

Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes

NAYS—33

Amash
Andrews
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Chaffetz
Conyers
Cummings
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Flake
Graves (GA)

NOT VOTING—11

Bralley (IA)
Duncan (SC)
Giffords
Hirono

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1901

Messrs. CONYERS and RANGEL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 378, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

INCREASING STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1954) to implement the President’s request to increase the statutory limit on the public debt, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 97, nays 318, answered “present” 7, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

YEAS—97

Berman
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Heinrich

NAYS—318

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barietta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)

Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holden
Hoyer

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—7

Ackerman
Chu
Doggett

NOT VOTING—9

Bralley (IA)
Duncan (SC)
Giffords

Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Insole
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)

Meeks

Johnson (GA)

Kaptur

Lucas

Myrick

Schwartz

Tierney

Walz (MN)

Polis

Pompeo

Posey

Price (GA)

Quayle

Rahall

Rangel

Reed

Rehberg

Reichert

Renacci

Reyes

Ribble

Richardson

Rigell

Rivera

Roby

Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher

Rokita

Rooney

Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam

Ross (AR)

Ross (FL)

Royce

Runyan

LaTourette

Ryan (OH)

Ryan (WI)

Scalise

Schiff

Schilling

Schmidt

Schock

Schrader

Schweikert

Scott (SC)

Scott, Austin

Scott, David

Sensenbrenner

Sessions

Shimkus

Shuler

Shuster

Simpson

Slaughter

Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)

Southerland

Stearns

Stivers

Stutzman

Sullivan

Sutton

Terry

Thompson (CA)

Thompson (PA)

Thornberry

Tiberi

Tipton

Towns

Turner

Upton

Van Hollen

Visclosky

Walberg

Walden

Walsh (IL)

Wasserman

Schultz

Webster

West

Westmoreland

Whitfield

Wilson (SC)

Wittman

Wolf

Womack

Woodall

Wu

Yoder

Young (AK)

Young (FL)

Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1911

Messrs. HASTINGS of Florida and CROWLEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I regret missing floor votes on Tuesday, May 31, 2011. Had I registered my vote, I would have voted:

“Yea” on rollcall 377, On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1484—Veterans Appeals Improvement Act, as amended;

“Yea” on rollcall 378, On motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 1082—Small Business Temporary Extension Act of 2011;

“Nay” on rollcall 379, On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1954—Debt Limit Extension.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

RENEWING AUTHORITY FOR STATE CHILD WELFARE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1194) to renew the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in State child welfare programs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1194

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

SECTION 1. RENEWAL OF AUTHORITY TO APPROVE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS DESIGNED TO TEST INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES IN STATE CHILD WELFARE PROGRAMS.

Section 1130 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-9) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “1998 through 2003” and inserting “2011 through 2016”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or kinship guardianship” after “placements”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “address kinship care” and inserting “provide early intervention and crisis intervention

services that safely reduce out-of-home placements and improve child outcomes”; and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D) and inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) If an appropriate application therefor is submitted, the Secretary shall consider authorizing a demonstration project which is designed to identify and address domestic violence that endangers children and results in the placement of children in foster care.”;

(C) in paragraph (4), by inserting “or kinship guardianship” after “assistance”; and

(D) in paragraph (5), by inserting “and the ability of the State to implement a corrective action approved under section 1123A” before the period;

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (6);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) an accounting of any additional Federal, State, local, and private investments (other than those with respect to which matching funds were provided under part B or E of title IV) made, during the 2 fiscal years preceding the application to provide the services described in paragraph (1), and an assurance that the State will provide an accounting of that same spending for each year of an approved demonstration project.”;

(3) in subsection (f)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting “, including all children and families under the project who come to the attention of the State’s child welfare program, either through a report of abuse or neglect or through the provision of services described in subsection (e)(1) to the child or family.”; and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D) and inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) a comparison of the amounts of Federal, State, local and private investments in the services described in subsection (e)(1), by service type, with the amount of the investments during the period of the demonstration project; and”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) INDIAN TRIBES CONSIDERED STATES.—An Indian tribe (as defined in section 479B(a)) shall be considered a State for purposes of this section.”.

SEC. 2. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise tonight in support of H.R. 1194, a bill to extend the child welfare waiver authority for States.

This bill will allow States to test innovative approaches to improve the way we protect children from abuse and neglect. In doing so, it extends authority that was in place between 1994 and 2006 but has since lapsed.

Since 2006, the Department of Health and Human Services has not had the authority to approve new efforts by States to test better ways of helping children at risk of abuse or neglect. The bill before us today would simply allow HHS to approve new waivers once again so States can test new ways of better serving children and families.

As the current chairman of the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over child welfare programs, I’m pleased to cosponsor this legislation with my friend, Mr. McDERMOTT, a current member of the subcommittee, as well as its prior chairman.

The Human Resources Subcommittee held a hearing on child welfare waivers last year, which showed the value of State flexibility in this area. Since 1994, 23 States have run waiver programs that helped inform the child welfare policy debate and, more importantly, improve the lives of children and families. Seven States have been granted extensions and have continued their waiver programs approved before 2006. This bipartisan bill before us today will allow such current waiver programs to continue, while importantly providing the Secretary of HHS with authority to approve up to 10 new waivers a year.

The bill before us is identical to legislation the House approved unanimously on September 23, 2010. However, the Senate did not act on that legislation before conclusion of the last Congress.

This bill is supported by the National Conference of State Legislatures, as well as groups active in promoting effective child welfare programs.

I would like to insert in the RECORD following my remarks copies of their letters in support of H.R. 1194.

Especially in challenging financial times, we must be sure that taxpayer dollars are well spent. The original 1994 law required rigorous evaluations of each waiver program, and this bill continues that requirement. This means States will have the flexibility to test new ideas, but the American people and the Congress will know if these ideas have made a difference. And because these waiver programs must be cost neutral to be approved in the first place, the Congressional Budget Office has assured us that this legislation as a whole is cost neutral.

I would like to include the CBO analysis to that effect in the RECORD as well.