

inserting language into our United States Constitution that constrains fiscal policy is nothing more and nothing less than a perversion of our democratic Republic. To take a major power away from the people of this country and replace it with an arbitrary percentage, 18, 19.7 percent, whatever that percentage is that is proposed to put into the Constitution as a percentage of GNP to spend on government, takes a basic power away from the people to elect Representatives to have those discussions.

That's what we're here for. Should it be 18 percent? 22 percent? 19 percent? 15 percent? Let's debate that and let the House and let the people of this country work their will. To put that into the United States Constitution in an arbitrary figure without a single hearing, without a single discussion, besides 1 hour of debate here on the floor of the House, is a perversion of the very Constitution that we began this session by reading into the RECORD of the House.

#### CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, over the last few months, we've heard a lot of speeches about fiscal responsibility. Today, here on the floor of the House of Representatives, we're going to give Members of Congress the opportunity to put their money where their mouth is.

The cut, cap, and balance plan actually imposes real cuts to spending today. It puts caps on future growth, and it says that we're going to put an amendment in the Constitution that requires the Federal Government to do what States and families do, and that's actually balance the budget.

Yet yesterday, the President comes out and says he would veto this plan. Well, of course, this is a President who said he wants commissions to balance the budget, who blames other people for the problems in Washington, who makes you think that the corporate jet owners are going to mysteriously balance the budget.

This is a real proposal that actually gets us back to a balanced budget. The President, I think, has shown that he's not serious about addressing the problem of out-of-control spending. It's not that we're taxed too little in this country; it's that Washington spends too much.

Cut, cap, and balance actually addresses the problem and puts fiscal sanity back in Washington where it's desperately needed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution welcoming the independence of the Republic of South Sudan, congratulating the people of South Sudan for freely and peacefully expressing their will through an internationally accepted referendum, and calling on the Governments and people of Sudan and South Sudan to peacefully resolve outstanding issues including the final status of Abyei.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2560, CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE ACT OF 2011

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 355 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 355

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2560) to cut, cap, and balance the Federal budget. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the purpose of debate only, I would like to yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 355 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2560, the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011. The rule provides for 4 hours of general debate on the underlying bill and grants the minority party a motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a seminal moment in our Nation's history. When I turn on the television, when I read the newspapers, I get a lot of advice. Folks say act: act to raise the debt ceiling, act to cut spending, act to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, today we are here to do all of those things—cut, cap, balance, and with it increase the debt ceiling in order to allow this country to continue its good line of credit.

But, Mr. Speaker, that line of credit is not something we can take for granted. Too often, I hear folks come to the

floor and say, Just raise the debt ceiling. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we've had that vote. We brought a clean debt limit vote to the floor. I would say for the sake of all the young people we're blessed to have here in the gallery with us today, Mr. Speaker, we voted "no." We defeated that clean debt ceiling to say, no, we cannot simply extend America's line of credit. We must take action to bend that curve of debt. Now that was this House acting, Mr. Speaker.

Last week, America's credit rating agencies joined in that debate. I read to you from Moody's last week:

"While the debt ceiling has been raised numerous times in the past and the issue has sometimes been contentious, bond interest and principal payments have always been paid on time. If the debt limit is raised again and default is avoided, a AAA rating would likely be confirmed."

That's what we hear all too often, Mr. Speaker. What we don't hear is this second sentence:

"However, the outlook assigned at that time would very likely be changed to negative unless a substantial and credible agreement is achieved on a budget that includes long-term deficit reduction. To retain a stable outlook, such an agreement should include a deficit trajectory that leads to stabilization and then decline in the ratio of the Federal Government debt to GDP."

Mr. Speaker, that may be a lot of bond analyst speak, but what that means in simple terms is, if we do nothing as a Nation, our credit rating will be downgraded, and if we simply raise the debt limit and do nothing to get a handle on our debt, our credit rating will also be downgraded. That's Moody's, Mr. Speaker.

S&P writes the same thing last week:

"We view an inability to timely agree and credibly implement medium-term fiscal consolidation policy as inconsistent with a AAA solvent rating, given the expected government debt trajectory noted above."

Mr. Speaker, that's what we're talking about today. Just cutting doesn't get it done. We've got some debt limit issues that we've got to deal with. Just capping doesn't get it done. We've still got some debt limit issues that we've got to deal with. Just balancing doesn't get it done. We've still got debt limit issues that we have to deal with. But, Mr. Speaker, just raising the debt limit doesn't get it done either.

It requires cutting, it requires capping, it requires balancing, and it requires raising the debt limit.

We have brought that resolution to the floor today. Mr. Speaker, while so many other folks in this town are content to talk, to pontificate, to share their wisdom with absolutely any television camera who will listen, this House moves forward legislation that describes line by line by line, in painful detail, what we will do to restore America's fiscal house.

I'm proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. I'm proud to be a member of the Rules Committee that has reported this rule to the floor today. I rise in strong support of this rule, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, my friend, Mr. WOODALL, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and in even stronger opposition to the underlying bill. This is a closed rule.

My friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) was on the floor last week telling us how excited he was as we debated a modified open rule for a flood insurance bill. My friend talked about how proud he was of the open process that allowed Members to offer germane amendments to the bill. But here we are today considering legislation that would fundamentally transform the United States economy, gut many of the programs like Social Security and Medicare that millions of Americans rely upon, and make radical changes to the Constitution, and the Republican majority of the Rules Committee has brought it to the floor under a closed rule. No hearings. No witnesses. No markups. No nothing.

□ 1250

This bill was cobbled together last Friday night and rushed to the floor just a few days later. I wonder if my friend from Georgia is just as excited about this process, because I'm sure not.

Last night in the Rules Committee, I offered my friends on the other side of the aisle the opportunity to put their votes where their rhetoric is and support an open rule. They chose to vote "no." Every single Republican member on the Rules Committee voted "no."

As for the underlying legislation, Mr. Speaker, I can't quite figure out if this is a meaningless exercise in political theater or an actual expression of Republican values. Frankly, I can't figure out which is worse. If it's theater, it would get lousy reviews. Both the White House and the Senate have made it very clear that they have no interest in supporting this bill. It's not going anywhere. Maybe it's just a rotten piece of red meat that the leadership is throwing to their right-wing base in anticipation of an actual agreement to raise the debt ceiling and cut the deficit. If so, it's a complete waste of this body's time. But if the Republican leadership means what they say, that they would like this bill to become the law of the land, it's a frightening prospect.

This legislation would result in staggering cuts to programs like Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Pell Grants, medical research, and infra-

structure, all while protecting tax cuts for the very wealthiest Americans and corporations. The bill would require us to cut Federal spending as a percentage of GDP to a level not seen since 1965.

And we had a very interesting discussion in the Rules Committee last night about the significance of that date. One of my Republican colleagues noted that 1965 was a time when we enacted some of our "so-called anti-poverty programs." And she's exactly right, Mr. Speaker.

Apparently, the Republican leadership would like to take America back to a time before Medicare, before Medicaid, before food stamps and school lunches, before Meals on Wheels and Head Start and Pell Grants. If that's their vision for America, Mr. Speaker, they should have the guts to stand on the floor and say so. But it's not my vision. It's not the vision of the people I represent in Massachusetts. It's not the vision of the American people who believe that in the richest society in the history of the world we have an obligation to make sure that the most vulnerable among us don't fall through the cracks.

At the same time, this bill would go out of its way to enshrine in the Constitution of the United States to protect tax cuts and loopholes for the richest 1 percent of Americans. Under this bill, Congress would need a mere majority to slash Medicare, but would need a supermajority to close a loophole that gives preferential treatment to owners of corporate jets. Talk about picking winners and losers, Mr. Speaker.

In the ongoing budget negotiations, the Republican leadership of this House have said that they will absolutely not consider raising any revenue to address the deficit and the debt, but listen to this: According to news reports, they're willing to force seniors receiving Medicare home health care to fork over new copays. So if an elderly woman in Worcester with diabetes has to pay more for a visiting nurse, the Republicans say so be it. But heaven forbid that oil companies making billions and billions of dollars in profits have to pay their fair share. Maybe they'll call those new copays "user fees" so that Grover Norquist and the Club for Growth will give them a pass. But tell the woman in Worcester who will be forced to go into a nursing home that her taxes didn't go up.

Mr. Speaker, this is an awful, awful bill brought to the floor under an awful, awful process. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this cynical effort and get back to work and meaningfully address the budget issues facing this Nation. Time is running out. We need to get to work to seriously resolve this crisis. Reject this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I'm confused about whether time is running out or about whether we're moving too quickly here today, but to clar-

ify that, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank my fellow Rules Committee member, the gentleman from Georgia.

I rise in support of both the rule, H. Res. 355, and the underlying legislation, H.R. 2560.

Mr. Speaker, there's no way to get around it: Washington has a spending addiction. The unchecked, out-of-control spending has gone on for decades. Regardless of what party controlled the White House or Congress, Washington spent, spent, and spent some more. And although throughout his campaign President Obama promised a "net spending cut," that hasn't happened. In fact, he's kept on spending and adding trillions of dollars to our debt, and that's why we're in the situation we are today, debating raising our debt ceiling once again.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to raise the debt ceiling. Instead, I want our Nation to get real with the spending and make some changes. H.R. 2560 isn't the easy choice, but it's the right choice, and that's why I'm cosponsor of this critical piece of legislation.

H.R. 2560 raises the debt ceiling, something I'm willing to say most of my Republican colleagues and I decidedly do not want to do. In return, though, H.R. 2560 implements spending cuts for this year and caps for the next 10 years.

But we all know statutory budget cuts from past Congresses don't mean an awful lot, which is why H.R. 2560 also calls for Congress to pass and send to the States a balanced budget amendment. Such an amendment would really hold Washington's feet to the fire. It would mean the U.S. Constitution prohibits the Federal Government from spending more than it collects.

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

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

Mr. NUGENT. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. That's real action. It's the real change and accountability in government that America needs and deserves. Mr. Speaker, we need a balanced budget amendment.

The President has yet to send to this body anything in writing. All we've received is a speech and rhetoric. We need to move this country forward. We need a balanced budget amendment. We need to pass H.R. 2560.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, I support a balanced budget amendment, but what the majority has brought before the House is

not even close to a balanced budget amendment. This is a political exercise designed to soothe the feelings of the most radical conservative elements in the House and debase our Constitution and our democracy in the process.

Cut, cap, and balance is simply an attempt to slash, burn, and deny responsibility for the deficit and debt limit crisis and distort the nature of our democratic Republic, reducing the ability of Congress to represent the will of the voters of this country and rendering elections and the public will meaningless.

If we're going to enact a balanced budget amendment, it should be pragmatic. It should be modeled after the type of approach that most States have. States have to balance their budget. Families have to balance their budget. Why shouldn't the United States Congress? Like many people on my side of the aisle, I could support language that would require and enshrine that total outlays do not exceed total receipts. That's what it means to balance a budget, as families and businesses across America know.

Instead, the proposal before the House is a recipe for tying the Nation's budget policy in knots and handing power over the budget process to a minority of the House Members or unelected Federal judges. It would make the entire Congress cease to function as a representative body by locking them into arbitrary percentages that were set without a single hearing or any process in our United States Constitution as a public expenditure share of GNP.

If you require a supermajority for even the smallest possible increase in revenue, you've essentially ensured that all the major pieces of legislation that Congress has passed would never have passed. If this amendment were in place in 1965, Congress never would have passed Medicare. In 1993, we wouldn't have passed President Clinton's deficit reduction plan and balanced the budget, or the 1997 balanced budget agreement under President Bush.

Furthermore, the spending caps that this bill sets for spending are completely arbitrary. They're pulled out of thin air. They bear no relation to our national needs now or in the future.

A balanced budget amendment must treat outlays and revenues equally, not bias one or the other in the Constitution itself, our fundamental governing document.

The majority is not only ignoring the realities of basic math, they're turning their backs on the pledges of an open process. This bill was brought to the floor rapidly through the Rules Committee yesterday, without a markup, without hearings, without witness testimony, and without allowing amendments from Republicans or Democrats.

□ 1300

A bill of this magnitude with such far-reaching consequences for our de-

mocracy itself should be treated more seriously than this. The concept of enshrining a particular percentage of public expenditures as a percentage of GDP is contrary to the concept of a democratic republic in which Congress is elected by the people of this country to govern this country.

For these reasons and others, I strongly urge a "no" vote on the rule and the bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a gentleman who held a very persuasive Special Order on this topic last night, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, all financial budgets will eventually balance. No individual, no family, no business, and no government can indefinitely continue to spend more money than they take in without someone having to make up the difference. Mr. Speaker, that includes the Federal budget of the United States.

Neither Mr. Obama nor congressional Democrats can repeal the laws of mathematics. The Federal budget of the United States Government will eventually balance. The question is whether the White House and those of us in this body will balance this budget ourselves by wise policy or whether national bankruptcy and financial ruin will do it for us.

From the day Barack Obama walked into the White House, his breathtakingly arrogant policies have absolutely ignored economic and financial reality. It took America the first 216 years of its existence to accumulate the debt that Barack Obama has accumulated in the short 2½-year span of his Presidency. He rammed a nearly \$1 trillion government takeover of health care down the throats of the American people, and he spent another nearly \$1 trillion on a failed government-based boondoggle for economic stimulus. During his short time in office, he has increased our Federal debt by nearly \$4 trillion in new debt, and now he says we will have \$1 trillion-plus deficits "for years to come."

Then, when speaking of the effort to reduce the deficit, the President has the hubris to tell conservative Republicans to take a balanced approach and to eat our peas. To that, I would just say to the President: Please pull up a chair, sir. We are ready to eat our peas, and we need help.

This Cut, Cap, and Balance bill is actually a solution to America's problem. It does not cut Social Security. It does not cut Medicare. It does not cut compensation to our men and women in uniform by one dime; but the balanced budget amendment it proposes does give us an honest chance of reforming and saving those programs and our country from bankruptcy in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the Democrat Congress of last year that gave a standing ovation to a \$2 trillion increase in our debt limit. This is the

Congress that was sent here by the American people to turn things around—and the American people are awake, Mr. Speaker. They are watching us, and they are tired of Democrats telling them that 2+2=13. If Democrats and the President are not willing to give the American people this chance by helping Republicans pass a balanced budget amendment in this Congress, the resulting consequences will be theirs alone, and I believe the people will hold them accountable.

By passing this Cut, Cap, and Balance bill along with the balanced budget amendment, we can restore confidence in the American economy in markets here and across the world. We can see more revenue come into these coffers than has ever happened in the history of the Nation, and we can set this country on a new road to the brightest days it has ever seen. It is something that is truly an opportunity beyond our dreams. This is the time to do it, and by the grace of God, that's exactly what we intend to do.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. Under the Republican plan, they will cut Social Security and Medicare by \$6,000 per senior citizen. Talk about a tax increase.

At this point, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I am just overwhelmed with the words "breathhtakingly arrogant policies." I am literally shocked, and let me tell you why.

When you want to understand, my Republican friends, why we're in the position we're in, what about the 37.5 percent of the debt being the Bush-era tax cuts of which this bill and any of your negotiations don't in any way suggest revenue?—which the American people understand.

Arrogant policies by the President? The Recovery and Reinvestment was only 5.2 percent, creating 3 million jobs. Let me say that again: 3 million jobs. The economic downturn came about with the Iraq war and others.

So, today, my friends come on the floor of the House with the Cut, Cap, and Balance. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, let me suggest to you that the amendments that were put in the bill have destroyed any sense of balance to the balanced budget amendment.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I have a new name for the bill, the bill which tap dances around the question of revenue and lifting the debt ceiling, which was done 60-plus times over America's lifetime with Reagan, Carter, President Bush and President Bush, and Clinton. So it's the "Tap Dance, Losers' Club and Bust the benefits bill." The losers are seniors and young people and those who need Social Security and those

who are disabled. Then, finally, instead of the balanced budget amendment, it is the bust the benefits of those who are in need and of the young people who are looking forward to a prosperous future and expanded opportunities in this Nation.

What do we need?—not the Cut, Cap, and Balance. It in no way invests in America. It in no way ends the tax loopholes that are part of our increasing debt. It will block the United States Congress from closing the loopholes of those who make billions of dollars every 3 months. We need innovation, infrastructure and education. That equals jobs.

Parents, I don't want to see the end of your children's opportunities by closing elementary and high schools and by disallowing them from going to college. That is what this bill is—not to cut, not to cap, not to balance. It's the "Tap Dance, Losers' Club, and Bust the Benefits of the American People bill." Let me suggest to you that these are the losers of this bill. Don't support a bill that will cause the American people to lose the American Dream.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2560, the "Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2011," which attempts to resolve our budget ceiling crisis by authorizing an increase in the debt limit while implementing spending cuts, caps on future spending, and requiring an amendment to the Constitution. While I support bipartisan efforts to increase the debt limit, I cannot support a bill that is a clear attempt to enact the policies embedded in the Republican budget resolution and to then enshrine the Republican budget in our Nation's Constitution.

This bill should be called the "Tap Dance, Loser Club, and Bust Bill." It tap dances around raising our debt ceiling and acting in a responsible manner to pay our Nation's debt obligations. Our Nation will be joining the losers club by threatening to eliminate important social programs such as Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and Pell grants. There has been a theme this Congress of focusing on cutting programs for the most at need and ignoring the need to focus on job creation. This bill busts the hopes and dreams of our children, seniors, and military families. It busts the hopes to grow our Nation in the future. H.R. 2560 has earned the name the "Tap Dance, Loser Club, and Bust Bill." I will call it that from this point forward, because that is what it is . . . when something walks like a duck, quacks like a duck and looks like a duck . . . Call it a duck!!!! This bill is wasting a tremendous amount of time when we should be focused on paying our Nation's bills and resolving our differences!

I stand here today to state firmly that increasing the debt ceiling is the responsible thing to do. Congress has already debated and approved the debt that an increased ceiling makes room for. However, my Republican colleagues have chosen to use this as an opportunity to hold the American people hostage to their extreme agenda. They know that the "Tap Dance Loser Club, and Bust Bill" is not a realistic proposal.

The fact that Congress, a body that typically has its fair share of political battles, has never played political chicken when it came to raising the debt ceiling should give us all pause,

and is a testament to the seriousness with which we must approach this issue. However, this time around, my Republican colleagues have created an impasse based upon an ideological commitment to spending cuts. While I understand and share the concern of my Republican colleagues with respect to deficit spending, and will continue to work with them in order to find reductions, now is not the time to put ideology over pragmatism. The reality is that, on August 3rd, the United States will begin to default on its debt obligations if the debt ceiling is not raised.

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

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

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

Once America defaults, investors who purchase U.S. bonds and finance our government will be less likely to lend to America in the future. Just as a person who defaults on a loan will find it harder to convince banks to lend them money in the future, a country that defaults on its debt obligations will find it harder to convince investors to lend money to a government that did not pay. Showing the world that the United States does not pay its debts makes the purchasing of that debt less desirable because it requires the assumption of more risk on the part of the investors.

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

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

As if another stock market crisis were not enough, the housing market would take another hit if America defaulted. Higher mortgage rates in a housing market already weak-

ened by default and foreclosures would cause a further depression of home values, destroying whatever equity families might have left in their homes after the housing crisis. Moreover, the long-term effects would reduce spending and investment in the housing market.

Republicans are attempting to place into our constitution the requirement that we balance the budget every year. In reality, achieving a balanced budget is not something that should automatically be required every year. For example, during economic downturns, the government can stimulate growth by cutting taxes and increasing spending. A constitutional amendment requiring us to cut spending to match revenue every year would limit our ability to respond to changing fiscal conditions and would dramatically impede federal responses to high unemployment as well as federal guarantees for food and medical assistance.

As it stands, H.J. Res. 1 requires spending cuts even deeper than those in this bill; in fact, it requires that spending be cut to the levels in the Republican Study Committee budget, levels that were so extreme that fewer than half of House Republicans voted for that budget. Finally, requiring a two-thirds vote to approve revenue increases creates a barrier to fixing inequities in our tax code by protecting more than \$1 trillion in spending through the tax code—spending that often benefits special interests, like owners of corporate jets—and well-to-do Americans.

H.R. 2560 cuts \$111 billion in FY 2012, places firm caps on future spending, and is contingent upon House and Senate passage of a Balanced Budget Amendment.

H.R. 2560, is yet another attempt to enact the policies that Republicans approved with their budget resolution this spring—to end the Medicare guarantee while continuing tax breaks for special interests and the wealthy. It requires immediate and steep spending cuts starting this October that will put more Americans out of work while the country is still recovering from the worst recession since the Great Depression. It caps total spending—including mandatory spending programs, such as unemployment benefits, that are designed to grow when the economy is bad—for fiscal years 2013–2021 at lower percentages of the economy (Gross Domestic Product, or GDP).

While it is clear that the country cannot continue on an unsustainable fiscal path, the bill limits spending to a percentage of GDP that the country has rarely achieved in the past. For example, the bill limits total outlays to 19.7 percent of GDP in 2018; outlays were at or below that level in only 12 of the last 43 years (from 1997 through 2004, and from 1969 through 1972).

Enforces the Republican budget resolution by limiting total federal outlays—including Social Security and Medicare—at the Republican budget's percentage of GDP in fiscal years 2013 through 2021. Automatic sequestration again would occur if the levels are breached. More immediately.

H.R. 2560 requires passage of a specific type of a so-called "balanced budget" constitutional amendment by both the House and the Senate before the debt limit can be increased. This new hurdle makes it even harder for Congress to increase the debt limit by August 2, which it must do to avoid fiscal calamity and higher interest costs for consumers and the government alike.

## STEEP SPENDING CUTS FOR 2012

H.R. 2560 limits fiscal year 2012 discretionary and entitlement spending to the levels in the Republican budget. If spending exceeds these limits there would be an automatic sequestration that makes an across-the-board cut to most programs to bring down spending. Spending in 2012 is to be cut by a net total of \$111 billion below current services.

**Discretionary Cap**—The bill's authors say they intend to cut non-security discretionary spending for next year by \$76 billion (a roughly one quarter reduction in budget authority), to below the 2008 level, and increase security spending, matching the President's request. However, the bill does not provide separate discretionary caps except for war funding, so Congress could cut where it chooses.

**Entitlement Cap**—The bill exempts veterans' benefits, Medicare, Social Security, and net interest from its entitlement (or direct spending) cap. These programs comprise roughly two-thirds of all entitlement spending. The bill cuts the remaining direct spending by \$51 billion (7 percent) in 2012, down to the levels in the Republican budget. The cuts will fall on programs like school lunches, student loans, food stamps (SNAP), Medicaid, and unemployment insurance—some of the very programs designed to automatically increase when the economy is down in order to lessen the impact of job losses and associated economic hardship.

As with the discretionary cap, there would be an automatic sequestration if direct spending is not sufficiently cut. Past sequestration provisions exempted specific programs, including low-income programs, but this bill repeals the broad list that has been the basis for sequestration in the past. Instead the bill exempts a smaller range of programs (but comprising about half of the budget): military personnel accounts, TRICARE for Life, military retirement, veterans benefits, Medicare, Social Security, and net interest.

## HOLDS DEBT LIMIT INCREASE HOSTAGE TO PASSAGE OF SPECIFIC TYPE OF BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

This bill will add a new obstacle to increasing the debt limit before the August 2 deadline by mandating that the House and the Senate first pass a Constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. The bill specifies that the Constitutional amendment has to be H.J. Res. 1 or a "similar amendment" that (1) limits total outlays to no more than total receipts; (2) limits spending as a percentage of GDP; and (3) requires that tax increases be approved by a two-thirds vote in both Houses of Congress.

Moreover, the Constitutional amendment itself is merely a ploy to make tax cuts for the wealthy and tax loopholes for big corporations a permanent fixture of American governance. It would make any revenue-raising measure unconstitutional unless a two-thirds supermajority approves it. This is simply unprecedented and unacceptable.

An alternative plan, put forth by Senate Democratic and Republican Majority and Minority Leaders HARRY REID and MITCH MCCONNELL, respectively, deals with the debt ceiling crisis in a way that is less controversial for Democrats. Although still in the negotiation stages, the plan has a few emerging ideas and general bipartisan support in the Senate. However, House Republicans have expressed their dissatisfaction with the proposal.

Tentatively, the Reid-McConnell Debt Ceiling Proposal would allow the President to

raise the debt ceiling 3 times in the next year in an amount totaling \$2.5 trillion. Furthermore, it permits Congress to vote on a resolution of disapproval of each increase of the debt ceiling, essentially assigning blame to President Obama for each increase. It includes a plan to reduce the deficit in the amount of \$1.5 trillion over 10 years through cuts to domestic programs, while avoiding cuts to entitlement programs or raising new taxes.

Moreover, the Reid-McConnell debt ceiling proposal would create a new Congressional Panel tasked with coming up with, by the end of the year, a way of reducing the deficit by another \$2.5 trillion or more through cuts in entitlements and other yet-to-be identified steps. The proposed committee would be comprised of 12 lawmakers who would issue a report to Congress on how to achieve this. While I am still not convinced that the cuts for this proposal will not unfairly harm our seniors and other beneficiaries of domestic programs, I anticipate the product of these negotiations, as they appear to be far more realistic than the bill before us today.

I urge my Colleagues to oppose H.R. 2560 which I have called the "Tap Dance, Loser Club, and Bust Bill," for it will send our Nation in the wrong direction. This detour into a spending debate is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply allows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present. We must protect Medicare, Social Security, Pell Grants and a plethora of other programs that are aimed at helping our citizens. I will not stand by any bill which threatens to eliminate Medicare.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to the gentlelady that there is only one bill in this Congress that abolishes every single corporate loophole in the entire United States Tax Code. That's H.R. 25, the Fair Tax. I would welcome the gentlelady on that bill because I too share a desire to see those loopholes eliminated.

I now yield 2 minutes to a cosponsor of the Fair Tax, the gentleman who has cosponsored bipartisan tort reform legislation here in the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, of course, in strong support of this bill and rule, that of cut, cap, and balance.

The gentlelady from Texas just stood up and said she would call it the "Tap Dance" bill. Quite frankly, what the President has in mind I would refer to as the "Whistling Past the Graveyard" plan. This cut, cap, and balance approach to this problem is just that within the first provision of cutting spending, Mr. Speaker, of \$111 billion and with \$35 billion of that, by the way, for mandatory spending, yet not one dime—not one dime—from Social Security or Medicare. We protect our seniors.

But as to this spending problem, I mean, it's just like the problem in this

country with drunk driving. Are we going to solve that problem by raising the blood alcohol level? Absolutely not. Are we going to solve this problem of runaway spending by just simply raising the debt ceiling without these caveats of cut, cap, and balance? Absolutely not. That's why we have to do this—to rein in this spending and to bring it down to historical levels of 20 percent of GDP.

Then the final part of cut, cap, and balance, Mr. Speaker, is the balance part. The President is asking for a balanced approach. That's exactly what this is. This is the balanced approach that makes sense because every other pledge in the past with regard to reining in spending, whether we're talking about Pay-As-You-Go—the Democrats like to tout that plan—never has worked because we don't abide by these pledges; we continue to spend.

The only way to make sure that future Congresses rein in this spending on a permanent level is to have a balanced budget amendment that calls for a supermajority to raise taxes. There are 49 out of 50 States that have a balanced budget amendment. Why in the world wouldn't Democrats join with Republicans in calling for a balanced budget amendment? Then to think that the President would issue a statement of administrative policy in opposition to this is absolutely ridiculous.

Support this commonsense bill. Stand strong for our country. This is the land of the free, but it has to be the land of the strong before it can become the land of the free.

□ 1310

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I just want to say to the gentleman from Georgia the reason why the President issued a veto threat is because he doesn't want you to destroy Social Security and Medicare, two of the most important social programs in this country that benefit millions and millions of seniors.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the extreme ideological bill before us today.

The Cut, Cap, and Balance Act, or as it should be more appropriately called the "cut, cap, and end Medicare act," is one of the most radical bills to come before this body.

But perhaps I should not be surprised. I've already seen the majority of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle vote to end Medicare, slash Medicaid, and now they want to cut Social Security benefits, too.

Instead of listening to the American people, the House Republican leadership continues to advocate for the elimination of Medicare, all while continuing to protect tax loopholes and

subsidies for Big Oil and Wall Street executives. This bill is actually more extreme than the Republican budget passed in April calling for deeper cuts and more hardships for the middle class and older Americans.

In fact, this bill does nothing to create jobs nor invest in the roads, bridges, clean energy technology, and job training that would really get our economy moving.

In short, H.R. 2560 will stifle growth, hurt middle class families, and undercut America's seniors. In my district there are over 93,000 Social Security beneficiaries and over 85,000 Medicare enrollees.

On behalf of my constituents and for future generations, I stand in strong opposition to this bill and the rule. I know that there are those on the other side of the aisle who want to support a reasonable plan to reduce the deficit. This is not the plan.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this dangerous proposal.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor and urge strong support of my colleagues for the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act, H.R. 2560.

I really believe if you owe debts, pay debts. We must find a way to honor the full faith and credit of the United States of America. But even more important than that, we must find a way to restore the faith and confidence of the American people and the world community in the fiscal integrity of the United States of America. That is our dual challenge.

After years of runaway Federal spending by both political parties, after failed economic policies by this administration, we find ourselves at a place of unprecedented fiscal crisis—more than a \$14 trillion national debt, \$1.65 trillion deficits. We now borrow more than 40 cents of every dollar that we spend here in Washington, D.C.

The Cut, Cap, and Balance Act applies commonsense principles and fiscal discipline to the challenges of spending restraint today, but it also introduces a new element—and that is a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Yes, we cut spending by \$111 billion next year, about \$5.8 trillion over 10. Yes, we cap Federal spending to back under 20 percent of GDP. But I think the time has come to make any increase in the debt ceiling contingent on sending a balanced budget amendment to the States. And here's why.

Washington, D.C., is not only broke, it's broken. Let me say again. After more than a decade here seeing my party in power in Congress and in the White House, seeing another party in

power in Congress and the White House, I am convinced that Washington, D.C., is not only broke, it's broken.

And the American people know in their heart of hearts there is something missing in the equation. It's in the guardrails in the Constitution of the United States of America. It is the guardrails that say it must be the objective of the Congress and of this and of future administrations to live within our means.

Thirty-one States have a balanced budget requirement in their constitution. Indiana has a prohibition on incurring debt. Forty-nine States require a balanced budget.

The time has come to cut, the time has come to cap spending, but the time has come to make any increase in the debt ceiling contingent on sending a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution to the States for ratification. And this we must do.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to use the 30 seconds, but I wanted to ask the distinguished gentleman from Indiana a question with my 30 seconds if he would be willing.

Will the gentleman engage in a brief question and answer?

As I understand it, under your balanced budget amendment, in the event that Congress is unable to achieve a balanced budget, a lawsuit could be filed forcing the Federal judiciary into the budget process. In effect, your balanced budget amendment would reverse the constitutional relationship by legalizing the legislature and politicizing the Judiciary. Is that your expectation, that a Federal judge could ultimately have the final say over budget matters in the House?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. PENCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. It would be my expectation that we would not yield the jurisdiction of constitutionality exclusively to the judiciary. Throughout American history, it has mostly settled there, but we contain it as well. But ultimately it would put the American people in charge—

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Reclaiming my time—

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

Mr. WOODALL. At this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another cosponsor of the Fair Tax, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, today the House is honoring a pledge

that we made to America in the largest landslide election in 70 years last November when the people of America spoke clearly and elected a new majority to govern the House to take America down the path to a balanced budget to restore prosperity, to restore jobs that had been lost under this President.

The American people spoke decisively last November and asked this new constitutional conservative majority in the House to cut spending, to cap spending, to enact a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, to shrink the size of the government, to get the government out of our lives and out of our pockets and put us back on a path of prosperity, which this legislation does.

I am very proud to be a coauthor of the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which has worked so well in Texas. Texas is a beacon for other States. We have demonstrated in Texas when you live within your means, when you cut taxes, when you limit litigation, when you limit regulation, when you get the government out of our pockets and off our backs that American ingenuity, American entrepreneurship will thrive and the economy will grow.

People have been voting with their feet to move to Texas, and we in this new constitutional conservative majority in the House are doing today what we promised America we would do last November. We are cutting. We're reaffirming the Ryan budget which, by the way, does not affect—anyone over the age of 55 is unaffected by the Ryan budget, is unaffected by this Cut, Cap, and Balance Act, but if we do nothing, if you are under the age of 55, you will be affected because Medicare is on a path to bankruptcy, as is Social Security.

So we're taking decisive action today, Mr. Speaker, to put America back on a path to prosperity, to grow jobs, to get the Federal Government back within the bounds of the Constitution with a balanced budget amendment. I am very proud today, Mr. Speaker, to be here in support of this legislation, which will honor the promise we made to America.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. HONDA.

Mr. HONDA. I rise today to oppose this ridiculous cut, cap, and balance proposal.

By walking away from every negotiation—from the Deficit Commission to the Biden Commission to direct talks with the President—Republicans have made it clear that they place petty politics above responsibly solving the country's budget challenges. This is the first budget bill or deficit reduction plan in the past quarter century that fails to specifically protect programs for the most vulnerable Americans from across-the-board cuts.



□ 1320

The “duck, dodge, and dismantle act” will butcher Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, unemployment insurance, child nutrition, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, nutrition for Women, Infants, and Children, Planned Parenthood, supplemental income for the elderly, public schools, teachers, and pay for firefighters and cops—all so that the Republicans can protect tax breaks and tax subsidies for the wealthy and powerful by erecting a constitutional barrier to any measure that would raise any revenue.

This bill is as extreme as it is unprecedented. It is not a serious response to months of good faith negotiations by the Democrats. I call on the House Republicans to stop the games and the posturing and do the responsible thing for the American people, and I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it gives me great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Our country is at a pivotal point in its history. Economists would call this an inflection point. But for those of us who are not economists, it's a critical time; it's a pivotal time. We have to decide, are we going to compete in the 21st century and see this country prosper and lead in the 21st century? Or will we sink in a sea of red ink? That's what it's come down to.

I think we need to move forward with a bold plan. We haven't seen anything from the President. He hasn't put anything on the table. We're coming forward with a plan that's credible. It lays out a path, a credible path to get us back to fiscal sanity. \$46,000 for every man, woman, and child is what the debt stands at today, and that does not include the unfunded liabilities going to the future, which takes us well north of that figure. We have a lot of work to do. It's time for this Congress to get serious about its responsibility, its responsibility to bring fiscal sanity and fiscal balance back.

We have a spending problem. There is clearly a spending problem. But if you look at the two fundamental problems facing the country, it's our unsustainable debt, but it's also the lack of economic growth to create private sector jobs. Now if we take the path that our friends want to take, they're going to raise taxes. They're going to raise taxes across the board. And what you're going to see is a worsening economic situation. We're not going to see the kind of job growth—in fact, we very well could go back into a recession with that type of plan.

Our plan puts us on a sustainable path. Coupled with tax reform, coupled with an energy strategy which we have, and moving forward with an aggressive export-oriented trade policy, you will see a competitive America; you will see job growth in this country.

But we have got to get spending under control.

And today is the day we can cast that vote. Today is the day we can decide we're going to restore American competitiveness, we're going to restore American credibility, and we're going to restore American confidence.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman from Louisiana that we can't compete without investments in innovation and infrastructure and education, and the bill that my Republican friends have brought before us today on the floor would devastate this economy. It would absolutely devastate the American economy.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

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

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman.

I rise today to speak against this rule and this bill. This will not solve our Nation's problems but, instead, will devastate our economy and the most vulnerable in our society.

Our Nation has run into fiscal problems for three reasons, none of which are addressed by this bill: the Bush tax cuts, foreign wars, and the recession.

When the fiscal situation of the government was better, I warned that their spending on tax cuts and foreign wars would cause fiscal problems which Republicans would then balance on the backs of social programs. But when the times were good, Republicans ignored these valid concerns, saying that “tax cuts pay for themselves” and, famously, “deficits don't matter.” They were wrong, and working families are suffering.

Now we get the explanation that by cutting government jobs and spending, you will create jobs and revive the economy. However, it is clear that what we really need are good, stable jobs and stimulus in order for the economy to grow again. My constituents never got the benefits of the Bush bubble. They worked the jobs that were available and paid their taxes. Now the jobs have evaporated, and the social safety net that they paid into is under severe threat.

I will vote against this bill on behalf of my constituents and the people like them across this Nation. I will be casting a vote for fairness and economic growth, against the Bush policies that the Republicans are seeking to extend, and for a better future for our children.

Our Nation became great by making investments in our people and infrastructure and by creating a stable middle class and a robust social safety net. It became great through Americans supporting one another and paying their fair share of the taxes. Today, we watch as the Republicans continue to turn their backs on that history and continue their push towards a “me first” economic system. I want no part of that bleak future, nor should our Nation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that that competing vision of trillions more in stimulus and more in government jobs and more in government spending is one idea of how to revive this economy. It's just not one that I share.

I yield at this time 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS), who also I do not believe shares that opinion.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, back home in my district, one of the things I am understanding and communicating with people is the difficulty in their understanding the difference between millions in debt, billions in debt, and trillions in debt. So I heard an analogy the other day that I thought was appropriate, that hopefully will help the American people better understand the financial situation in the United States of America.

Imagine that you are a family and you haven't been keeping track of your finances for a good while. Finally, you decide to sit down at your kitchen table, the two spouses get together, and they accumulate their income, they accumulate their expenses, and they accumulate their debt. And as they go through their income, they discover that they have about \$50,000 that they can spend—that's their income—for the upcoming year. And then they look at their expenses, and they put all the bills together and how they spent over the past year. And they discover that last year, they spent \$80,000, meaning that they have spent \$30,000 more than their income. And then finally, they pick up their Visa card bill, and that Visa card bill is \$320,000.

Well, those are the exact same ratios that we're talking about with the United States Government and the debt that we face. We have got a budget that's around \$3.5 trillion. We have got an income that's a little over \$2 trillion, and we have a deficit that is \$14.3 trillion. All of that is unsustainable. It is a financial house of cards. And we have to take a tough but reasonable course, and that's what cut, cap, and balance is all about. Cut, cap, and balance, that is the way we score financial security for the United States of America, and that is the way to create jobs.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the legislation before us today.

If we do not act in 2 weeks, the United States will, for the first time in history, default on its debt. With the economy in a vulnerable position right now, we should be working to create jobs. Instead of acting responsibly and in a bipartisan way to raise the debt ceiling, the Republican majority has decided to make this a form of hostage-taking to press their agenda.

Congress has always paid for its past financial commitments with Republican majorities agreeing to raise the

debt ceiling seven times during the Bush administration. Everyone understands the long-term challenge posed by budget deficits, and President Obama and Democrats support a balanced approach to addressing that challenge.

Yet the ideological and extreme bill before us today does not address the number one concern of the American public, jobs, but rather seeks to implement an agenda that will, in fact, destroy jobs and the social safety net, ends Medicare, and reduces the Social Security benefits that our seniors have earned and deserve. Rather than making investments to create jobs and economic growth, the Republican majority is proposing cuts which will lead to a loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs, even as we are mired in unacceptably high unemployment.

With this bill, the Republicans choose to put in place a spending cap that will cement in law the Republican budget that chooses to end Medicare, places the burden of deficit reduction on the backs of the middle class and the most vulnerable. And, finally, the Republican majority is choosing to hold hostage an increase in the debt ceiling to the approval of an amendment that will make it impossible to raise revenue.

What do I mean? It will make it impossible to end the subsidies to Big Oil, make it impossible to close the loopholes that allow corporations to ship their jobs overseas, or abuse tax havens that allow them to pay almost nothing in Federal taxes. To achieve deficit reduction, they will end Medicare, implement deep cuts to Social Security and other programs that are critical to the middle class.

□ 1330

Instead, what they need to do is to go after the 12 largest corporations in this Nation. The Citizens for Tax Justice has said that those corporations pay a negative 1½ percent tax on \$171 billion in profits and about \$64 billion in tax subsidies.

You want to do something to balance the budget and make a deal with deficit reduction? Go after those corporations that are paying zero in taxes instead of going after middle class Americans or seniors who rely on Medicare and who rely on Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican agenda undermines America as a country where middle class American families have an opportunity for a decent retirement.

Oppose this outrageous piece of legislation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a colleague who is a great leader on this issue, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, this is quite an interesting debate that we're having, and I think it is an historic day. It is a time when we have the opportunity to do something about the out-of-control, reckless Washington spending. It's long overdue.

I had an email from a constituent a few minutes ago. They're watching the debate and, I would offer to my colleagues, I think lots of Americans are watching this debate. They're waiting to see if we have the courage, if we have the political will to actually do something about spending money we don't have for programs our constituents don't want.

Amazingly, my constituent could not believe that there are people who would actually come to this floor and say that they opposed cutting what the Federal Government spends because we're borrowing 40 cents of every dollar that is spent. They were amazed that people would oppose placing a cap over what that government can spend. And they were quite amazed that they would actually stand and oppose a balanced budget amendment, something that is long overdue for our country.

This problem has been years, decades in the making. I think we all agree with that. But I also think there's one thing that we will all agree with: The past 3 years has seen such a rapid rate of accelerated spending that it has added \$3.4 trillion, this administration has added \$3.4 trillion to our debt. Unprecedented.

And, indeed, included in that was the passage of the President's health care bill, PPACA, or Obamacare, which spent another \$1.2 trillion. And, by the way, to my colleagues, you all made the choice and the decision in that bill to cut \$575 billion out of Medicare. I just remind you of that.

The time has come for fiscal responsibility. It is time to pass Cut, Cap, and Balance. I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and to support the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I just would like to respond to the gentlelady from Tennessee.

When she talks about the need for political will, what we need is the political will to stand up to Big Oil and to end subsidies that amount to corporate welfare.

The bill that my Republican colleagues are bringing to the floor today let's them off the hook and, instead, goes after the poor and the most vulnerable and our senior citizens. That's why this bill is so outrageous, because they are so unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Americans today are getting an up-close view of Republicans' misguided plans, misplaced priorities, and massive assault on the middle class. It's not, as they call it, "Cap, Cut, and Balance." It's really a "Cash Cow for Billionaires."

The Republicans are pushing Grandma and middle class families overboard while protecting the superrich and the powerful.

Will Republicans protect Grandma's Medicare and Social Security checks? No. Grandma is being pushed overboard.

What about programs that help low-income children visit their doctor? No. They are getting pushed overboard.

What about programs that ensure that veterans benefits are paid on time? No, veterans are being pushed overboard.

But the massive Bush tax cuts for the wealthy, the tax subsidies for Big Oil? They're too precious, the Republicans say. They have to be kept on board. So billionaires will not see their undeserved tax breaks taken away. The oil industry will not see their unjustified tax subsidies, as consumers are tipped upside down at gas stations, taken away from them. No, those subsidies, they have to be kept on board. And, ladies and gentlemen, that's not fair. That's not balanced.

Grandma, kids, veterans, they should not have to contribute to balancing the budget, but billionaires and Big Oil are exempted by the Republicans. This is the face of their party—Big Oil and billionaires. That's who they are protecting.

They have deficit attention disorder. If there were such a thing as a Nobel Prize in economics in reverse, they would be the first winners of it.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a mentor of mine, the gentleman from the great State of Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. After a 3-year spending spree in which the President drove up the national debt by 56 percent, the President has the nerve to tell the American people that they have to eat their peas. This from a President who has had the Federal Government on a supersize me diet since the day he was sworn in. Marie Antoinette would be proud of such arrogance.

One must ask, where has the President been? He owns this economy. It's his policies that have left 15 million Americans without work. It's his policies that have stifled business growth and investment. It's his policies that have given us more deficit spending than any other administration in history.

The President talks about entitlement reform but offers no plan, no legislation. The President talks about his budget fairness, and yet this very budget was rejected by the HARRY REID Senate Democrats by a vote of 97-0.

The President denounces the Bush tax cuts yet personally extended them a few months ago. In 2006, the President voted against increasing the debt ceiling citing a lack of leadership, now he offers none.

But today, the House Republicans will lead with a plan. That plan is cut, cap, and balance. And on the back, we have the President's plan. This is it: speeches. That's what we get after 3 years and the largest deficit in history from the President of the United States, speeches and admonishments.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to my friend from Illinois.



Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it the gentleman's opinion that under the Republican cut, cap, and balance program—

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, you've got to go fast because I'm willing to answer your question but I can't—

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Is the gentleman prepared to turn the balancing aspect of this program over to the Federal judiciary?

Mr. KINGSTON. The President has backed us up against the wall. If we don't do something serious and, yes—

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Is the gentleman prepared to turn the balancing aspect over to the Federal judiciary?

Mr. KINGSTON. I agree with you. By law we need to have a balanced budget amendment so that Congress' hands will be tied from increasing the deficit.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will it be the responsibility of the Federal judiciary?

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

□ 1340

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

For months our colleagues on the other side have known of the need to avoid a default crisis and meet our Nation's obligations. But instead, today they move with lightning speed to the floor a sham bill that is nothing more than a way to score political points at a time that we need, the markets need, and the world needs seriousness.

It's time to meet our obligations for seniors, retirees, and veterans, for Social Security and Medicare, and to create jobs and grow this economy. Those on the other side of the aisle know that the bill that's on the floor today would do nothing like that. The underlying bill would in fact reap catastrophic consequences for our Nation's economy and our most vulnerable communities, and that's the truth.

What kind of majority wants to throw our economy into another tailspin by having us default on our obligations? Well, I'm going to tell you it's the irresponsible kind. They have been unrelenting in their quest to eliminate Medicare and cut Social Security, and this bill is no different.

The American public needs to understand what is at stake here: It's the default on our Nation's obligations that will throw out of whack Social Security, Medicare benefits, veterans' benefits, everything that we know in this economy because of the foolishness that's going on here in this Chamber.

I ask my colleagues to please be responsible. Protect our future; protect our children's future; invest in our roads and our bridges and our infrastructure; create jobs; but please stop this foolishness.

I ask for a "no" vote on the bill and a "no" vote on the underlying rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I'm going to try to speak as quickly as I possibly can.

Under the balanced budget amendment, the sole responsibility for interpreting the Constitution of the United States is the Federal court system, a Federal judge. And I wanted to ask the gentleman if he would join me in just an answer to the question—since it's on my time—what would qualify a Federal judge to cut a Federal program? What would qualify them? Would we take them through a process in the Senate, asking them what programs they support? Are we politicizing the judiciary?

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The answer is there's absolutely nothing different from this amendment than any other amendment to the Constitution that relies on the judiciary to interpret it.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Reclaiming my time, so instead of the Congress of the United States making a judgment about programs and then answering to the people in an elective political process, we are shifting the responsibility to a Federal judge to make a cut in the program; is that correct?

Mr. WOODALL. That is not correct. The responsibility lies here, as my colleague knows. But as is true with every word in the Constitution, it relies on the judiciary to interpret it.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Reclaiming my time, the responsibility for interpreting the Constitution is a Federal judge. Under a balanced budget amendment, a Federal judge would be responsible for cutting these programs; is that correct?

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I have the sponsor of the legislation right here to answer that very question.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. Does the gentleman have additional speakers?

Mr. WOODALL. I don't, though I do have the bill's sponsor here to answer any questions you all might have.

Mr. MCGOVERN. He didn't answer any of them last night; so I'm not sure whether we will get many answers here today.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will not take a minute. I will just ask the sponsor of the bill, as I did last night in the Rules Committee, do you genuinely believe that this particular measure is going to become the law?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I genuinely hope it does become the law. I think the American people deserve this Federal Government to live within the confines of a balanced budget amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I heard the word that you "hope." Let me tell you what I told you last night; I'll bet you cash money that it ain't going to become the law.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. If the gentleman will yield, I don't take cash bets. But you know what? You also talked about bouncing; and the only thing that's going to bounce is the government's check.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has yielded back his time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I'm sorry. I thought he yielded to me. I apologize.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, once again I stand in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the underlying bill.

It's time for a grown-up moment, Mr. Speaker. It's time for the Members of the House, Republican and Democrat, to come together to address the looming crisis over the debt limit. We are exactly 2 weeks away from the possibility of the United States defaulting on its obligations of not paying its bills. This is not an acceptable outcome.

I know that there are some on the other side of the aisle—in fact I talked to one just this morning—who will not vote for anything that raises the debt ceiling. That's unfortunate. Default would result in collapsing markets and skyrocketing interest rates. It would deal a devastating blow to the full faith and credit of the United States. It would throw even more Americans out of work. The bill before us does nothing to prevent that outcome.

Slashing Medicare and Social Security while protecting tax cuts for the wealthy is not a responsible solution. I think the American people have made it clear in poll after poll after poll. They have said to my Republican colleagues, keep your hands off of Medicare and off of Social Security.

What my Republican colleagues are trying to do with this legislation is lower the standard of living for our senior citizens. They deserve a hell of a lot better. The fact of the matter is our senior citizens have built this country, they have worked hard to make this country what is today. They deserve better from this Congress. They should

not have to pay to balance this budget because they did not cause this economic crisis.

It is just simply unfair to protect all this corporate welfare, all these tax loopholes to protect corporations with jets and to protect corporations so they don't have to pay taxes, and they can incorporate overseas in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands. It is just wrong. It is wrong to continue these subsidies to Big Oil that have made billions and billions and billions of dollars. Why aren't they paying their fair share?

And Mr. Speaker, it is just wrong to radically alter the Constitution of the United States of America. We need to focus on jobs, and innovation plus infrastructure plus education equals jobs. We have to invest as well as cut. This bill would slash the investments we need to put people back to work and to grow our economy. It cuts Pell Grants. It would cut education at every level. It would cut monies for roads and bridges. It would cut money that would help this economy grow that can help put more people back to work so we can start reducing the debt in a responsible way.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of this debate, I will ask the House to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment that will ensure that this bill does nothing to impede job increases and economic growth. So a vote in favor of the previous question is a vote to increase unemployment and to threaten our economic recovery.

Given the fact that you gave us a closed rule, I don't think it's too much to ask that we have at least some language in here that protects jobs and that would protect the American worker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, reject this closed rule that is unfair, and reject the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it was 224 years ago that the Constitutional Convention was wrapping up that summer in 1787. Ben Franklin walked out of the front door and a woman asked him, "What did you create?" And he famously responded, "A republic, if you can keep it." That's what the debate is about here today, Mr. Speaker—our Republic, and can we keep it?

Mr. Speaker, the last time we debated a balanced budget amendment was back in 1995, 16 years ago. At that time, now-Minority Leader STENY

HOYER said this: "This country confronts a critical threat caused by the continuation of large annual deficits. I am absolutely convinced that the long-term consequences of refusing to come to grips with the necessity to balance our budget will be catastrophic. And those who will pay the highest price for our fiscal responsibility, should we fail, will be those least able to protect themselves and the children of today and the generations of tomorrow."

Mr. Speaker, this debate is about those who are least able to protect themselves, and this is about the vision that we have chosen for ourselves as Americans.

□ 1350

Mr. Speaker, 223 years ago, in a letter written in November, Thomas Jefferson said this: I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government to the genuine principles of its Constitution. I mean an additional article taking from government the power of borrowing.

Our Founding Fathers, 223 years ago—folks talk about a bill being rushed to the floor. This is a debate that has been going on since the founding of our Nation, since the founding of our Nation. We had this discussion in 1995. We had this discussion in 1994. Every Congress for the 10 years between 1985 and 1995, we discussed a balanced budget amendment. Apparently, there was no need to discuss it any longer, and look where we are.

I was down in Chinatown the other day, Mr. Speaker, where, conveniently enough, our United States debt auctions were held, right downtown in Chinatown. We sold \$36 billion of debt in Chinatown the day I was down there at 0.0005 percent interest. But hear this—I will close as I opened, Mr. Speaker—from our friends at S&P: "We view an inability to timely agree and credibly implement medium-term fiscal consolidation policy as inconsistent with a AAA sovereign rating."

Mr. Speaker, this isn't about raising the debt limit; this is about preserving the Republic. Go ahead and raise the debt limit; Moody's says that's not enough. Go ahead and raise the debt limit; S&P says that's not going to get you anywhere. Inconsistent with a AAA rating is the borrowing and spending that this Congress has brought to the House.

Now, we talked about rushing a bill to the House floor, Mr. Speaker. I'll say this, and some of my Democratic colleagues have said it, and I associate myself with their comments: This reflects the priorities of this House. What we're working on today is exactly what we were working on when we worked on H.R. 1 in February, one of the most open and brilliant moments in this House's history in terms of debate. Well, the priorities we are setting today are the same priorities we were

setting when we had that very open budget debate earlier this year in April where we brought every budget to the House and said: What can we agree on as a House? And you know what we agreed, Mr. Speaker? We agreed on the priorities that are set forth in Cut, Cap, and Balance.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about who is willing to compromise. Mr. Speaker, I can't find a single colleague on this side of the aisle who is enthusiastic about raising the debt limit, not one. But folks are willing to do it if we can preserve the Republic for our children and grandchildren, which we can do with cut, cap, and balance.

Mr. Speaker, there's all of this talk in Washington about default on the national debt. That is a serious conversation, a serious conversation.

I want to talk about defaulting on the promises of our Founders. I want to talk about defaulting on our Republic. One wish Thomas Jefferson had, one wish: If it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution, it would be an additional article taking from government the power of borrowing.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there's a lot of reluctance to do that. There are lots of great things that folks have, priorities that they would like to spend on. This isn't about those spending priorities. We'll still have that conversation. H.R. 1 was about those priorities. Our budget discussion was about our priorities. Today, it is about the future of our Republic. You need read no further, Mr. Speaker, than the credit rating agencies telling us that August 2 is not the date we have to fear. Today is the day that we have to fear because, if we fail to pass this bill, our Republic stands in peril.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for this rule. I am grateful to the Budget Committee for bringing forward this resolution, and I ask for a unanimous vote of support as this resolution comes to the floor.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 355 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

(1) Strike "the previous question" and all that follows and insert the following:

The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; (2) the amendment printed in section 2, if offered by the Minority Leader or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(2) At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

**TITLE IV—PROTECTIONS FOR JOBS AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

**SEC. 401. PROVISIONS OF ACT INEFFECTIVE IF RESULTING IN JOB LOSSES OR SLOWER GDP GROWTH.**

No provision in this Act or amendment made by this Act shall apply if it would result in a reduction in private payroll employment or a slower growth of GDP.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

**THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS**

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Mem-

ber leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 175, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 603]

YEAS—235

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

Posey	Runyan	Sullivan
Price (GA)	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Quayle	Scalise	Thompson (PA)
Reed	Schilling	Thornberry
Rehberg	Schmidt	Tiberi
Reichert	Schock	Tipton
Renacci	Schweikert	Turner
Ribble	Scott (SC)	Upton
Rigell	Scott, Austin	Walberg
Rivera	Sensenbrenner	Walden
Roby	Sessions	Walsh (IL)
Roe (TN)	Shimkus	Webster
Rogers (AL)	Shuler	West
Rogers (KY)	Shuster	Westmoreland
Rogers (MI)	Simpson	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Rokita	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Rooney	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Southerland	Womack
Roskam	Stearns	Woodall
Ross (FL)	Stivers	Yoder
Royce	Stutzman	Young (IN)

NAYS—175

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

NOT VOTING—21

Bachmann	Filmer	Moore
Blumenauer	Giffords	Pascarell
Capuano	Graves (MO)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Hinchee	Schrader
Cravaack	King (IA)	Wilson (FL)
Doggett	Loeback	Young (AK)
Ellison	McDermott	Young (FL)

□ 1419

Messrs. ISRAEL, GUTIERREZ, and KILDEE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GUINTA, BARTLETT, and FRANKS of Arizona changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 603, I was unable to vote due to previous commitments in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Jacob Corbin of the Elections Division of the California Secretary of State’s office, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held July 12, 2011, the Honorable Janice Hahn was elected Representative to Congress for the Thirty-Sixth Congressional District, State of California.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk.

Enclosure.

SECRETARY OF STATE,  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
Sacramento, CA, July 12, 2011.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special General Election held on Tuesday, July 12, 2011, for Representative in Congress from the Thirty-Sixth Congressional District of California, show that Janice Hahn received 41,585 or 54.6 percent of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Janice Hahn was elected as Representative in Congress from the Thirty-Sixth Congressional District of California.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by Los Angeles County, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

JACOB CORBIN,  
Elections Division,  
California Secretary of State.

SPECIAL ELECTION NIGHT VOTE TALLY SEMI-OFFICIAL CANVASS, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE 36TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT\*

[Special General Election, July 12, 2011]

Districtwide Los Angeles County:**		
Registered Voters .....	342,492	
Votes Cast .....	76,221	
County Turnout % .....	22.3	
Total Reportable Precincts .....	261	
Precincts Reporting .....	261	
Percentage of Precincts Reporting .....	100.0	

	Janice Hahn, Dem.	Craig Huey, Rep.
Votes Cast .....	41,585	34,636
Percentage of Total Votes Cast .....	54.6	45.4

\*Vacancy resulting from the resignation of Jane Harman.

\*\*Congressional District 36 is wholly contained in Los Angeles County.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE JANICE HAHN, OF CALIFORNIA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from California, the Honorable JANICE HAHN, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect HAHN and the members of the State delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise her right hand.

Ms. HAHN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 112th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE JANICE HAHN TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the residents of California’s 36th Congressional District chose JANICE HAHN last week in a special election to succeed our esteemed colleague Jane Harman. Jane will be missed, but we welcome JANICE to Congress where she will undoubtedly serve as a powerful champion for her constituents.

She begins her career in Congress with a strong record of fighting for jobs, the environment and working families. As a city of Los Angeles councilwoman, she led successful initiatives to improve her community. She created jobs by standing with unions and advocating for development to promote tourism. She worked to clean the air in L.A. by addressing the pollution from the ports and by enacting strong diesel truck emission standards. She stood with working families through her support of living wages and health care.

JANICE carries on the legacy of her father, Kenny Hahn, a former Los Angeles County supervisor and a passionate civil rights advocate. As a

United States Congresswoman, JANICE will surely add more victories to her already long list of accomplishments.

She is joined today by her son Danny; daughter, Katy; son-in-law, John; and three grandchildren—Brooklyn, McKenna and Josiah.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me join on behalf of my Republican colleagues from California and across the country in extending a hearty congratulations to our new colleague, filling the great shoes—they’re not huge shoes of course—but succeeding our good friend Jane Harman.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that JANICE HAHN comes from a family that has had a great, great, long tenure of public service. Her father, Kenneth Hahn, served as a supervisor in the County of Los Angeles—a huge job. They represent about three times as many people as we, Mr. Speaker; and her brother, of course, a judge, has served as the mayor of the city of Los Angeles.

Our new colleague has come here at certainly an extraordinarily crucial time in our Nation’s history, and will face many challenges ahead; but I also want to say that our thoughts and prayers go to our new colleague. Not everyone knows that, literally on the eve of the election, her mother, Ramona, passed away suddenly. I know that she, as are all the members of the Hahn Family, would be extraordinarily proud of this moment.

We extend a hearty congratulations.

Mr. STARK. Please join me and all of the California delegation in welcoming JANICE.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

Ms. HAHN. Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker, Leader PELOSI, and honored Members.

It is wonderful to be here today representing the 36th Congressional District in California. I am honored and thankful for this incredible opportunity to serve here in the United States House of Representatives. I am humbled to be the first Los Angeles City councilmember elected to Congress since Ed Roybal almost 50 years ago.

I was born into public service. My dad, Kenny, represented the people of Los Angeles for 46 years. My brother, Jim, served as mayor, and is now a superior court judge. Our dad taught us that serving others is more than a job—it’s a calling. It requires honesty, hard work and, most of all, the courage to do the right thing.

In 1961, a young and controversial civil rights leader named Martin Luther King, Jr. came to Los Angeles for his very first visit, and not a single elected official wanted to greet or welcome him except for one—my father.