from the public. This may cause a small increase in the debt, because when Treasury redeems Social Security IOUs, it must pay any interest accrued on that debt. Our bill exempts this interest from counting against the debt limit.

Madam Speaker, according to CBO, Social Security's cash shortfall is projected to reach \$77 billion this year. Over 10 years, Social Security's shortfall will total \$1.3 trillion. These cash shortfalls are permanent and are growing each and every year.

Madam Speaker, in closing, we owe it to the American people. In fact, we must come together to preserve and protect Social Security.

□ 0940

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to our distinguished whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, the ranking member.

I rise partly in sadness, wholly in disappointment, that we are playing this game. How sad. I tell my other friend from Michigan, his amendment is sad, too, I want to say. It's a device to try to get people to vote for a bill that has no merit by making Members' pay somehow present in this bill. We ought to consider things on their merit, not on this political gamesmanship.

Madam Speaker, for the second time, House Republicans have decided to put our country at risk by defaulting on its obligations. They know this bill is not going anywhere. They know the President would veto it, and they know Republican economists think this bill makes no sense. I won't ask the gentleman who chairs the Ways and Means Committee his real view on this bill.

This so-called "debt prioritization" bill mandates that, in the event we hit the debt limit, we will pay China first, not our contractors doing business with us, not our Federal employees, not veterans—yes, Social Security is taken care of—not our military. We'll pay China first. That's what this bill says. No major creditor in this country would have a debt prioritization. Now, the secondary lenders and tertiary lenders, yes, have prioritization, but no major lender, no big corporation. They say, if we incur a debt, we'll pay it—not we'll pay this one first and you second or third or fourth. We'll pay China first and other creditors before we pay our troops, seniors, health care and veterans benefits. Yes, you've made an exemption for Social Security, not in the original bill, but politically that was too hot to handle, so you added Social Security.

Just yesterday, Speaker BOEHNER admitted that this bill means the United States of America will voluntarily act

like a bankrupt corporation and pay China before we pay our troops. How sad. How patently political. How transparent that we are trying to give a fig leaf so that we can play around with the national debt. Ronald Reagan would be deeply disappointed, and he expressed that.

Speaker BOEHNER said:

Those who have loaned us money, like in any other proceeding . . . the bondholders usually get paid first. The same thing here—pay China first.

This partisan bill is not a feasible solution to our debt problem, and even Republicans recognize this won't work.

Tony Fratto, a former Bush administration spokesman on economic policy—this is a Republican spokesman—said:

Prioritization is impossible. Is the government really going to be in the position of withholding benefits, salaries, rent, contract payments, et cetera, in order to pay off Treasury bondholders? That would be a political catastrophe.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Former Bush chief economic adviser Keith Hennessey—this is an economic adviser, not a spokesperson—said this:

If the U.S. Government legally commits to paying someone a benefit or agrees to pay a firm for a good or a service, the U.S. Government should fulfill that agreement in a timely fashion. To do otherwise is taking the first step to becoming a banana republic.

That's Hennessey, not HOYER, not a Democrat. That's a Bush economic adviser.

Madam Speaker, we should not be admitting defeat and ranking the losers as this bill would do. Instead of choosing to pay China or any other holder of our debt before we pay our troops—and we ought to pay them, and we ought to pay them on time, but that's not the issue. The issue is the United States of America, the most creditworthy Nation on Earth, ought to pay all its debt in a timely fashion—all—not prioritize—all—across the board. For our wounded veterans and for the seniors who have worked hard to build this country, we should be working to fix the problem by coming to a consensus on a big and balanced deal to reduce our deficit, including tax reform, which the chairman is so assiduously seeking.

Playing politically motivated games with the creditworthiness of the United States will only risk another downgrade.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Full Faith and Credit Act.

Now, much has been said about how ridiculous it is that we find ourselves going through this debt limit routine

so darned often, but this limit exists in order to induce this body to reflect on the folly of our mindless borrow-and-spend practices. Such reflection ought to lead us to serious debate and even to cooperation. It presents an opportunity for public servants to engage in thoughtful, respectful dialogue and to craft long-term solutions.

As we approach the limit for the third time in my 2½ years here, we have an opportunity to work together and finally make our largest programs of government sustainable. We have an opportunity to work together and finally tackle long-neglected issues like tax reform so that jobs and personal incomes can grow more quickly.

The Full Faith and Credit Act protects and advances such opportunities for Congress to accomplish big things, and it does this simply by removing the specter of default from the table altogether. No one is contemplating default over our Nation's obligations. America will always and forever pay its bills, and the Full Faith and Credit Act makes this crystal clear—by making default impossible.

Our support for this act simply cannot and should not be regarded as ideological or partisan, so I respectfully call on every one of my good colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to support this commonsense bill, to take default off the table, and to put the focus squarely on dealing with our real challenges. Let's harness this opportunity of an approaching borrowing limit to come together as problem solvers.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 10 seconds.

Now, this bill not only contemplates default—it plans for it. Default is default is default.

I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished former chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. I heard the last speaker, but there is no question in my mind that when a person from the other side said that the Republican Party's first priority is not the salvation of our country but to stop Barack Obama, I didn't take him too seriously after the election; but I see the campaign continues. As a political veteran, I understand that; but let me make it clear what we are doing today.

I had a friend who was deeply in debt. He owed so much money that he just knew he couldn't pay all of his creditors. Now, it was nowhere near \$14 trillion, but it was a lot. The creditors harassed him day in and day out, telling him he had to make these payments. Finally, he got annoyed, he got angry, and he called his creditors and told them, If you keep harassing me, I will not put your name in the hat, because every month I put all of my creditors' bills into a hat; but the way you are treating me—calling the job, harassing me at home—your name will not go into the hat.

Now, that's pretty poor policy, I would think, but if I understand this correctly, we are telling our creditors that certain names will be in that hat and that other people will not be in that hat.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RANGEL. So what names go into the hat?

Communist China goes into the hat. Iran and Venezuela go into the hat. Saudi Arabia goes into the hat. Russia goes into the hat.

Who's outside the hat?

Disabled veterans are out of the hat, and health providers are out of the hat. A lot of people who deserve to be considered as creditors to protect full faith and credit are out of the hat.

This is bad for my friend—it's worse for our country—and this is not the way those people to whom we owe money should be treated. America is greater than that.

□ 0950

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and commend Chairman CAMP and Mr. McCLINTOCK.

The Full Faith and Credit Act authorizes the Treasury Secretary to make only the principal and interest payments on our national debt if the United States reaches its current national debt limit of more than \$16.4 trillion. The legislation also holds harmless Social Security benefits and requires a weekly report from the Treasury Department regarding the interest and principal payments it has made due to our ever-growing national debt.

As almost everyone knows, our national debt is more than \$16.4 trillion, a number that is mind boggling and almost unimaginable. Our Federal Government has grown so large that trying to save a nickel for every dollar we spend is difficult.

To put \$16.4 trillion in perspective, this equates to more than \$111,500 in debt per taxpayer. If you stacked \$16.4 trillion in one dollar bills, it would stack to the moon 4 times.

If we fail to get our spending under control, it will not just be our children and grandchildren who will suffer but everyone hoping to retire in five to ten years as well. If we continue on this path, we will soon be printing so much money that pensions will be worth very little.

In fact, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office released a report on February 5th of this year projecting the United States will be making a total of more than \$224 billion in interest payments on our national debt. By 2023 it is estimated we will be making \$857 billion in interest payments on our national debt, almost quadrupling our yearly interest payment.

This legislation is a thoughtful, creative way to not dig ourselves further into this hole. We

cannot continue our reckless spending ways and expect our creditors to continue funding a Nation that borrows money just to make its own interest payments.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I had hoped that amidst all the controversies that grip Congress, certainly we should at least be able to agree that the full faith and credit of the United States should not hang in the balance every time there's a fiscal controversy in Washington. I also want to thank Chairman CAMP and his Ways and Means Committee for revisions that make this solution much simpler and more practical than the original draft.

Madam Speaker, this bill simply guarantees that the sovereign debt of the United States Government will be paid in full and on time under any circumstances.

Most States have had similar provisions to guarantee their debt in their laws or constitutions for generations. Last year, in testimony to the Senate, Ben Bernanke praised these State provisions for maintaining confidence in their bonds. He told our House Budget Committee that a similar measure at the Federal level would help to protect us against a sovereign default, which he called a "very high priority."

And yet, this President and his followers in Congress, who have taken our Nation on the biggest borrowing binge in its history—who've run up more debt than almost all of his predecessors put together—oppose this commonsense measure to strengthen the credit upon which that debt depends.

This bill tells credit markets that even in the event of an impasse on the debt limit, their loans to this government are absolutely safe.

The Democrats have raised three arguments in opposition. First, the whip just said that guaranteeing the Nation's sovereign debt is just an excuse for not paying our other bills. What utter nonsense. I challenge him to name one Member of Congress who has ever suggested that this measure is an acceptable substitute for not paying our other bills. Do they actually suggest that all these other States that have guaranteed their sovereign debts for generations have ever used these guarantees as an excuse not to pay their other bills?

On the contrary, by providing clear and unambiguous mandates to protect their credit first, they actually support and maintain their ability to pay for all of their other obligations.

The second argument that we have heard ad nauseam is that this bill will pay China before it pays our troops. Well, I would remind them, as the chairman said, that more than half of our debt is actually held by Americans, often by American pension funds. China holds just 11 percent. So this measure actually protects Americans far more than the Chinese.

But whether our loans come from China or from grandma's pension fund, without the Nation's credit, we cannot pay our troops or any of our other obligations.

We are borrowing a quarter of every dollar that we spend, and under this administration we have amassed a debt that is now larger than our Nation's entire economy. Our Nation's credit now carries a greater strain and burden than it ever has before. This measure strengthens our credit by guaranteeing that our sovereign debt will be paid in full and on time.

Perhaps the most bizarre argument that we've heard is that by guaranteeing the Nation's credit, we actually undermine it and risk another downgrade in our credit rating. After all, as the ranking member said, a downgrade followed the last debt debate in Congress.

Here are the facts: Standard & Poor's officials had warned for months that Congress had to reduce the projected 10-year deficit by \$4 trillion in order to maintain its AAA credit rating. Because of Democratic intransigence, this Congress could only reduce it by \$1.2 trillion. So we lost the rating. Facts are indeed stubborn things.

But the opponents are correct in one point—that several officials did express a concern that the impasse could have caused a default in the Nation's sovereign debt. That is precisely what this measure would protect us from in the future.

No one advocates that the government delay paying any of our bills, and this legislation does no such thing. Indeed, this legislation protects our ability to pay all of our other bills because paying those bills depends on maintaining the Nation's credit.

Given the precarious state of our Nation's finances, principled disputes over how the debt limit is addressed are going to happen from time to time. Just a few years ago, then-Senator Barack Obama vigorously opposed an increase in the debt limit that was sought by the Bush administration.

When these controversies erupt, as they inevitably do in a free society, it is imperative that credit markets are supremely confident that their loans to the United States are secure. That's what this bill does.

For once, let us set aside all this partisan posturing and act in the Nation's interest.

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

I want the record to be clear: of the public debt prioritized by this bill, foreign holders own 47 percent and China holds 22 percent of that.

I now yield 1½ minutes to another distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. McDERMOTT.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, we haven't done anything in this House all week, and here we are working on a

plan on how the government can default on its debts. That's what this is really all about.

It reminds me of the derivation of the word "bedlam."

Bedlam was a large mental hospital in the middle of London. It was really called "Bethlehem," but people locally called it "Bedlam." This is a policy that came out of bedlam and will create bedlam.

If we don't pay our debts, we are going to create problems in our own country, as well as in the world economic system.

If you want to lose the United States dollar as the currency that is used by the world, start by not paying your debts. Everybody will say, Why do we want a dollar? Those folks don't pay. That's what you're creating—bedlam—here today.

I urge everyone to vote "no."

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, from the very origins of this country, the very beginnings, this country has always made good on its sovereign debt.

Let me be clear what this bill does. It ensures that the United States shall never default on its sovereign debt.

What does it not do? It's not a solution to the debt problem. We have a serious long-term liability problem in this country and a failure by our colleagues on the other side to recognize that we have to deal with this. Simply raising taxes ad nauseam is not a solution. We need to come to a real solution so that seniors are not left behind on their Medicare benefits and Social Security is taken care of.

What does it not do? It's not a pay China first bill. China's holdings are less than 8 percent, and the ranking member's figures were wrong because he failed to account for the Social Security trust fund in that calculation. What we have used are the accurate figures from the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

What does it not do? It does not authorize new spending and new debt. This bill just simply says the United States shall always make good on its sovereign debt. It doesn't provide a solution to the long-term problem. We've got to solve those problems. We need to come together and come up with solutions for the longer-term liability with Medicare and all the other spending programs that are bankrupting this country.

It's been said that the national debt of the United States is a threat to our national security in the long run. We need real long-term solutions and not demagoguery and not disingenuous arguments.

The language is very clear. We have seen what the language is in these credit rating agencies as they did this downgrade. It was basically a failure of Congress to come together and work

with the administration to come up with a real long-term plan. That is the issue.

The United States will not default on its debt, and this provides an extra tool for Treasury.

□ 1000

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), another very distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. LEVIN, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Pay China First Act. We are the United States of America, and we pay our bills. Madam Speaker, I cannot believe that this body would even entertain or consider a bill that puts the Social Security check of 56 million seniors and people after China. How can we justify putting 2 million American military personnel, many of whom are in harm's way, after China? That is not right. That is not fair. As a Congress, we can do better, much better.

Let me be crystal clear. Default is not an option. The United States of America pays all of its bills as they come due. This is the American way.

Let's stop playing games and do what is right; do what is just; do what is fair. Let's do what every American citizen has to do, pay our debts. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote "no" on the Pay China First Act. We have a moral obligation to do what is right.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN), a distinguish member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I think it is important to say first and foremost that no matter how passionate you are, no matter how loud you scream, it doesn't convert nonsense to facts. The point is China's debt holdings are less than 8 percent. It makes for a great talking point. I understand that.

Madam Speaker, nobody wants to hit the debt ceiling. In fact, no one wants to get anywhere near it. On the contrary, we are the ones that are trying to get Washington's spending under control so it will live within its means. That's why we talk about budgets and spending and living within our means, because House Republicans fight that fight. If we weren't doing it, we wouldn't even know that there are limits to our spending. The House budget does just that, balancing the Federal budget in 10 years.

We understand that we must take precautions to protect the creditworthiness of the United States. We can hope for the best, but we must prepare for the worst. And the worst that can happen with the debt ceiling is a government default. The bill before us today takes default off the table, period. No more, no less.

We've been told by the credit-rating agencies that the greatest factor affecting our national credit rating is the government's ability to pay its debt-holders. This bill makes sure that it will. This bill requires—not allows—requires Treasury to continue to pay principal and interest on existing debt if, and only if, we hit the debt ceiling before a deal is reached. This is a backstop that takes default off the table.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. With it we can focus on the other issues of debt and spending that created the problem in the first place. We can have an honest debate about what is driving government debt and how to deal with it. I hope we don't get anywhere near the debt ceiling limit. I hope we use the next few months to negotiate and reach an agreement that avoids any risk of hitting the debt ceiling; but until then, we should agree that it's our duty to protect America's credit rating.

I look forward to voting for this measure, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), another very distinguished member of our committee.

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

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I stand in opposition to the Republican proposal today to pay China first.

Now, I think that there is another way that we might describe this legislation from our Republican friends, and it would go like this: let's balance the budget when Bill Clinton is President, and let's balance the budget when Barack Obama is President. But in the intervening 8 years, let's go on a reckless spending spree and cut taxes by \$2.3 trillion, engage two wars internationally, embrace a prescription drug bill, spend the country into oblivion, and cut taxes for the wealthiest people.

Recall: balance the budget when Bill Clinton is President, and balance the budget when Barack Obama is President. Worry about the debt not when George Bush is President, but only when you have Democratic Presidents.

This is a reckless proposal today, and everybody knows it.

Speaker BOEHNER is quoted in one of the dailies this morning as saying of course we pay the bondholders first. That's a fact. The previous speaker didn't mention that. He said, let's deal with the facts. So who are the bondholders? They emphasize, they suggest that it's the American people. Foreign debt is held by the Chinese and the Japanese second, and everybody knows it.

So it's austerity for the American people, but make sure that the bondholders are paid. It's cut back on everything for the American people, but

make sure the bondholders are paid. Cut taxes by \$2.3 trillion, and not to worry about the austerity of the American people.

Recall: balance the budget when Bill Clinton is President; balance the budget when Barack Obama is President.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and for bringing this bill forward, Congressman MCCLINTOCK's Full Faith and Credit Act. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of the bill because what the bill does is clearly take default off the table as an option when we're having negotiations over the debt ceiling.

Now, people would say why is this even an issue. Unfortunately, it's an issue because the only people in town who have been threatening default are President Obama and liberals in Congress. And you've heard some of the speakers against this bill today talking about the threat of default. What's so good about this bill is it takes default off the table. It takes away their ability to default on our Nation's debt.

In fact, President Obama in the last debt ceiling negotiation almost 2 years ago was the one running around the country threatening to default on our credit, so much so that it scared the markets and hurt our economy. And, in fact, it is one of the things that led to a downgrade, the first time in our Nation's history that our credit rating was downgraded because the problem that gets us to the debt ceiling is that Washington has a spending problem. It's spending that continues to force us to hit the debt ceiling.

And so when we're negotiating on the debt ceiling, we shouldn't be worried about the President running around threatening default; we should be focused on fixing the spending problem. Americans sent us here to tackle the tough issues, not to be clouded and confused by the President's threats of default. Unfortunately, the GAO has even said the President can prioritize. He should. It would be responsible to pay your debts, but the President himself has said he would consider defaulting if we hit the debt ceiling.

And so what this bill says is you pay Americans first. As the chairman of Ways and Means pointed out, it is American citizens who own the bulk of our debt. They would be paid. Social Security would be paid. But then we could focus on the spending problem, and the negotiations on debt ceiling would be about solving the spending problem in Washington that continues to force us to hit the debt ceiling so that we can stop living from crisis to crisis and finally get our economy moving again. I urge passage.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman. I rise today to oppose

the Pay China First Act, and I do this with a heavy heart because I know the number of talented individuals that we have on this committee and the process that we've been through where we're working together. It astounds me that somehow the ideological tail of the Tea Party wags the whole Republican effort in this area, and the ideological reach of the Tea Party exceeds the certainty that we should be bringing to the American people.

□ 1010

Instead, we're playing hostage politics again, holding up the American people, creating all the uncertainty that we don't need in this kind of climate instead of demonstrating that we can sit down and work together.

I get the politics. I understand how you have to accede to a group that continues to take us to the precipice and then pull back. The American people are through with it.

Let's sit down, deal with this, and then move on; create the certainty that will create the jobs here. Let's not find ourselves in a situation that becomes almost oxymoron, where we're paying China first, at the expense of Americans when there is no good reason why we should be dealing with this issue whatsoever, other than the hostage politics that it creates to deal with an ideological minority that drives the other side.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA I appreciate my colleague from Michigan allowing me to speak here today. My colleague from California, I'm glad to be a cosponsor of this very important measure.

"Full faith and credit," what does that mean? What does it mean to the American people? When we ask for them to send us to Washington, to send us to this august place, we're asking for their faith in what we do with their money, with their tax dollars.

And so when we report back to them, what does that look like to them? Have we upheld their faith? Have we done everything we can in this Nation to keep the credit rating of America on line?

This measure is a giant step towards keeping that faith, to paying our bills on time, to paying the types of things that keep our credit rating in a best possible fashion for our country.

We default on that, we put our whole economic system in peril. We drive up the cost of doing business for our government, and more tax dollars it costs to run our government when we do that.

We hear talk about pay China first. Well, that's kind of funny, because if we wouldn't do that kind of business with China, if we'd pay attention to our own level of spending and growing the economy of this country instead of having to do things that cause debt to go up higher, we wouldn't be having to contract with them for more debt.

So that comes back to this place here, reforming the way we do busi-

ness. We don't need to run up more debt. We don't need to put ourselves in a position where we can't get together on getting the budget done, on getting the debt ceiling adjusted whatever it takes so we don't fall into this default position.

So I think this is a giant step in the right direction. I commend my colleagues for making this happen. And let's uphold the faith that we've asked of the people of this country by paying our bills on time, by paying the debt, the interest that it takes to keep our credit in line as best possible as we can in this country.

So this is a measure that deserves support and puts the priorities first. I ask for support for it.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I rise in opposition to the Pay China First Act. Simply by putting this legislation on the floor, it does real damage in terms of putting questions in the minds of people around the world who to this point have been giving billions of dollars to the United States Government to be able to pay for past spending at record low rates.

I listened to the last speaker opine that we need to do everything to justify the faith in the American people. Well, the reckless threats that we saw 2 years ago, where, for the first time, we really were staring into the face of the abyss and it was a real possibility that they would withhold the votes, deny increase in the debt ceiling and, for the first time in our history, not pay for spending already incurred, in fact, ironically, the Ryan budget would have required a massive increase in the debt ceiling. The American people know this, and no amount of subterfuge here is going to eliminate that doubt, that concern, that apprehension. It may give the illusion of a few more days' breathing room with the debt ceiling.

What we need to do is set this aside and get to business. I would note, with no small amount of irony, that my friends on the other side of the aisle who have been so interested in a budget now refuse to appoint members for a conference committee so that the House and the Senate can come together and do that. That would be a lot more productive than this charade.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I, too, rise in opposition to the Pay China First Act.

Madam Speaker, I, for the life of me, do not understand why we are even seriously considering this legislation which would call for the default on our Nation's financial obligations for the

very first time in our Nation's history, completely jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States of America, jeopardize the economic recovery, which still needs help right now, and it would be the greatest unforced, self-inflicted wound that this body can commit against the U.S. economy in our Nation's history.

But let's be clear. This has very little to do about true fiscal responsibility. This issue, this legislation is being driven by a very narrow bunch on the other side with a radical governing philosophy which basically says, I hate my government so much that I'm willing to jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States and bring this economy down until we get our way. That's what's driving this legislation right now. That's the jeopardy that we face with it.

And I doubt that this has a serious chance of passing. But what the answer to this is is for us to go to conference on the budget resolutions that have now passed the House and Senate and start talking and listening to each other to find the common ground we need to reach a long-term deficit reduction agreement.

But defaulting on some of our obligations will mean putting great doubt in the rest of the investors in the United States in regards to who will be next. And that's what this legislation is promising: a default with some, a payment of China and others at the expense of the U.S. economy.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this ill-conceived legislation.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. I rise, Madam Speaker, in strong opposition to the Pay China First Act. This is a Pyrrhic proposal if I ever saw one.

By the way, the firefighters are in town today and tomorrow, and I'm going to go to every firefighter I see in Washington, D.C., and tell them how foolish—you know, the sponsors of this legislation believe that the Federal Government has no responsibility to firefighters or police officers anyway. It's strictly a local thing. So they're not trying to balance a budget.

If this bill becomes law, the government will still be borrowing money and our deficit will increase. It's what this bill allows us to borrow money for that is so shameful.

Is the government allowed to pay our Active Duty military? No.

Can we add to our deficit to fund veterans' benefits? No.

What about Medicare? Sorry, we're not going to pay those bills.

However, the government is allowed to borrow to pay back foreign bondholders. The majority apparently believes it's okay to borrow money and add to our deficit to pay China, but not to honor the obligations we have to our

troops, our veterans, our seniors, et cetera. Shameful. There is simply no other word.

The United States of America pays its bills, period, end of sentence, case closed. We've done it for 200 years, whether it's obligations that we have to our troops or seniors, we have to those who have bought our bonds.

We all saw what happened in the summer of 2011. We don't need a repeat.

□ 1020

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to another member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Pay China First Act. This is a very dangerous debate that we are conducting today because I think it has ramifications beyond simple debate. It calls into question whether or not America will pay its bills. You could also call this bill the Put America Last Act because that's exactly what this bill does. It's a bill that will actually make the Tea Party policies a reality, turning us into a deadbeat nation, a nation that does not pay its bills.

This Republican bill will codify into law a new low for America. It will ensure U.S. taxpayers always pay China and other regimes and foreign banks before our veterans, before our seniors on Medicare, and even before our enlisted troops bravely serving overseas. That's right. We'll pay these folks before we pay these folks. We pay these folks under this bill if it were to become law before we pay these folks. That simply is wrong and unacceptable to the American people.

Even the sponsors of this bill admit that in addition to putting China first and America last, their bill will also increase the deficit. Let me say that again. This bill will also increase the deficit and will pay China first. What the Republican majority is doing with this bill is announcing to the world—everyone from small businesses who sell services to the government to grandmothers buying savings bonds for their grandchildren—that this Congress is not serious about paying our Nation's bill.

My colleagues, please, put Americans first, put our troops first and China last. Do not pass the Pay China First Act.

Mr. CAMP. I would like to include for the RECORD a letter from the Congressional Budget Office that says this bill has no budget impact.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2013

Hon. DAVE CAMP
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Jared Brewster.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SUNSHINE
(For Douglas W. Elmendorf, Director).
Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST
ESTIMATE

H.R. 807—Full Faith and Credit Act

H.R. 807 would allow the Department of the Treasury to issue debt to pay principal and interest on debt held by the public and debt held by the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Disability Insurance Trust Fund, if the statutory limit on debt is reached. The bill would require the Treasury to provide a weekly report to the House Committee on Ways and Means and Senate Committee on Finance outlining the exempted transactions until a new debt limit is enacted.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 807, by itself, would result in no costs or savings to the federal government because it would not change any of the government's tax or spending policies. Therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply. In addition, CBO estimates that the bill would not significantly add to the Treasury's administrative costs.

H.R. 807 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Jared Brewster. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

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

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my real pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the ranking member on the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Michigan. I strongly oppose this bill which, as our colleagues have said, says we should pay the government of China before we pay our troops, before we pay our veterans, and before we pay other bills here in the United States.

Of all the bad ideas that have come to the floor of this House, this one is one of the worst. It's a reckless, irresponsible proposal that says the United States of America is not going to pay all the bills that are due and owing. That will have a terrible impact on our creditworthiness, it will undermine the full faith and credit of the United States, and it would wreak havoc in the economy.

Look, Madam Speaker, our constituents don't have the luxury of waking up one morning and saying: Do you know what? I'm only going to make my mortgage payment. I'm not going to make my car payment, and I'm not going to make my credit card payments.

If they did that, what would happen? They would lose their creditworthiness. For the United States of America to say we're going to pay some bills but not all would have hugely damaging impacts on the economy.

And it gets worse, because when they say, We've got to pay some, but not all, you've got to decide whom you're going to pay first. And what they decide here

is they're going to pay China first, and they have to decide who is not a priority. In this bill, our veterans are not a priority, and our troops risking their lives in Afghanistan are not a priority. China is a priority; they're not.

Now, Madam Speaker, what will happen here is that people will lose faith in whether or not the country pays its bills. People need to understand very clearly that this is not about expanding the debt ceiling in order to take on new obligations. This is about paying our existing obligations. And if we announce to the world that we're planning on not paying our obligations, whether they're to bondholders or to our troops, guess what happens? People will lose faith in the United States Government, and the economy will get hit hard.

Let's vote against this bill that says China comes before our troops and our veterans.

Mr. CAMP. In August of 2010, Chairman Admiral Mullen said that the most significant threat to our national security was our debt. And since that time, we have added hundreds of billions of dollars to our national debt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to a distinguished Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, ALLYSON SCHWARTZ.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I rise in strong opposition to this Republican pay China first bill, which would jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States. This legislation dictates which of our Nation's bills we will pay and which we will not, and poses a serious, dangerous threat to our economy. The Republicans put foreign creditors ahead of our veterans, Active Duty military, Medicare recipients, and small businesses.

The Republicans' refusal to pay our Nation's bills inflicts another round of unnecessary wounds that weakened our economy in 2011. American families, American workers, and American small businesses have battled economic uncertainty for far too long, and this deeply irresponsible legislation will only exacerbate the challenges we face.

Instead of moving us closer to common ground on a balanced, responsible path for economic growth, Republicans' brinkmanship threatens to undermine consumer and investor confidence and slows economic growth.

I urge opposition to this legislation and instead that we do what we have always done as Americans: pay our bills, pay them on time, pay them in full and protect America's economy and our financial standing in the global economy.

Mr. LEVIN. Can I ask our distinguished Speaker how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMP. I have no further speak-

ers. Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Pay China First Act. Once again, the Republican majority has chosen to play politics with the credit of our Nation. Instead of coming to the table with solutions, they are ensuring that we will come to a default on our Nation's debt.

This bill accomplishes one simple goal: pay China first. If the Republicans cause a default on our debt, H.R. 807 would guarantee that bondholders in China and other foreign nations will get paid before our men and women in uniform. Honorable veterans and the doctors and the hospitals that take care of our senior citizens on Medicare will all lose out. Are these truly the right priorities for our country, Madam Speaker?

Democrats are focused on job recovery, job growth, and securing a future for our hardworking taxpayers and the middle class. We are ready to act now on commonsense budget proposals that are balanced and fair. I ask the majority now to stop playing political games and let's work together on commonsense solutions to strengthen our country.

Mr. LEVIN. So, Mr. CAMP, are you ready to close this part of our debate? How much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I just want to read the facts why this bill essentially says "China first." I want everybody to understand this isn't rhetoric; this is reality.

The Republicans, under this bill, prioritize \$14.3 trillion in debt, of that, \$2.7 trillion in Social Security and \$11.6 trillion in public debt. Of that public debt, \$5.6 trillion is foreign. So when you come up and talk about all of the American public, you are not talking about what is in this bill. And of that foreign debt, the largest creditor is China, with over \$1 trillion.

□ 1030

So it's absolutely true that essentially what you're saying is pay the largest of the foreign creditors instead of American troops, veterans, physicians, school lunch programs, universities doing medical research, taxpayers getting refunds, and other Federal trust funds holding Treasury bonds, Medicare—these are Americans—deposited insurance, highway trust funds, et cetera, et cetera. That's the fact.

Now, there's some effort here to say, oh, we're not defaulting. Yes, you are. You're not defaulting on sovereign debt, but you're defaulting, except for Social Security, on everything else. Republicans are becoming lead defaulters in terms of paying our debt.

As I said earlier, the credit agencies have said, and I'll close with this:

It is not assured that the Treasury would or legally could prioritize debt service over

its myriad of other obligations . . . but very likely prompt downgrade, even as our debt obligations continued to be met.

This is a drastic, serious mistake. Vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I think it's helpful in a debate like this to start with the facts. And I would just say it's illustrative of just how out of touch and irresponsible the other side is when they assert that our debt is \$14 trillion. Our debt is over \$16 trillion. They've just lost \$2 trillion? No wonder they don't think this is an urgent problem. They don't even know what our debt is.

This legislation is very similar to 1996, legislation that was passed in a bipartisan vote and was signed by then-Democrat President Bill Clinton.

Many States guarantee their government debt, or what is often called their sovereign debt, and they have done that for decades. If we default on our government or sovereign debt, the consequences are so severe that no one gets paid—our military, our seniors, our veterans, our farmers. All Americans deserve a strong economy, and that means getting our debt under control.

And let's just clear up another fact. The top two-thirds of our debt is held by Americans and their retirement funds, including the U.S. military retirement fund.

Now, one reason we're in this position is that this administration has racked up more than \$5 trillion in debt, more than the previous four Presidents added together. That's why we're in this situation. We have a debt problem. This legislation ensures that the debt of the United States will be paid.

So I urge support for H.R. 807, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, after line 17, insert the following (and redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly):

(c) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—None of the obligations issued under subsection (a) may be used to pay compensation for Members of Congress.

Page 7, line 2, insert "the authority is in use" after "week".

Page 7, strike line 13 and all that follows through line 17.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 202, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act, permanently takes default off the table, as we've been debating, but this amendment makes a couple of simple

changes. It clarifies that any debt issued pursuant to this bill may not be used to pay salaries of Members of Congress—of the House and of the Senate.

It also makes clear that each and every time the Secretary of the Treasury uses the authority provided in the bill, that the Secretary must report weekly on the amount of debt issued and the reason for the issuance to ensure transparency so that Congress is fully informed.

So I urge support for my straightforward amendment and support for the underlying bill and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume. I'm just going to speak for a short time and then yield.

I respect the chairman of the committee; we've been friends for a long time. It's really sad this amendment is here. There can't be money used under the bill for salaries. There's no lack of clarity here. Essentially, this is an effort to give some kind of fig leaf, or whatever it is, for a terrible, terrible bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have already spoken about this amendment. I think this amendment is as sad as the bill.

We continue to play games because we think that, in a way, we will compel people to vote for something they don't want to vote for—and, in my view, are not going to vote for. I think it's sad. I think we continue to demagogue this institution and its Members. That's sad. We leaders should not do that. This is a serious bill.

Now, I want to tell the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I know what the debt is. And I know that debt has been incurred because we bought a lot of things we didn't pay for, including over \$1 trillion of Afghanistan and Iraq, including a prescription drug bill that projects over \$2 trillion, including tax cuts that were \$2.3 trillion that not a penny were paid for. I understand, and I think it's serious.

The sad thing is that this is not a serious response. This is an irresponsible response. This is a response that, as I said earlier, says that we will pay some people first, but we won't pay all our debts. The richest country on the face of the Earth, the most creditworthy nation on the face of the Earth, we won't pay all our debts.

There is a simple way to do this: stop demagoguing one another. And I want to say to the gentleman, as he knows, Democrats have demagogued this issue when we've had Republican Presidents

and Republicans have demagogued it when we've had Democratic Presidents.

We all know that we've incurred debts and we're going to pay them. That's all this is. It's very simple: we're either going to pay our debts or we're not.

Now, I want to tell my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, I know about the debt. The gentleman refers to \$5 trillion. I'm sure the gentleman knows these statistics:

Under Ronald Reagan, the debt was increased 189 percent; under George Bush, 55 percent—the first George Bush, 55 percent; under this President so far, a little over 40 percent.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Every Republican President with whom I've served, Madam Speaker, every Republican President has increased the debt as a percentage of GDP higher than either Bill Clinton or Barack Obama. Bill Clinton was the lowest, 37 percent. This President is a little over 40 percent of GDP. It's just like saying the minimum wage now is \$7.25, which is so much higher than it was in 1970—which is not the case. Now, as a dollar, a nominal figure, it's higher, and the gentleman knows that very well. He is my friend and I have great respect for him. But this bill is unfortunate. This amendment is—I won't characterize it as harshly as I feel about it.

We have to stop playing games. We have to be serious. We need to come together and adopt a big plan that's balanced, that can pass and will put this country on a fiscally sustainable path; and, in the process, we ought to pay our bills because we incurred them. We incurred them honestly for objectives that this House, this Senate, and the President of the United States signed for.

□ 1040

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield that minute and a half to the vice chair of our caucus, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. I have reservations about the constitutionality of this amendment. What I will say is I would gladly give my pay if it meant that these guys don't get paid. I will give my salaries to the defenders of this country, the men and women who are the front line, if their pay was in question. If all the money in the Congress in our pay could do that, I would gladly do that.

But I say we should definitely pay these guys before we pay these guys. That's what your bill does. The overriding bill would have these guys get paid before these guys. Forget about us guys.

This amendment is a farce. It's to divert attention from the fact that you want to pay these guys before you pay these guys. At the end of the day, that's what the overriding bill is about—putting China first, paying China first, putting our troops last, putting the American people last. It's about putting them first and us last.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I will use it by saying, a default is a default is a default. This bill is a serious mistake, as is the amendment. People can do what they want on the amendment. Vote "no" on the basic bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I just wanted to say I also have great respect for the gentleman from Maryland who spoke a couple of speakers ago, who is the distinguished minority whip. We have worked closely together on other issues as well.

I would just say that this legislation is very similar to legislation that was passed in a bipartisan way in 1996 and signed by then-President Bill Clinton. So, this is not something that is brand-new in terms of an approach for this Congress to take when dealing and struggling with debt and our debt issues.

I think it is also important to remember as we go through this debate that now our debt is larger than our entire economy and that the debt that has been incurred under this administration is larger than the debt of the previous four Presidents. We have a path that is unsustainable that has gotten worse, and this has gone on for far too long.

I think it is important, though, that we make these clarifying points in this amount. Clearly, we've heard a lot about demagoguery about who gets paid first. The vast majority of our debt is held by Americans. Americans and the U.S. military retirees will be paid first under this bill; and their retirement funds, their pensions, their savings, that's very important.

This is about making sure that the debt of the United States—that the United States has incurred, not the ongoing payments, but the debt of the United States—is paid. That takes default off the table. That allows us then to move forward to get the larger bipartisan solutions on this growing and difficult problem with our debt that we need to address.

The amendment makes it clear that Members of Congress' salaries won't be paid, that any debt issued will not pay that. It also makes clear that the Secretary of the Treasury must report weekly on the amount of debt. We need transparency. We often don't get the latest information. We need that, both House and Senate. So, this is a straightforward amendment. It's clarifying.

I urge support for the amendment, I urge support for the underlying bill,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to speak on H.R. 807, which would result in the Congress refusing to pay obligations it has already agreed to. American families do not get to choose which bills to pay and which ones not to pay, and the United States Congress cannot either without putting the Nation into default for the first time in its history.

I oppose this bill because not only will it be bad for America, but devastating for Houston. Just as our nation's economy has begun to show signs of sustained improvement, along comes H.R. 807 to further depress the economy of the parts of Houston which have not been fortunate enough to benefit from the economic recovery. The city of Houston has a half-trillion dollar economy which is threatened if the United States economy begins to falter because of the sequester already in place, and misguided legislation like this bill.

This bill would threaten the full faith and credit of the United States, cost American jobs, hurt businesses of all sizes, and do irreparable damage to the economy. It is important to note that the Dow Jones Industrial Average closed above 15,000 for the first time ever, and jobless claims fell to a five-year low this week.

Why would we want to jeopardize this progress with a bill like H.R. 807, which is a step in the wrong direction.

This legislation would cause the Nation to default on payments for Medicare, veterans, national security, and many other critical priorities. This legislation is unwise, unworkable, and unacceptably risky. Earlier this year, the Congress took a sensible approach to paying the bills it had already incurred by raising the debt limit. By contrast, the proposal in H.R. 807, which chooses which bills to pay, is a deeply irresponsible approach that is simply default by another name.

Americans want a clean debt limit increase, which has been done numerous times but the normal process by which the Treasury Secretary consults with the President and Congress, seems to have hit a major roadblock. This obstructionist governing is based on a practice that seems to put ideology over pragmatism and politics over common-sense legislating.

Madam Speaker, another reason I cannot support H.R. 807 is because it gives preference to making payments to foreign bond holders such as China, Iran, and the Cayman Islands over the payments needed for critical services for our veterans, and those payments required under Chapter 31, United States Code, which insures the savings of Americans.

I would hope that my colleagues on the other side realize that these are trying times for the American people and brinkmanship is not the answer. This body must come up with a sensible solution to the pressing financial problems which plague our economy. We cannot continue to hold our Nation hostage, keeping the benefits of recipients of Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare who must have sleepless nights because they are worried about the disappearance of their monthly checks.

I support a long-term increase in the debt limit that would increase certainty and economic stability. The bill before us this morning,

H.R. 807, is a short-term measure with unnecessary complications, needlessly perpetuating uncertainty in the Nation's fiscal system, and I would note that the Obama Administration is also in opposition to this woeful piece of legislation that allows China to be paid first.

My colleagues want to buy time so that they can figure out how to squeeze the American taxpayer even more by devising bone-crunching cuts and slashes to entitlement programs—all of which is driven by rabid ideology—as opposed to sitting down and working with Democrats to come up with reasonable budget reforms which do not hurt Seniors and the disadvantaged.

Madam Speaker, Social Security is currently the only source of income for nearly two-thirds of older American households receiving benefits, and roughly one-third of those households depend on Social Security for nearly all of their income. Half of those 65 and older have annual incomes below \$18,500, and many older Americans have experienced recent and significant losses in retirement savings, pensions, and home values. Today, every dollar of the average Social Security retirement benefit of about \$14,800 is absolutely critical to the typical beneficiary.

Contrary to some claims, Social Security is not the cause of our nation's deficit problem. Not only does the program operate independently, but it is prohibited from borrowing. Social Security must pay all benefits from its own trust fund. If there are insufficient funds to pay out full benefits, benefits are automatically reduced to the level supported by the program's own revenues.

I would add that instead of short-term management of self-inflicted fiscal crises, I truly believe we have an opportunity to strengthen the economy by putting the Nation on a sounder fiscal path. Progress has already been made towards that goal. In 2011, the President signed into law \$1.4 trillion in spending reductions, not counting additional savings from winding down the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. We need to seize this template and move forward—not backwards, in the direction of H.R. 807.

The fiscal agreement the President signed at the beginning of January increased revenue from high-income households by over \$600 billion. Together with interest savings, these two steps will cut the deficit by more than \$2.5 trillion over the next decade. We should have done more to address our revenue problem.

The President has made clear that he remains willing to work with both parties in the Congress to budget responsibly and to achieve additional deficit reduction consistent with the principles of balance, shared growth, and shared opportunity. By adding Chained CPI to the discussion it is clear that President Obama is willing to go more than halfway to meet the House Majority; but they have not reciprocated.

The President has also made clear that he will not have another debate with the Congress over whether or not they should pay the bills that they have already racked up through the laws that they passed. The President has made clear that the Congress has only two options—pay their bills, or fail to do so and put the Nation into default. And I am in complete agreement.

According to the Bipartisan Policy Center, spending for Medicare and Medicaid is projected to increase from 21 percent of non-in-

terest federal spending in 2010 to 31 percent by 2020. The numbers are workish sounding but in terms of real dollars, the increase is mammoth. That is why we must address the spending issue in earnest but not using the paltry monthly income of Seniors to pay for yachts for millionaires.

National spending on health care has grown about 2 percentage points per year faster than GDP over time. Federal revenues, however, have not kept pace, growing at roughly the same rate as GDP.

As a result, federal deficits will be driven upward by federal health programs unless their rate of growth is tamed. This discrepancy must be dealt with sooner rather than later, but no matter how you couch it, there is no better translation than the word: b-r-o-k-e.

I hasten to add that Community Health Centers provide much needed, high-quality healthcare to over 20 million Americans. These centers are able to serve vulnerable portions of the American population, including racial and ethnic minorities, as well as rural and low-income Americans.

I want to give some pertinent facts about my district and why the uncertainty provided by H.R. 807 is a step in the wrong direction.

The Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown Metropolitan Area consists of 10 counties: Austin, Brazoria, Chambers, Fort Bend, Galveston, Harris, Liberty, Montgomery, San Jacinto and Waller.

The Houston metro area:

It ranks sixth among U.S. metropolitan statistical areas with a population of 5,867,489 as of mid-2009, and it covers more than 10,000 square miles, and has a gross product of \$403.8 billion, according to The Perryman Group. This area recorded 2.54 million payroll jobs in November 2010, more than the job counts of 31 U.S. states, including Arizona, Colorado and Alabama.

The Houston economy has experienced a resurgence but let's remember the economic history:

The recession hit Houston in September '08. Our region lost 152,800 jobs through January '10. We began to recoup jobs starting in February that year and by October '11, the region had gained 153,000 jobs, or 101.1 percent of what we lost in the recession.

And though Houston faces some challenges in the near term, the long-term outlook is bright. The challenges are those of managing growth rather than economic stagnation. The long-term outlook for the Houston metro area is positive, and steady growth will be the norm for Houston for the foreseeable future. What Houston cannot afford right now is continued uncertainty from Washington, DC.

Moreover, given the uncertainty of final funding decisions and the possibility that across-the-board spending cuts will drag us back into a recession unless Congress and the President can reach agreement to prevent the currently scheduled "sequester," it is critical that we work towards bipartisan solutions to our nation's financial woes. Given the U.S. economy is showing signs of progress, it is crucial that we continue to fund government programs without interruption.

Lastly, as a Senior Member of the Homeland Security and Judiciary Committees I understand the importance of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection mission to enforce drug, trade and travel laws in efforts to keep our borders safe; and the importance of ensuring

that our nation remains safe from terrorists and others who would do harm to our nation.

In summation, I urge my colleagues to reject this poll-driven exercise in futility and give a clean debt ceiling vote so that the American people can carry-on with the business of achieving prosperity.

Doing a clean debt limit bill is not a new law, new outlay, or some random, esoteric exercise in the fulfillment of the Obama Doctrine. In fact, according to the Congressional Research Service, since March 1962, Congress has enacted 76 separate measures that have altered the limit on federal debt. Typically, the Treasury Secretary consults with the President and Congress, and the limit has been subsequently raised to accommodate our fiscal needs.

And I close with the sacred words from our Constitution. Section 4 of the 14th Amendment states clearly that: "the validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be questioned." And a great nation pays its debts. That is why I oppose H.R. 807.

I urge my colleagues to resoundingly reject H.R. 807.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, today we find ourselves debating a bill that could result in the United States of America defaulting on our debts. It seems that the Republican majority of the 113th Congress has decided to continue the practice of governing from one manufactured crisis to another.

H.R. 807, the Pay China First Act, is a part of this majority's campaign of playing politics with our national economy at a time when the number one priority of this Congress should be putting Americans back to work.

Madam Speaker, we raise our nation's debt ceiling to pay the bills that our nation has already accrued. The Republican majority's insistence on using the debt ceiling in their crusade against a short-term deficit crisis that doesn't exist, has already harmed our nation's recovery.

This bill, which the Republican majority knows full well has no chance in the Senate, is nothing more than political posturing at its worst. It is nothing more, Madam Speaker, than an attempt by the Republican majority to wash their hands of the calamitous effects their economic policies are having on the American people who want nothing more than their Congress to stop playing politics and get about the work they were elected to do.

Instead, the Republican majority has continued their crusade of irresponsible spending and tax cuts which disproportionately affect those who need it the most.

The number one priority of the 113th Congress should be putting Americans back to work and supporting policies that promote growth.

Madam Speaker, the people of Brooklyn's 9th Congressional district, whom I have the honor of representing in this body, are tired of the 113th Congress undermining the recovery our nation needs. This bill is not worthy of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I submit an article in today's New York Times that, using analysis from leading public and private-sector economists, lays out the harm that the majority's focus on irresponsible spending cuts is having on our struggling economy.

[From the New York Times, May 8, 2013]

ECONOMISTS SEE DEFICIT EMPHASIS AS IMPEDING RECOVERY

(By Jackie Calmes and Jonathan Weisman)

WASHINGTON—The nation's unemployment rate would probably be nearly a point lower, roughly 6.5 percent, and economic growth almost two points higher this year if Washington had not cut spending and raised taxes as it has since 2011, according to private-sector and government economists.

After two years in which President Obama and Republicans in Congress have fought to a draw over their clashing approaches to job creation and budget deficits, the consensus about the result is clear: Immediate deficit reduction is a drag on full economic recovery.

Hardly a day goes by when either government analysts or the macroeconomists and financial forecasters who advise investors and businesses do not report on the latest signs of economic growth—in housing, consumer spending, business investment. And then they add that things would be better but for the fiscal policy out of Washington. Tax increases and especially spending cuts, these critics say, take money from an economy that still needs some stimulus now, and is getting it only through the expansionary monetary policy of the Federal Reserve.

"Fiscal tightening is hurting," Ian Shepherdson, chief economist of Pantheon Macroeconomic Advisors, wrote to clients recently. The investment bank Jefferies wrote of "ongoing fiscal mismanagement" in its midyear report on Tuesday, and noted that while the recovery and expansion would be four years old next month, reduced government spending "has detracted from growth in five of past seven quarters."

That period roughly coincides with the time that Mr. Obama and Congressional Republicans have shared governance since Republicans took control of the House in 2011, promising an immediate \$100 billion in spending cuts. Republicans did not get that much then, but the series of budget compromises with the president since—while not so great as they wanted—will soon reduce annual discretionary spending for domestic and military programs to the lowest level in half a century.

As for revenues, Mr. Obama forced Republicans to acquiesce in January to higher taxes from wealthy Americans. But worse, in the macroeconomists' view, both parties agreed not to extend a two-year-old cut in Americans' payroll taxes for Social Security, reducing their spending money.

In all this time, the president has fought unsuccessfully to combine deficit reduction, including spending cuts and tax increases, with spending increases and targeted tax cuts for job-creation initiatives in areas like infrastructure, manufacturing, research and education. That is a formula closer to what the economists propose. But Republicans have insisted on spending cuts alone and smaller government as the key to economic growth.

The results, Mr. Obama has taken to saying, despite his complicity, are "self-inflicted wounds."

"The only way the problem does get fixed is if both parties sit down and they say, 'How are we going to make sure that we're reducing our deficit sensibly?'" he said last week at a news conference. "How are we making sure that we're investing in things like rebuilding our airports and our roads and our bridges, and investing in early childhood education, basic research—all the things that are going to help us grow?"

Mr. Obama added, "I cannot force Republicans to embrace those common-sense solutions."

Speaker John A. Boehner stood by the Republicans' policies during a session Tuesday with reporters. "After four years of mediocre job creation, it's obvious that we don't need more tax hikes and more government spending," he said. "We need smarter policies to make America more competitive and expand opportunities for everyone in our country."

"We're the ones pushing this town to do the right thing when it comes to the economy and jobs," Mr. Boehner added.

The Federal Open Market Committee, which sets policy for the central bank, noted signs of improvement in the private sector last week in a statement. "But fiscal policy is restraining economic growth," it added, echoing public comments that Ben S. Bernanke, the Fed chairman, has made for months. In April, the International Monetary Fund said the United States would achieve further growth "in the face of a very strong, indeed overly strong, fiscal consolidation."

Thursday will capture as plainly as any day lately the differing approaches of Mr. Obama and Republicans toward the economy and government's role.

Mr. Obama plans to travel to Austin, Tex., to visit technology students, workers and entrepreneurs and promote his ideas to support efforts like theirs—the kind of initiatives that Republicans have blocked.

House Republicans expect to pass a measure that would allow the Treasury to "prioritize" debt payments if Congress and Mr. Obama cannot agree this year to increase the nation's debt ceiling so the Treasury can keep borrowing money to pay all creditors. Under the bill, as tax receipts came in, the first priority would be paying creditors—like China, Democratic opponents argue—and second would be Social Security checks. But the measure would likely die in the Democratic-controlled Senate.

The "prioritization" proposal first arose in 2011 from among the most conservative House Republicans, those who were driving hardest against the White House on raising the debt ceiling and expressing unconcern about default, but it has now become mainstream in the House ranks.

Economists and financial analysts generally dismiss the idea as unworkable if not dangerous, and count on Democrats to block it. Gregory Daco, a senior principal economist at IHS Global Insight, said the Republicans' proposal was the kind that caused his clients to ignore the fiscal policy out of Washington, and rely instead on the Fed to buttress the recovery.

"Whenever I talk to our customers or clients, they sort of brush off everything that's related to fiscal policy," Mr. Daco said. "The view is, 'Oh, it doesn't matter.' That's what I hear a lot."

"What we try to convey is that it does matter," he said. "It is important in terms of growth. It's also important in terms of confidence."

He noted that the economy was much stronger than Europe's largely because the United States initially opted for stimulus measures and allowed deficits to increase when the recession and financial crisis hit five years ago. European governments pursued austerity policies to cut their debts, further stalling economic activity and in turn inflating deficits.

The more recent austerity policies here are helping to bring annual deficits down, as a new report of the Congressional Budget Office shows, after four years of trillion-dollar shortfalls. Yet many analysts would prefer that the measures had been timed for when the economy is strong and unemployment below 7 percent.

"While I agree that the U.S. must get its fiscal house in order," Jerry Webman, chief

economist at OppenheimerFunds, wrote, “I join the likes of the I.M.F. in cautioning that too much austerity, too soon, is likely counterproductive.”

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act, which is simply a plan to default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

Under this measure, the Treasury could not borrow above the federal debt limit for any other purpose than to pay selected holders of our debt, many of whom are outside the United States.

While supposedly prioritizing this debt, all other already-incurred debt would still be paid by general revenues on a cash-flow basis. Forcing Treasury to default on many of our fundamental obligations, such as paying our active-duty troops, paying doctors and hospitals that care for our seniors on Medicare, paying veterans’ benefits, and before American small businesses are paid.

Raising the debt ceiling to pay bills already incurred should not be negotiable, and certainly should not be held hostage for cuts to programs that serve everyday Americans.

The pursuit of this bill is not in the best interest of Americans. It rebuts economists who say that debt prioritization is an awful, if not impossible policy, especially in light of the fact that the Treasury makes 80 to 100 million payments per month. The Bipartisan Policy Center and the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, as well as the Treasury itself, all agree on the conclusion that it would be simply impossible for them to pick and choose which bills are paid and which are not.

By virtually ensuring a state of daily defaults on legal obligations of the federal government, this misguided proposal is more likely to create chaos in credit markets than ease investors’ fears.

We should not forget the lessons of 2011, when we last neared default over disagreements to raise the debt ceiling. Political brinksmanship with the debt ceiling caused uncertainty on Wall Street, the U.S. government’s credit rating was downgraded for the first time in history, and we saw increases in borrowing costs to the tune of \$1.3 billion according to a report from the Government Accountability Office, which will add up to \$19 billion in unnecessary additional debt over the next decade.

The consequences of a default would be much worse and reverberate across our economy, affecting every American through higher interest rates, investors fleeing the U.S. market and broad economic uncertainty.

This legislation has a very clear purpose—forcing the United States government to default on its obligations during forthcoming debt ceiling negotiations.

America is not a delinquent nation, and we cannot risk becoming one. I urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous bill, H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Full Faith and Credit Act. As a conservative, ensuring that our nation pays its bills on time is a top priority.

The Full Faith and Credit Act would protect America’s credit rating by ensuring that we do not default on our nation’s debt. It requires the Treasury to continue to make timely payments on our principal and interest in the event that our nation’s debt limit is reached.

Furthermore, what this does is take the politicization of the debt limit debate off of the table. Without a chance for default, we can negotiate in good faith with the President and Congressional Democrats on a plan that addresses our real problem—out of control spending.

I look forward to having this debate, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act. Instead of working productively with Democrats, my Republican colleagues seem content to continue dabbling in debt limit chicanery that threatens the economic security of this country.

Let me be clear: H.R. 807 offers no comprehensive solution to the debt limit. It is a legislative blueprint for how the United States should pay its bills after it defaults. More baffling is the fact that the bill prioritizes debt payments to Chinese bondholders over paying our troops, supporting our veterans, and making Medicare payments to seniors.

That Republicans continue to push bills like this indicates they have no real interest in fixing the sequester or putting in place the kinds of policies that will contribute to stable economic growth. This will have a seriously debilitating effect on financial markets at a time when we can ill afford it. In addition, H.R. 807 could lead to another downgrade of our country’s credit rating because the bill indicates to markets that it assumes a default will actually occur.

Madam Speaker, this is irresponsible policymaking at its finest. H.R. 807 threatens to undo the full faith and credit of the United States, a promise that has stood for over 200 years and is the foundation of global capital markets. I urge my colleagues to put aside partisan differences and act in the country’s best interests by voting this bill down.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, the purpose of the Full Faith and Credit Act (H.R. 807) is to protect the full faith and credit of the United States by requiring the Treasury Secretary to issue such debt as may be necessary to prevent a sovereign default. During the consideration of this bill in the Ways and Means Committee, I offered an amendment to clarify the relationship between debt issued under the authority in this bill and the statutory debt limit. This amendment was adopted by voice vote and is part of the bill as ordered reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

This bill provides additional and limited authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to issue new debt obligations on behalf of the United States solely for the purpose of paying the principal and interest on specified debt obligations of the United States once the statutory debt limit has been reached. The intent of this bill is that debt obligations issued under the authority provided by the bill will count against the debt limit with one exception. This exception provides that if counting the full amount of these newly issued obligations against the debt limit would cause the debt limit to be exceeded, then the amount of the newly issued obligation that is in excess of the debt limit shall not count toward the limit.

The following is a hypothetical example to explain the intended operation of this bill. Assume the debt limit has been reached and the payment of principal and interest on an existing debt obligation amounting to \$100 requires the Treasury Secretary to issue \$101 of new

debt obligations using the authority provided in this Act. In this example, \$100 of that new obligation would count against the debt limit while \$1 would not. Importantly, applying this provision is a continual responsibility. If at some future date the stock of debt subject to the limit were reduced by \$1, then the \$1 that originally did not count against the debt limit would now count toward the debt limit. Under no circumstance can there be both room to issue new debt obligations without exceeding the statutory debt ceiling and an outstanding stock of debt obligations issued under the authority in this bill that is not subject to the debt limit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on a motion to recommit, if ordered; passage of H.R. 807, if ordered; and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 340, nays 84, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—340

Aderholt	Chabot	Forbes
Alexander	Chaffetz	Portenberry
Amash	Chu	Foster
Amodei	Cicilline	Foxx
Andrews	Coble	Frankel (FL)
Bachmann	Coffman	Franks (AZ)
Bachus	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Barber	Collins (GA)	Gabbard
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Gallego
Barr	Conaway	Garamendi
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Garcia
Barton	Cook	Gardner
Benishek	Cooper	Garrett
Bentivolio	Costa	Gerlach
Bera (CA)	Cotton	Gibbs
Bilirakis	Courtney	Gibson
Bishop (GA)	Cramer	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Crawford	Gohmert
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Black	Crowley	Gosar
Blackburn	Cuellar	Gowdy
Bonamici	Culberson	Granger
Bonner	Daines	Graves (GA)
Boustany	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Brady (TX)	DeFazio	Green, Al
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Bridenstine	DelBene	Griffin (AR)
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Griffith (VA)
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Grimm
Broun (GA)	DeSantis	Guthrie
Brownley (CA)	DesJarlais	Hahn
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Hall
Bucshon	Duckworth	Hanabusa
Burgess	Duffy	Hanna
Bustos	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Harris
Camp	Ellmers	Hartzler
Campbell	Enyart	Hastings (WA)
Cantor	Eshoo	Heck (NV)
Capito	Esty	Heck (WA)
Capps	Farenthold	Hensarling
Carney	Farr	Herrera Beutler
Carter	Fincher	Higgins
Cartwright	Fitzpatrick	Himes
Cassidy	Fleischmann	Hinojosa
Castro (TX)	Fleming	Holding

Honda	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Horsford	Rodgers	Salmon
Hudson	McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta
Huelskamp	Meadows	Scalise
Huizenga (MI)	Meehan	Schiff
Hultgren	Meng	Schneider
Hunter	Messer	Schock
Hurt	Mica	Schrader
Israel	Michaud	Schwartz
Issa	Miller (FL)	Schweikert
Jackson Lee	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin
Jenkins	Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (OH)	Mullin	Sessions
Johnson, Sam	Mulvaney	Sewell (AL)
Jones	Murphy (FL)	Sherman
Jordan	Murphy (PA)	Shimkus
Joyce	Napolitano	Shuster
Keating	Negrete McLeod	Simpson
Kelly (IL)	Neugebauer	Sinema
Kelly (PA)	Noem	Slaughter
Kilmer	Nolan	Smith (NE)
Kind	Nugent	Smith (NJ)
King (IA)	Nunes	Smith (TX)
King (NY)	Nunnelee	Southerland
Kingston	O'Rourke	Stewart
Kinzinger (IL)	Olson	Stivers
Kirkpatrick	Owens	Stockman
Kline	Palazzo	Stutzman
Kuster	Pastor (AZ)	Swaiwell (CA)
Labrador	Paulsen	Takano
LaMalfa	Perry	Terry
Lamborn	Peters (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Lance	Peters (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Langevin	Peterson	Thornberry
Lankford	Petri	Tiberi
Larson (CT)	Pittenger	Tierney
Latham	Pitts	Tipton
Latta	Poe (TX)	Titus
Lipinski	Polis	Tonko
LoBiondo	Pompeo	Turner
Loeback	Posey	Upton
Lofgren	Price (GA)	Valadao
Long	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Lowenthal	Quigley	Vargas
Lowey	Radel	Veasey
Lucas	Rahall	Vela
Luetkemeyer	Rangel	Wagner
Lujan Grisham	Reed	Walberg
(NM)	Reichert	Walden
Luján, Ben Ray	Renacci	Walorski
(NM)	Ribble	Walz
Lummis	Rice (SC)	Waxman
Lynch	Rigell	Weber (TX)
Maffei	Roby	Webster (FL)
Maloney, Sean	Roe (TN)	Wenstrup
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Westfield
Markey	Rogers (MI)	Williams
Massie	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)
Matheson	Rokita	Wittman
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Wolf
McCauley	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack
McClintock	Roskam	Woodall
McCollum	Ross	Yoder
McHenry	Rothfus	Yoho
McIntyre	Royce	Young (AK)
McKeon	Ruiz	Young (FL)
McKinley	Runyan	Young (IN)
	Ruppersberger	

NAYS—84

Bass	Fudge	Nadler
Beatty	Grayson	Neal
Becerra	Grijalva	Pallone
Blumenauer	Gutierrez	Pascrell
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Brown (FL)	Holt	Pelosi
Butterfield	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Capuano	Huffman	Pocan
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Clarke	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kennedy	T.
Cleaver	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Levin	Scott, David
Cummings	Lewis	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Maloney,	Shea-Porter
DeGette	Carolyn	Sires
Delaney	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McDermott	Velázquez
Doyle	McGovern	Visclosky
Edwards	Meeks	Wasserman
Ellison	Miller, George	Schultz
Engel	Moore	
Fattah	Moran	

Waters

Watt
Welch

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Davis (CA)

Pearce

Pingree (ME)

Ryan (OH)

Speier

Tsongas

□ 1111

Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mrs. BEATTY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. VELA, COURTNEY, BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, POLIS, HINOJOSA, HIGGINS, Ms. BONAMICI, Messrs. HONDA, and TIERNEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated for:
Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 140, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. MAFFEI. In its current form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Maffei moves to recommit the bill H.R. 807 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON DEFAULT THAT PAYS CHINA FIRST INSTEAD OF PROTECTING AMERICA'S SENIORS, VETERANS, AND THOSE HARMED BY NATURAL DISASTERS.

This Act shall not take effect if it would result in the United States Government defaulting on its legal obligations for the first time in its history, as evidenced by the Secretary of the Treasury taking any of the following actions:

(1) Making payments of debt obligations to foreign bond holders, including those in China, Iran, and the Cayman Islands, before making payments of debt obligations required under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, for the Deposit Insurance Fund and the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund, which insure savings for Americans.

(2) Failing to make a payment of a debt obligation to the Social Security and Medicare trust funds or redeem a debt obligation held by those trust funds.

(3) Failing to redeem a debt obligation held by a trust fund providing veterans benefits, including the Veterans Special Life Insurance Fund, the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund, the Armed Forces Retirement Home Fund, and the Court of Veteran Appeals Retirement Fund.

(4) Failing to redeem a debt obligation held by an intragovernmental fund with the purpose of assisting Americans during a natural

disaster, including reserves for the National Flood Insurance Program and other disaster relief funds appropriated to the President.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

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

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, I am offering this amendment today as the final amendment, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, the American people want us to work together—Republicans and Democrats—to reduce our debt, pay our bills, and avoid an economic catastrophe, which would result from default. But how can Democrats work with the Republican leaders of this House when their plan for America is to default?

Madam Speaker, Republicans today proved this by bringing forth this legislation, which presumes it will happen and maps out not if but what happens when the United States defaults.

Their plan ensures that foreign creditors such as China, Japan, and OPEC countries Iran and Saudi Arabia would continue to get paid while we halt other payments to groups of Americans who have earned those benefits. This bill prioritizes Chinese lenders ahead of American seniors and veterans and college students. That's why it's called the Pay China First Act.

The House Republican bill would stop pay for 1.4 million Active Duty troops and almost 800,000 activated Reserves and National Guards. It would end benefits for 3.4 million disabled Americans; eliminate education benefits and home purchasing assistance for 1.3 million veterans; put American small businesses that sell goods and services to the government on the hook for major losses; and stop payment to doctors and hospitals who take care of the 50 million Medicare patients around this country.

□ 1120

Madam Speaker, the Republican plan that we debate here today ignores the needs and priorities of the American people; and it does so, Madam Speaker, so that the Republican leadership can sidestep the political problem that, after being fully complicit in running up our Nation's credit card debt, their side doesn't want to pay the bill.

It strains the bounds of cynicism to think that any elected leaders would prioritize a policy of political convenience over the well-being of those injured from fighting for America's freedom; but that is what's happening today.

We need to come together as a Nation to fix our debt, and we need to do it in the right way, not on the backs of our middle class families and seniors, and certainly not by defaulting on the debt we owe our veterans.

Instead of finding ways to pay China first, we should be using this time to find a way to balance our budget and avoid defaulting on any of our obligations.

We should be working together to come up with a plan that addresses the very serious fiscal challenges facing this country. And these are not easy choices, but they are why our constituents sent us here, Democrats and Republicans, to answer the challenges of our time as our forebears did in theirs. The brinkmanship that Congress has put us in time and time again has created uncertainty in the economy. It prevents economic growth. It stifles job creation.

This Republican plan will plunge our recovering economy back into a recession. It will raise unemployment. It might even freeze credit worldwide. It is a reckless plan to default for the first time in our Nation's history, and economists agree it will be devastating.

What this side is proposing is nothing but a plan to fail.

Madam Speaker, I didn't come here to plan to fail. I came here to focus on jobs and growth and a stronger middle class and promote a commonsense budget that's balanced and fair, that expands our economy and responsibly reduces deficit.

Instead of prioritizing China and foreign sovereign funds, we should be protecting our American troops who are in harm's way as we speak, our veterans; our seniors who rely on Medicare and Social Security; American small businesses; and college students who earned Pell Grants.

That's what this amendment does. It would stop the horrible consequences of default. It is a simple choice: plan to default on our debts or reject this plan and work together to avert catastrophe.

Which one will my Republican colleagues choose today?

Madam Speaker, above your august chair, and even above our great American Flag, the symbol of freedom, are the words: In God We Trust. And through good times and bad, that trust has been rewarded.

Madam Speaker, the American people, our seniors who depend on Medicare, our students who have worked hard to earn a Pell Grant to pay for college, our small businesses who have sold their wares to the Federal Government at a fair price, and our veterans who have sacrificed for our freedom, they have put their trust in us.

For 237 years, this Nation has paid its debts, not just some of them, like the ones to foreign creditors. Our forebears have always kept faith with the American people. They didn't pick and choose. They did their duty, and so must we.

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

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, you know, this body just spent the last hour listening to the other side saying how we can't default. But the irony of this motion to recommit is it actually mandates default. The irony of this motion is that it mandates default that would send our economy into a tailspin. It would ensure that nobody gets paid.

Vote "no" on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam 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 200, noes 227, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—200

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)

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
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin

Lewis
Lipinski
Loeback
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
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
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)

NOES—227

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
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)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
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
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
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
Paulsen

Perry
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)
Rohrabacher
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
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Braley (IA) Flores Pearce
Doggett Kelly (IL)

□ 1132

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 141 had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 141 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 207, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Fleming	Lummis
Alexander	Forbes	Marchant
Amodei	Fortenberry	Marino
Bachmann	Fox	McCarthy (CA)
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Barletta	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Barr	Gardner	McHenry
Barton	Garrett	McKeon
Benishek	Gerlach	McKinley
Bentivolio	Gibbs	McMorris
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Meadows
Black	Goodlatte	Meehan
Blackburn	Gosar	Messer
Bonner	Gowdy	Mica
Boustany	Granger	Miller (FL)
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)
Bridenstine	Graves (MO)	Miller, Gary
Brooks (AL)	Griffin (AR)	Mullin
Brooks (IN)	Griffith (VA)	Mulvaney
Broun (GA)	Guthrie	Murphy (PA)
Buchanan	Hall	Neugebauer
Bucshon	Hanna	Noem
Burgess	Harper	Nugent
Calvert	Harris	Nunes
Camp	Hartzler	Nunnelee
Campbell	Hastings (WA)	Olson
Cantor	Heck (NV)	Palazzo
Capito	Hensarling	Paulsen
Carter	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Cassidy	Holding	Petri
Chabot	Hudson	Pittenger
Chaffetz	Huelskamp	Pitts
Coble	Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)
Coffman	Hultgren	Pompeo
Cole	Hunter	Posey
Collins (GA)	Hurt	Price (GA)
Collins (NY)	Issa	Radel
Conaway	Jenkins	Reed
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Reichert
Cotton	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Cramer	Jordan	Ribble
Crawford	Joyce	Rice (SC)
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rigell
Culberson	King (IA)	Roby
Daines	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Rogers (AL)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
DeSantis	Kline	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Rokita
Duffy	Lamborn	Rooney
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (TN)	Lankford	Roskam
Ellmers	Latham	Ross
Farenthold	Latta	Rothfus
Fincher	Long	Royce
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Runyan
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)

Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al

Doggett
Flores

Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberti
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski

NAYS—207

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

NOT VOTING—4

Pearce
Peterson

□ 1139

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 140, answered “present” 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—264

Aderholt	Eshoo	McCaul
Alexander	Esty	McClintock
Amodei	Farenthold	McCollum
Bachmann	Farr	McHenry
Bachus	Fattah	McKeon
Barber	Fincher	McKinley
Barletta	Fleischmann	McNerney
Barr	Fortenberry	Meadows
Barrow (GA)	Foster	Meeks
Barton	Frankel (FL)	Messer
Becerra	Frelinghuysen	Mica
Bentivolio	Gabbard	Michaud
Bera (CA)	Gallego	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Garrett	Miller (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	Miller, Gary
Black	Goodlatte	Moran
Blackburn	Gosar	Mullin
Blumenauer	Gowdy	Mulvaney
Bonamici	Granger	Murphy (FL)
Bonner	Grayson	Murphy (PA)
Boustany	Grimm	Nadler
Brady (TX)	Guthrie	Napolitano
Braley (IA)	Gutierrez	Neugebauer
Bridenstine	Hahn	Noem
Brooks (AL)	Hall	Nugent
Brooks (IN)	Hanabusa	Nunes
Broun (GA)	Harper	Nunnelee
Buchanan	Harris	O’Rourke
Bucshon	Buchanan	Hastings (WA)
Burgess	Bucshon	Heck (WA)
Calvert	Bustos	Higgins
Camp	Calvert	Himes
Campbell	Camp	Hinojosa
Cantor	Campbell	Holt
Capito	Cantor	Horsford
Carter	Capito	Huelskamp
Cassidy	Capps	Huffman
Chabot	Cárdenas	Hurt
Chaffetz	Carney	Issa
Coble	Carter	Johnson (GA)
Coffman	Cartwright	Johnson, Sam
Cole	Cassidy	Kaptur
Collins (GA)	Castro (TX)	Keating
Collins (NY)	Chabot	Kelly (PA)
Conaway	Cicilline	Kennedy
Cook	Clay	Kildee
Cotton	Coble	King (NY)
Cramer	Cole	Kingston
Crawford	Collins (NY)	Kline
Crenshaw	Cook	Kuster
Culberson	Cooper	Labrador
Daines	Cramer	LaMalfa
Davis (CA)	Crenshaw	Lamborn
Davis, Danny	Cuellar	Langevin
DeGette	Culberson	Lankford
Delaney	Cummings	Larsen (WA)
DeLauro	Daines	Latta
DelBene	Davis (CA)	Lipinski
Dent	Davis, Danny	Loeb sack
Deutch	DeGette	Lofgren
Dingell	Delaney	Long
Doyle	DeLauro	Lowe
Duckworth	DelBene	Lucas
Edwards	DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer
Ellison	Deutch	Lujan Grisham
Engel	Diaz-Balart	(NM)
Enyart	Doyle	Luján, Ben Ray
Eshoo	Duncan (SC)	(NM)
Esty	Duncan (TN)	Lummis
Farr	Edwards	Marchant
Fattah	Ellison	Marino
Foster	Ellmers	Massie
Frankel (FL)	Engel	McCarthy (CA)
Fudge	Enyart	McCarthy (NY)
Gabbard		Sessions
Gallego		
Garamendi		
Garcia		
Gibson		
Grayson		
Green, Al		