



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 22, 2011

No. 111

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Compassionate and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As this House comes together at the end of a long week, bless the work of its Members. Give them strength, fortitude, and patience. Fill their hearts with charity, their minds with understanding, and their wills with courage to do the right thing for all of America.

The work that they have is difficult work. May they rise together to accomplish what is best for our great Nation and, indeed, for all the world, for You have blessed us with many graces and have given us the responsibility of being a light shining on a hill.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GENERAL AVIATION

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, President Obama has systematically and recklessly attacked the general aviation industry. It's one of America's last remaining great manufacturing industries, employing over 1.2 million people and contributing \$150 billion in economic activity each year. He has demonized its users and drawn a line in the sand for higher taxes.

And whom is President Obama hurting? Bill Gates? Warren Buffett? No. He's hurting line workers in Wichita, Kansas, and all over the country. He's hurting small business owners trying to get from Topeka to Des Moines to close a business deal.

These attacks on our industry are only a diversion, a distraction from the failed economic policies of this administration. His policies have left us with a \$1.6 trillion deficit this year alone and a loss of over 2 million jobs during his time in office.

Mr. Speaker, the aviation industry is not asking for a bailout like he gave the auto guys. Just leave us alone. Get out of the way. We have a community that just wants to create jobs and grow our economy. That may not be your agenda, Mr. President, but it is certainly mine.

THE CHAINED CPI

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

Mr. KUCINICH. The latest attack on elderly beneficiaries of Social Security

is a scheme by which seniors' cost of living benefits would be cut through something called a "chained" consumer price index—the CPI—chained involves a formula which recalculates the cost of living.

The theory behind the chained CPI is that as the cost of living goes up, consumers—in this case, seniors—buy cheaper products. For example, if poor seniors cannot afford to buy and eat steak but can only afford to buy and eat cheaper cat food, their cost of living benefit would be chained to the cost of the cat food because it's cheaper than steak; and as a result, seniors will see their cost of living benefit reduced to the cheaper product and get a smaller Social Security check.

The chained CPI sets up seniors for a reduced standard of living. If you must afford less, you get less Social Security benefits.

The chained CPI, chaining seniors to poverty. It's time to break those chains.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MASTER SERGEANT KENNETH B. ELWELL

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, today I have the high honor and solemn task of rising to commemorate the life and service of Master Sergeant Kenneth Elwell, who was killed in action in Afghanistan this past Sunday.

Sergeant Elwell, who enlisted in the Army shortly after his graduation from Council Rock North High School, was killed along with a fellow infantryman by an IED during a routine foot patrol in Kandahar on the morning of July 17. He leaves behind a wife Kristen and two children, Elise and Nicholas of Fort Wainwright, Alaska; his mother Janice of Holland, Bucks County, Pennsylvania; and countless other family and friends whose lives he touched.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5377

While those close to Sergeant Elwell have lost a husband, father, son, brother, and friend, America too has lost a hero. He served our Nation because he loved our Nation. His sister summed up his services perfectly when she said, "He did what he loved, so we could do the simple, everyday things that we take for granted." And although the grief of the family must be overwhelming, I hope that they're able to take a measure of solace in the gratitude of the Nation that Kenneth died defending.

Tonight his community will honor and remember him, but it is the duty of all of us here in Congress and across our grateful Nation to never forget his ultimate sacrifice and the family that he leaves behind.

COMMEMORATING LIBERIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize the rich history of Liberia as we mark Liberian Independence Day on July 26. We honor people of Liberia and those individuals of proud Liberian descent who are celebrating 164 years of independence.

Today we celebrate a great country, its people, their traditions, and the mark they have made on cities like Providence, Rhode Island, and others, making them great places to live, work, and raise families. Rhode Island's flourishing Liberian community has played an important role in making the State what it is today, and I would like to thank them for their great contributions. I am proud to honor your heritage and the difference you have made in our State and in this country.

Recently, along with my colleagues here in the Congress, I had the opportunity to welcome the President of the Republic of Liberia, Her Excellency Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, to Washington and confirmed our support for Liberian peace efforts. May we continue to be inspired to support the people of Liberia through their democratic tradition as we celebrate Liberian Independence Day.

IT'S TIME TO GET SERIOUS ABOUT THE DEFICIT

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, last night I had a town hall. Obviously I wasn't there; I had to be here. So we did it by way of Internet. And it was amazing how the consensus of those who were there was a request for those of us to take seriously our leadership responsibilities and do something about the fiscal mess we are in.

In answering them, I was thinking about what the President's bipartisan

deficit commission leaders said about the plan we passed here in the House. They called it a serious, honest, straightforward approach to addressing our Nation's enormous fiscal challenges. It sounds like that's the answer to the questions that were being asked last night by our constituents.

Interestingly enough, there is a poll out, rendering an opinion by the American people on the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill that we passed here in the House. Over 60 percent of the American people happen to think it's a good idea. Perhaps we ought to stop the name calling and look at what the American people are telling us to do and get serious, as the President's bipartisan deficit commission said, and come up with a serious, honest, straightforward approach to addressing our Nation's enormous fiscal challenge.

REPRESENTING MY CONSTITUENTS

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I am told on a daily basis by my Republican colleagues what the American people want. I certainly respect the election certificates of my colleagues. I would ask they respect mine. I also am not sure where they find the time to travel to these other districts to hear what is being said. My colleagues and my constituents are telling me we were sent here to make democracy work, to come up with a balanced approach, and take this country's fiscal responsibilities seriously.

The poll the gentleman just mentioned, in the CBS poll that came out yesterday, two-thirds of the American public want a balanced approach. That means a combination of cuts to revenues to balance our fiscal crisis. With that being said, we have a large number of Members who take pledges, pledges to not raise taxes, pledges to not ask oil companies to pay one penny more. The only pledge a Member of this House should ever make is when they raise their hand to serve the Constitution and this country.

I'm also told many times in this House what the intent of our Founding Fathers was. Now, while that's open for debate, there is one thing I'm certainly positive about: When our Founders gathered together, they created a government, not a Wall Street bank.

□ 0910

AN EQUITABLE SOLUTION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. In December the President caved to the Republicans and extended all the Bush tax cuts, immediately increasing this year's deficit by \$400 billion and the 10-year deficit by \$4

trillion, precipitating the great debt and deficit crisis.

Now we're hearing from the press today that the President is preparing yet another great cave. Instead of saying we will have some revenues to solve this problem, he is apparently about to cut a deal that will be all cuts.

So it's ironic. He cuts taxes to create a crisis, and then we cut spending to protect the tax cuts because tax cuts create jobs, except they haven't created jobs, but we've got to continue to protect them. It's all very, very sad.

If we get rid of all the Bush tax cuts—\$4 trillion—no cuts in Social Security, no cuts in Medicare, no cuts in veterans benefits, and \$4 trillion less in deficits, now, that would be an equitable solution.

TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, in the 5 years leading up to the economic collapse in 2008, 67 percent of the new wealth that was created in this Nation accumulated in the hands of the richest 1 percent. They now control about two-fifths of all the money in this Nation. But our Republican friends block them out of their line of sight when they look to see who can pay for our mounting deficit. They see only Social Security recipients and Medicare recipients, the disabled and the hungry.

It was bad enough that we were crazy enough as a Nation to fight two trillion-dollar wars while cutting taxes for the wealthy at the same time. Now Republicans are asking only the most vulnerable to help pay for it and threatening to collapse the world's economy by defaulting on American debt at the same time.

I won't stand for it, Madam Speaker, and my constituents won't either. Social Security and Medicare recipients didn't get us into two mismanaged wars. They didn't get the benefit of the Bush tax cuts, and they shouldn't have to pay for it.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2551, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 359 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in

the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2551.

□ 0913

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 21, 2011, amendment No. 11 printed in the House Report 112-173 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 21, 2011, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 112-173.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 211. There is appropriated, for salaries and expenses of the Office of Technology Assessment as authorized by the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (2 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), hereby derived from the amount provided in this Act for the payment to the House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust Fund \$2,500,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 359, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, for 23 years, Congress had the benefit of a really excellent organization, the Office of Technology Assessment. The OTA helped Congress look at the policy implications of new technologies. Then 16 years ago, OTA was defunded. When Congress turned out the lights, they argued that other organizations would provide what OTA did—think tanks, academies, universities.

We now have 16 years of evidence that we have not gotten from these other sources what we got from OTA. We need OTA now more than ever, and my amendment would shift a mere \$2.5 million into OTA to breathe life back into this important agency that had a great record of improving congressional decisionmaking, preventing tax dollar waste, and generally improving the debate on many policy issues.

OTA is still on the books; it was simply defunded and, with this amendment, can be funded again. The money comes from a well-funded, little used trust fund for Capitol building revitalization.

The OTA produced thorough, balanced nonpartisan studies on a huge variety of policy-relevant subjects. Listen to some of the reports, all produced by OTA in the years before it was defunded 16 years ago:

Adverse Reaction to Vaccines, Retiring Old Cars to Save Gasoline and Reduce Emissions, Environmental Impact of Bioenergy Crop Production, Testing in Schools, Treatment of Alzheimer's Disease.

Think about it; these studies, a few of the many on issues of great concern to us today, were written before 1995. The OTA was the best tool Congress has had to deal with our inability to look forward, to recognize and comprehend trends, to find perspective in problem solving—in other words, our congressional attention deficit disorder.

Sixteen years ago, Congress hoped to save money by cutting OTA, and, in the process, we lost one of our best opportunities to save money by avoiding costly mistakes. It is documented that OTA saved taxpayers several hundred million dollars by understanding the best IT system for use by the Social Security Administration, millions of dollars of savings through better Agent Orange programs, billions of dollars by avoiding a poorly constructed Synfuels Corporation.

Now, not every OTA project found favor with everyone. Some in Congress did not like to hear OTA call into question some of the extravagant claims of the missile defense contractors. But history shows OTA was right, and the missile defense folks at the Pentagon have spent a decade working around the problems uncovered.

Some in Congress complained that OTA reports did not have the quick turnaround of, say, CRS, but that is just the point. OTA is the antidote to the myopia that comes from our very short attention cycle.

OTA never advocated policy solutions; it didn't play politics. These are our jobs, but we need help. OTA was of Congress and for Congress. They knew our language and our decisionmaking framework. That's why our organizations never really filled the void created by the defunding of OTA.

If we had a functioning OTA in recent years, I think there's little doubt that we could have been more aware of and better prepared to deal with looming shortages of vaccines, to incorporate new designs for flood control levees, to extend high quality medical care to rural regions, to employee effective techniques for oil spill cleanup, or to reduce the risks of cell phone hacking, to name just a few issues of current interest.

The Office of Technology Assistance is not, and never was, a panacea. However, it is the best institutional tool we have had to recognize the policy implications of technology trends, to digest arguments involving technology, to expose some of our own blind spots—in other words, to illuminate and inform our legislating.

We in Congress have not distinguished ourselves in recognizing and comprehending trends and implications of technology. Now, most of our colleagues here in this body do not know OTA ever existed. Most Members do not miss it. This shows, I think, just how badly we need it. Always the first step in dealing with a shortcoming is acknowledging that we have it. We badly need OTA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0920

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate very much the gentleman from New Jersey's passion for this program. He mentioned that they turned out the lights in 1996, some 15 years ago, and I can't help but wonder why the lights haven't been turned on in the last 15 years.

I talked to the gentleman yesterday, and I didn't know much about the OTA, but I couldn't help but wonder why, in the midst of the financial mess that we find our country in, he would pick this time to try to resuscitate a program that has lay sleeping for 15 years. I don't know whether he has tried every year to resuscitate this program and nobody was listening. I hope he has tried before. There were probably times when money was more plentiful and he might have had a better chance of bringing back a new program, a little more government, but I think this is just bad timing.

I told him that if he wants to continue to try to educate the Members and tell them what a wonderful program this was up until 1996, there may be some day that it would be resuscitated. But the Members should know that in 2008 we gave \$2.5 million to the Government Accountability Office to do these kind of technological assessments, and they've been doing that for the last 4 years.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. In answer to your two questions, the first is, as I said, the fact that this body doesn't know that it lacks OTA is the strongest argument of how badly we need it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, reclaiming my time, if this was simply a question of education, I hope the gentleman has been working diligently for the past few years as hard as he worked for the last 24 hours to make people aware and to crank this thing back up. But again, this is the wrong time to try to start a new government program.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. As for the funding, there is an offset from a little-used fund, a

trust fund for building revitalization that is unlikely to be spent in the coming year.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Reclaiming my time, that's an interesting question too. I appreciate that question. And that \$30 million is there to use to make sure that we protect the health and safety of people in our buildings here.

So I understand it won't cost any more money, but it's just a brand-new Federal program that I think is not a good time to be trying to do that. Again, if you've been trying to do that for the last 15 years and no one has been listening, then it must not be all that great a program. But once again, I appreciate your being a champion of that, and maybe someday it will come back to life.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Chair, to answer the question about whether it's a new program, it isn't. It was defunded back in '96.

Since 2008, through GAO, we have been trying to fund it through their end and build it up since then, but still a lot of folks didn't understand that this body really does need the kind of technological development in the public and private sector and harness outside experiences in the form of advisory panels and peer review, something that GAO and CRS cannot do, and we can do it through this program.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I would just simply say, as I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this, again, I thank the gentleman for bringing it to our attention. It seems strange that it hasn't been funded for the last 15 years. I think this is not the year to crank it back up, resuscitate it. I think we have plenty of bipartisan research that's available to the Members. And maybe there are some private and non-private corporations, big foundations that might want to do this on a voluntarily basis. But again, I urge a negative vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, I want to speak about an amendment Mr. MORAN is about to offer. This is about the use of Styrofoam in our cafeterias. You may remember that in 2007, then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI established the Greening the Capitol program, and the goal was to make the U.S. House of Representatives a national leader in resource stewardship and sustainable business practices, and we made significant progress.

One of the places where we made progress was we replaced the Styrofoam in the cafeteria and used recyclable dishware. We are now back to Styrofoam. McDonalds doesn't use Styrofoam. Years ago, McDonalds and other fast food restaurants replaced Styrofoam with recyclable paperboard containers. There is no reason we can't do that. There is no reason we shouldn't do it.

Polystyrene is practically unrecyclable. Most polystyrene containers end up in landfills and incinerators. There are cancer-causing chemicals that are used during its manufacture. In 1986, the EPA report on solid waste named polystyrene manufacturing the fifth largest creator of hazardous waste.

We should adopt the Moran amendment and do it the right way.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 21, 2011, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 112-173.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR
POLYSTYRENE CONTAINERS

SEC. 211. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to obtain polystyrene containers for use in food service facilities of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 359, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, at the beginning of the year, the House did away with the composting program that had been part of the Green the Capitol Initiative. It has been a success. People around the country were watching it and in fact following the example that we set. But at the beginning of the year, as I say, the House of

Representatives instituted the use of polystyrene containers instead of clean, biodegradable material.

My amendment would limit the use of funds made available by this Legislative Branch appropriations bill to obtain polystyrene products in our food service facilities. We should show our commitment to the health of our visitors and our employees and to the future of our environment. We should lead by example. That's the program that we had in place until this January.

The House should be using recyclable and biodegradable products and should be avoiding polystyrene foam packaging. We should be a model institution for others to follow. As the gentleman from Vermont said, over 20 years ago, McDonalds and other fast food restaurants replaced polystyrene foam with recyclable and paperboard containers. Making that our standard is the least we can do.

The House of Representatives is the only member of the Capitol Complex to revert to foam packaging. Neither the Senate, the Library of Congress, nor the Capitol Visitors Center food service centers use polystyrene products. Congress should be setting the standard for sustainability in the 21st century. We should be leading by example.

And my amendment provides a way through which we can show that leadership to the thousands of constituents who visit our offices each year.

Polystyrene is practically unrecyclable. Most polystyrene containers end up in landfills or incinerators; and problems with polystyrene include cancerous chemicals that are used during its manufacture, minimal recyclability, enormous bulk during disposal, and toxic byproducts that are released during incineration.

A 1986 EPA report on solid waste named the polystyrene manufacturing process the fifth largest creator of hazardous waste, and toxic chemicals leak out of these containers into the food and drink they contain and endanger the human health and reproductive systems of the people who visit the Capitol and who work in the Capitol.

□ 0930

105 Members have sent a letter to House leadership asking that they eliminate polystyrene from House food service operations. My amendment would do just that by limiting the funds made available in this act from being used to obtain polystyrene containers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute simply to give you three good reasons why we should defeat this amendment.

Number one, it really doesn't do anything because we don't spend any

money in this bill for House restaurant services. They are funded through a revolving trust fund, and that money comes from another source. So it wouldn't have any impact in the first place.

Number two, if it did have any impact, all it would do is raise the cost of everything in the restaurants, which would be passed on to the folks. That's not a great thing, to spend more money.

Number three, my last good reason, the gentleman mentioned that this year there was a bipartisan letter from the chairman of the House Administration Committee along with the ranking member to say we tried this program and we're going to end it.

So for those three reasons, I think it is appropriate to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, with regard to the argument that the gentlemen makes, first of all it seems to me that we should set ourselves on record, and the appropriations bill is the ultimate source of funding for the Capitol complex. But the argument that this will save money it seems to me is deficient when we are talking about human health. I mean, we could choose not to spend money on purifying our water. We'd save a lot of money. Just let people drink out of the tap or get their water wherever. But we feel that the health of our employees and our constituents who visit us is important enough that we should spend that extra money.

Science is telling us that, in fact, toxics leak from this material into the food and the drink that our employees and our constituents are using. We may not be as fully aware of that, but we know that polystyrene is a toxic material. It seems to me we should err on the side of caution, particularly when the health of our employees and our constituents is concerned.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, Chairman LUNGREN, the chairman of the House Administration Committee and the author of the letter that ended the program in January.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just reiterate, this came to my attention as chairman of the House Administration Committee when we received a letter from the Democratic side of the aisle as part of the transition team recommending that we discontinue this part of the greening initiative process, Greening the Capitol process; that is, this one did not work. It was a Democrat who told us we ought to get rid of it.

So once I heard that, I also heard complaints from both Democratic and Republican Members of the House and their staffs that the recyclable utensils we had didn't work—didn't work—and they asked for something that did work. And so we cancelled the program.

This idea about Styrofoam being a real health hazard, Linda Birnbaum, who is the toxicologist who heads the government agency that declared styrene a likely cancer risk, said this: Let me put your mind at ease right away about Styrofoam. In finished products, certainly styrene is not an issue.

The gentleman has said, and the other gentleman from Vermont said, that we ought to follow McDonald's. They no longer have this product. Well, yesterday my staff went out and got this product from McDonald's, which is Styrofoam; and got this product from McDonald's, which is Styrofoam; and got this product from McDonald's, which is Styrofoam. So I don't know where they get this information.

Lastly, they should understand that polystyrene is approved as safe for use in food service by the FDA. Anything that contains food product that comes into contact with individuals must be approved by the FDA. This is approved by the FDA.

Also, this week we are receiving bids back from our request for proposal on trying to get a waste energy recycling program to get rid of the waste that we have here on the Hill. This is to turn it into energy by way of heat energy and capture any of the offensive by-products that may be produced. This is what we are doing.

Look, you can have good science and you can have bad science. You can have smart science and you can have dumb science. You can have science or you can have no science. Now, I'm not sure which of the latter categories this proposal falls into, but it's not science. Science suggests that this is something that ought to be appropriate.

There are any number of producers of polystyrene in Members' districts around this country. There are 2,100 users of it. This amounts to billions of dollars and thousands of jobs, tens of thousands of jobs, 8,000 just in California alone.

So once again, we are using bad science to scare people. And what's the impact? It's going to cost more money. I approved of this program because it saves a half a million dollars in a single year—half a million dollars. It will save energy, and we will have literally no residue when we move from waste to energy production. It's a win/win/win situation.

By the way, members of our staffs have thanked me for doing this. They now have utensils that actually are usable.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, first of all, the letter that was sent did not request polystyrene products by any means. It was referring to another product that was corn based. Certainly Mr. BRADY was not recommending dangerous Styrofoam material.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, before I came here to Congress, I was in the restaurant business. We had to please the customers that we served. We certainly couldn't give them an inferior product. Only in Washington, D.C., would we spend more and get less. The gentleman from California has referenced \$500,000 a year more in cost, and if you did a survey of the people who used those products, it would be dismal.

I had the experience of putting a fork in a hot piece of meat one day, and it melted. That is ridiculous. We in Congress should not give inferior products to people who work here and serve here, and spend more money for it.

So with that, Madam Chairman, let's just do the commonsense thing here and get a product that works and spend less money.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BIGGERT, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1383. An act to temporarily preserve higher rates for tuition and fees for programs of education at non-public institutions of higher learning pursued by individuals enrolled in the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs before the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvements Act of 2010, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1002

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRENSHAW) at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 359 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2551.

□ 1003

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 112-173 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-173 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. HAYWORTH of New York.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. STUTZMAN of Indiana.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WATT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 102, noes 302, answered “present” 7, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 622]

AYES—102

Bartlett
Gohmert
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Hensarling
Herger
Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conyers
DesJarlais
Duncan (TN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Flores
Fox
Fudge

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander

Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello

NOES—302

Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte

Gingrey (GA)
Richardson
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Towns
Moore
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Petri
Pompeo
Price (GA)

Gosar
Gowdy
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)

Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee

Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loeb
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George

Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarella
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—7

Chandler
Courtney
Edwards

Akin
Baca
Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blumenauer
Butterfield

Lofgren, Zoe
Meeks
Castor (FL)
Clay
Davis (IL)
Ellison
Giffords
Griffith (VA)
Hinchey

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Messrs. RIVERA, WOMACK, GRIMM, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. KINZINGER of Illinois, AUSTRIA, DENHAM, Mrs. BONO MACK, Messrs. REED, LUJAN, WAXMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Messrs. CRAVAACK, PITTS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. VISCLOSKY, JOHNSON of Illinois, BECERRA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. PERLMUTTER, SCOTT of South Carolina, GOWDY, MCGOVERN, MULVANEY, GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. BUERKLE, Messrs. LEWIS of California, NUNES, TIBERI, MCCOTTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. EMERSON, Messrs. ROHRABACHER, HASTINGS of Florida, ROONEY, HUNTER, HURT, BOREN, FLEISCHMANN, and COSTELLO changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. HERGER, SHUSTER, CASSIDY, RIBBLE, KINGSTON, CARSON

of Indiana, BURGESS, and BURTON of Indiana changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

Mr. YARMUTH changed his vote from “no” to “present.”

Mr. MEEKS changed his vote from “aye” to “present.”

Messrs. CONAWAY and HARPER changed their vote from “present” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. HAYWORTH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HAYWORTH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 299, noes 112, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 623]

AYES—299

Adams	Conaway	Gowdy
Aderholt	Connolly (VA)	Granger
Alexander	Cooper	Graves (GA)
Altmire	Costa	Graves (MO)
Amash	Costello	Green, Al
Andrews	Courtney	Griffin (AR)
Austria	Cravaack	Grimm
Bachus	Crawford	Guinta
Baldwin	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Barletta	Critz	Hahn
Barrow	Cuellar	Hall
Bartlett	Culberson	Hanna
Barton (TX)	Davis (CA)	Harper
Bass (NH)	Davis (KY)	Harris
Benishek	DeFazio	Hartzler
Berg	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)
Biggart	Denham	Hayworth
Bilbray	Dent	Heck
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Heinrich
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Blackburn	Donnelly (IN)	Herrera Beutler
Bonner	Doyle	Higgins
Bono Mack	Dreier	Himes
Boren	Duffy	Hochul
Boswell	Duncan (SC)	Holden
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Holt
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Huelskamp
Bralley (IA)	Emerson	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks	Eshoo	Hultgren
Broun (GA)	Farenthold	Hunter
Buchanan	Fincher	Hurt
Bueshon	Fitzpatrick	Inslee
Buerkle	Flake	Israel
Burgess	Fleischmann	Issa
Burton (IN)	Fleming	Jenkins
Calvert	Flores	Johnson (IL)
Camp	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
Campbell	Fortenberry	Johnson, E. B.
Canseco	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Franks (AZ)	Jones
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Cardoza	Gallely	Keating
Carney	Gardner	Kelly
Carter	Garrett	Kind
Cassidy	Gerlach	King (IA)
Chabot	Gibbs	Kingston
Chaffetz	Gibson	Kinzinger (IL)
Chandler	Gingrey (GA)	Kissell
Coble	Gohmert	Kline
Coffman (CO)	Goodlatte	Labrador
Cole	Gosar	Lamborn

Lance	Olson
Lankford	Owens
Larsen (WA)	Palazzo
Larson (CT)	Paul
Latham	Pearce
Latta	Perlmutter
Lewis (CA)	Peters
Lipinski	Peterson
LoBiondo	Petri
Loeb	Pingree (ME)
Loeb	Pitts
Lofgren, Zoe	Platts
Long	Poe (TX)
Lucas	Polis
Luetkemeyer	Pompeo
Lujan	Posey
Lummis	Price (GA)
Lungren, Daniel E.	Quayle
Lynch	Reed
Mack	Rehberg
Manzullo	Reichert
Marchant	Renacci
Marino	Ribble
Matheson	Richardson
McCarthy (CA)	Rigell
McCarthy (NY)	Rivera
McCaul	Roby
McClintock	Roe (TN)
McCotter	Rogers (AL)
McHenry	Rogers (KY)
McKeon	Rogers (MI)
McMorris	Rohrabacher
Rodgers	Rokita
Meehan	Rooney
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen
Michaud	Roskam
Miller (FL)	Ross (AR)
Miller (MI)	Ross (FL)
Miller, Gary	Rothman (NJ)
Miller, George	Royce
Mulvaney	Runyan
Murphy (CT)	Ryan (WI)
Murphy (PA)	Scalise
Myrick	Schiff
Neugebauer	Schilling
Noem	Schmidt
Nugent	Schrader
Nunes	Schwartz
Nunnelee	Schweikert

NOES—112

Ackerman	Hanabusa
Bass (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Hinojosa
Berkley	Hirono
Berman	Honda
Brady (PA)	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Jackson Lee
Capuano	(TX)
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN)	Kaptur
Chu	Kildee
Cicilline	King (NY)
Clarke (MI)	Kucinich
Clarke (NY)	Langevin
Clay	LaTourette
Cleaver	Lee (CA)
Clyburn	Levin
Cohen	Lewis (GA)
Conyers	Lowe
Crowley	Maloney
Cummings	Matsui
DeGette	McCollum
Dicks	McDermott
Dingell	McGovern
Doggett	McNerney
Dold	Meeks
Edwards	Miller (NC)
Engel	Moore
Farr	Moran
Fattah	Nadler
Filner	Napolitano
Frank (MA)	Neal
Fudge	Oliver
Garamendi	Pallone
Gonzalez	Pascrell
Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Grijalva	Payne
Gutierrez	Pelosi

NOT VOTING—21

Akin	Castor (FL)
Baca	Davis (IL)
Bachmann	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Giffords
Black	Griffith (VA)
Blumenauer	Hinche
Butterfield	Landry

Scott (SC)	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
Scott, Austin	The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
Sensenbrenner	There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.
Sessions	
Sherman	
Shimkus	
Shuler	
Shuster	
Simpson	
Smith (NE)	
Smith (NJ)	
Smith (TX)	
Smith (WA)	
Southerland	
Speier	
Stearns	
Stivers	
Stutzman	
Sullivan	
Terry	
Thompson (CA)	
Thompson (PA)	
Thornberry	
Tiberi	
Tierney	
Tipton	
Tonko	
Tsongas	
Turner	
Upton	
Walberg	
Walden	
Walsh (IL)	
Walz (MN)	
Watt	
Webster	
West	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Wolf	
Womack	
Woodall	
Yoder	
Young (FL)	
Young (IN)	

Price (NC)	AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA
Quigley	The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.
Rahall	The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
Rangel	The Clerk redesignated the amendment.
Reyes	
Richmond	
Roybal-Allard	
Ruppersberger	
Rush	
Ryan (OH)	
Sánchez, Linda T.	
Sanchez, Loretta	
Sarbanes	
Schakowsky	
Scott (VA)	
Scott, David	
Serrano	
Sewell	
Sires	
Slaughter	
Stark	
Sutton	
Thompson (MS)	
Towns	
Van Hollen	
Velázquez	
Visclosky	
Wasserman	
Schultz	
Waters	
Waxman	
Welch	
Wilson (FL)	
Woolsey	
Wu	
Yarmuth	

Markey
McIntyre
McKinley
Paulsen
Pence
Schock
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1041

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 153, noes 260, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 624]

AYES—153

Adams	Gohmert	Noem
Akin	Goodlatte	Nugent
Amash	Gowdy	Nunes
Bartlett	Graves (GA)	Nunnelee
Barton (TX)	Graves (MO)	Olson
Bass (NH)	Green, Gene	Palazzo
Benishek	Griffin (AR)	Paul
Bilbray	Hall	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Platts
Blackburn	Heck	Poe (TX)
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Herger	Posey
Brooks	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Quayle
Buchanan	Hultgren	Reichert
Buerkle	Hunter	Renacci
Burgess	Hurt	Ribble
Burton (IN)	Issa	Rigell
Campbell	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Canseco	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Rokita
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Cassidy	Jordan	Roskam
Chabot	Keating	Ross (FL)
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Royce
Coffman (CO)	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Kissell	Scalise
Costello	Kline	Schilling
Culberson	Labrador	Schrader
Denham	Lamborn	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Donnelly (IN)	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Duffy	Long	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Duncan (TN)	Lujan	Smith (NE)
Farenthold	Mack	Smith (TX)
Fincher	Manzullo	Smith (WA)
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Southerland
Flake	Matheson	Stearns
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
Fleming	McCaul	Sullivan
Flores	McCotter	Terry
Forbes	McClintock	Thornberry
Fortenberry	McHenry	Walsh (IL)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Webster
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	West
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Gallely	Mulvaney	Wittman
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Garrett	Myrick	Yoder
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Young (IN)
Gibbs		
Gibson		
Gingrey (GA)		
Gohmert		
Goodlatte		
Gosar		

NOES—260

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger

NOT VOTING—19

Baca
Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blumenauer
Butterfield
Castor (FL)
Davis (IL)
Ellison
Giffords
Griffith (VA)
Hinchev
Landry
McIntyre
McKinley
Paulsen
Pence
Schock
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1046

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. STUTZMAN
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 194, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 625]

AYES—218

Adams
Akin
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latta
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey

Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loefgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Townes
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B. T.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loefgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Baca
Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blumenauer
Butterfield
Castor (FL)
Davis (IL)
Ellison
Giffords
Griffith (VA)
Hinchev
Landry
McIntyre
McKinley
Paulsen
Pence
Schock
Sullivan
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1051

Mr. LUJÁN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 283, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 626]

AYES—130

Aderholt	Guinta	Olson
Austria	Hall	Palazzo
Barletta	Harper	Paul
Barton (TX)	Hartzler	Pearce
Berg	Hastings (WA)	Peterson
Bishop (UT)	Huelskamp	Pitts
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)	Platts
Bonner	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Hunter	Posey
Brown (GA)	Hurt	Price (GA)
Buchanan	Issa	Quayle
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Campbell	Jordan	Rooney
Canseco	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Cantor	King (NY)	Roskam
Carter	Kissell	Ross (FL)
Chabot	Kline	Runyan
Coble	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Latta	Scalise
Costa	Long	Schilling
Cravaack	Lucas	Schmidt
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Scott (SC)
Davis (KY)	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Denham	Mack	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Manzullo	Sessions
Donnelly (IN)	Marchant	Southerland
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Stearns
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Stutzman
Fincher	McCotter	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	McHenry	Tiberi
Forbes	McKeon	Tipton
Gallely	McMorris	Turner
Gerlach	Rodgers	Turner
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Walsh (IL)
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary	Webster
Gohmert	Mulvaney	West
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland
Granger	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Wittman
Graves (MO)	Noem	Womack
Griffin (AR)	Nunes	Woodall
Grimm	Nunnelee	Yoder

NOES—283

Ackerman	Bachus	Benishek
Adams	Baldwin	Berkley
Akin	Barrow	Berman
Alexander	Bartlett	Bigert
Altmire	Bass (CA)	Bilbray
Amash	Bass (NH)	Bilirakis
Andrews	Becerra	Bishop (NY)

Bono Mack	Hanna
Boren	Harris
Boswell	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Hayworth
Brady (TX)	Heck
Braley (IA)	Heinrich
Brooks	Hensarling
Brown (FL)	Herger
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler
Buerkle	Higgins
Calvert	Himes
Camp	Hinojosa
Capito	Hirono
Capps	Hochul
Capuano	Holden
Cardoza	Holt
Carnahan	Honda
Carney	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Inslee
Cassidy	Israel
Chaffetz	Jackson (IL)
Chandler	Jackson Lee
Chu	(TX)
Ciilline	Jenkins
Clarke (MI)	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (IL)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.
Cleaver	Jones
Clyburn	Kaptur
Coffman (CO)	Keating
Cohen	Kildee
Cole	Kind
Connolly (VA)	King (IA)
Conyers	Kingston
Cooper	Kinzinger (IL)
Costello	Kucinich
Courtney	Labrador
Crenshaw	Lance
Critz	Langevin
Crowley	Lankford
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)
Culberson	Larson (CT)
Cummings	Latham
Davis (CA)	LaTourette
DeFazio	Lee (CA)
DeGette	Levin
DeLauro	Lewis (CA)
Dent	Lewis (GA)
Deutch	Lipinski
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo
Dicks	Loeb sack
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe
Doggett	Lowey
Dold	Luján
Doyle	Lungren, Daniel
Dreier	E.
Duffy	Lynch
Edwards	Maloney
Ellmers	Markley
Emerson	Matheson
Engel	Matsui
Eshoo	McCarthy (CA)
Farenthold	McCarthy (NY)
Farr	McClintock
Fattah	McCollum
Finer	McDermott
Fitzpatrick	McGovern
Flake	McNerney
Fleming	Meehan
Flores	Meeks
Fortenberry	Mica
Foxx	Michaud
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)
Frank (AZ)	Miller, George
Frelinghuysen	Moore
Fudge	Moran
Garamendi	Murphy (CT)
Gardner	Nadler
Garrett	Napolitano
Gonzalez	Neal
Goodlatte	Nugent
Gosar	Olver
Green, Al	Owens
Green, Gene	Pallone
Grijaiva	Pascrell
Guthrie	Pastor (AZ)
Gutierrez	Payne
Hahn	Pelosi
Hanabusa	Perlmutter

NOT VOTING—19

Davis (IL)	McKinley
Ellison	Paulsen
Giffords	Pence
Griffith (VA)	Schock
Hinchey	Young (AK)
Landry	
McIntyre	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1057

Messrs. JOHNSON of Illinois, DUFFY, PETRI, SULLIVAN, ROYCE, ROHRBACHER, and SHUSTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. MACK and LONG changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 235, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 627]

AYES—176

Ackerman	Engel	Lofgren, Zoe
Andrews	Eshoo	Lowey
Bachus	Farr	Luján
Baldwin	Fattah	Maloney
Barrow	Filner	Markley
Barrow	Frank (MA)	Matsui
Bartlett	Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)
Bass (CA)	Gibson	McCollum
Becerra	Gonzalez	McDermott
Berkley	Green, Al	McGovern
Berman	Green, Gene	McNerney
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Meeks
Boren	Gutierrez	Michaud
Boswell	Hahn	Miller (NC)
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Miller, George
Brooks	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Brown (FL)	Hayworth	Murphy (CT)
Capps	Heinrich	Nadler
Capuano	Higgins	Napolitano
Cardoza	Himes	Neal
Carnahan	Hinojosa	Olver
Carson (IN)	Hirono	Owens
Chaffetz	Hochul	Pallone
Chu	Holt	Pascrell
Ciilline	Honda	Pastor (AZ)
Clarke (MI)	Hoyer	Payne
Clarke (NY)	Inslee	Pelosi
Clay	Israel	Peters
Cleaver	Jackson (IL)	Peterson
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Petri
Cohen	Johnson (IL)	Pingree (ME)
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Conyers	Jones	Price (NC)
Cooper	Kaptur	Rahall
Costa	Keating	Rangel
Costello	Kildee	Reyes
Courtney	Kind	Richmond
Critz	Kissell	Ross (AR)
Crowley	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
Cummings	Lance	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Sánchez, Linda
Deutch	Levin	T.
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Doggett	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Doyle	Loeb sack	Schiff
Edwards		

Scott (VA) Thompson (CA) Wasserman
 Scott, David Thompson (MS) Schultz
 Serrano Tierney Waters
 Sewell Tonko Watt
 Sherman Towns Waxman
 Sires Tsongas Welch
 Slaughter Van Hollen Wilson (FL)
 Smith (WA) Velázquez Woolsey
 Speier Visclosky Wu
 Stark Walz (MN) Yarmuth
 Sutton

Griffith (VA) McIntyre Pence Sherman
 Hinchey McKinley Schock Shuler
 Landry Paulsen Young (AK) Sires

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining in this
 vote.

Thompson (MS) Waters
 Tierney Watt
 Tonko Waxman
 Towns Welch
 Tsongas Wilson (FL)
 Van Hollen Woolsey
 Velázquez Wu
 Visclosky Yarmuth
 Wasserman
 Schultz

□ 1102

Mr. ISRAEL changed his vote from
 “no” to “aye.”

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE
 The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 179, noes 234,
 not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 628]

AYES—179

NOES—235

Adams Gosar Palazzo
 Aderholt Gowdy Paul
 Akin Granger Pearce
 Alexander Graves (GA) Perlmutter
 Altmire Graves (MO) Pitts
 Amash Griffin (AR) Platts
 Austria Grimm Poe (TX)
 Barletta Guinta Pompeo
 Barton (TX) Guthrie Posey
 Bass (NH) Hall Price (GA)
 Benishek Hanna Quayle
 Berg Harper Quigley
 Biggert Harris Reed
 Bilbray Hartzler Rehberg
 Bilirakis Hastings (WA) Reichert
 Bishop (UT) Heck Renacci
 Blackburn Hensarling Ribble
 Bonner Herger Richardson
 Bono Mack Herrera Beutler Rigell
 Boustany Holden Rivera
 Brady (TX) Huelskamp Roby
 Broun (GA) Huizenga (MI) Roe (TN)
 Buchanan Hultgren Rogers (AL)
 Bucshon Hunter Rogers (KY)
 Buerkle Hurt Rogers (MI)
 Burgess Issa Rohrabacher
 Burton (IN) Jackson Lee Rokita
 Calvert (TX) Rooney
 Camp Jenkins Ros-Lehtinen
 Campbell Johnson (OH) Roskam
 Canseco Johnson, Sam Ross (FL)
 Cantor Jordan Royce
 Capito Kelly Runyan
 Carney King (IA) Ryan (WI)
 Carter King (NY) Scalise
 Cassidy Kingston Schilling
 Chabot Kinzinger (IL) Schmidt
 Chandler Kline Schmidt
 Coble Labrador Schrader
 Coffman (CO) Lamborn Schwartz
 Cole Lankford Schweikert
 Conaway Latham Scott (SC)
 Cravaack LaTourette Scott, Austin
 Crawford Latta Sensenbrenner
 Crenshaw Lewis (CA) Sessions
 Cuellar Long Shimkus
 Culberson Lucas Shuler
 Davis (KY) Luetkemeyer Shuster
 Denham Lummis Simpson
 Dent Lungren, Daniel Smith (NE)
 DesJarlais E. Smith (NJ)
 Diaz-Balart Lynch Smith (TX)
 Dold Mack Southerland
 Donnelly (IN) Manzullo Stearns
 Dreier Marchant Stivers
 Duffy Marino Stutzman
 Duncan (SC) Matheson Sullivan
 Duncan (TN) McCarthy (CA) Terry
 Ellmers McCaul Thornberry
 Emerson McClintock Tiberi
 Farenthold McCotter Tipton
 Fincher McHenry Tipton
 Fitzpatrick McKeon Turner
 Flake McMorris Upton
 Fleischmann Rodgers Walberg
 Fleming Meehan Walden
 Flores Mica Walsh (IL)
 Forbes Miller (FL) Webber
 Fortenberry Miller (MI) West
 Foxx Miller, Gary Westmoreland
 Franks (AZ) Moore Whitfield
 Frelinghuysen Mulvaney Wilson (SC)
 Fudge Murphy (PA) Wittman
 Gallegly Myrick Wolf
 Gardner Neugebauer Womack
 Garret Noem Woodall
 Gerlach Nugent Yoder
 Gibbs Nunes Young (FL)
 Gingrey (GA) Nunnelee Young (IN)
 Gohmert Olson

NOT VOTING—21

Baca Blumenauer Davis (IL)
 Bachmann Braley (IA) Ellison
 Bishop (GA) Butterfield Giffords
 Black Castor (FL) Goodlatte

Ackerman Eshoo Markey
 Altmire Farr Matsui
 Andrews Fattah McCarthy (NY)
 Baldwin Filner McCollum
 Bartlett Portenberry McDermott
 Bass (CA) Frank (MA) McGovern
 Becerra Fudge Meeks
 Berkley Garamendi Michaud
 Berman Gonzalez Miller (NC)
 Bishop (NY) Green, Al Miller, George
 Boswell Grijalva Moore
 Brady (PA) Gutierrez Moran
 Braley (IA) Hahn Murphy (CT)
 Burgess Hanabusa Nadler
 Capps Hastings (FL) Napolitano
 Capuano Neal
 Cardoza Heinrich Olver
 Carnahan Higgins Owens
 Carney Himes Pallone
 Carson (IN) Hinojosa Pascarell
 Chandler Hirono Pastor (AZ)
 Chu Hochul Payne
 Cicilline Holden Pelosi
 Clarke (MI) Holt Perlmutter
 Clarke (NY) Honda Peters
 Clay Hoyer Pingree (ME)
 Cleaver Insee Polis
 Clyburn Israel Price (NC)
 Cohen Jackson (IL) Quigley
 Connolly (VA) Johnson (GA) Rahall
 Conyers Johnson, E. B. Rangel
 Cooper Kaptur Reichert
 Costa Keating Reyes
 Costello Kildee Richardson
 Courtney Kind Richmond
 Critz Kissell Rigell
 Crowley Kucinich Rothman (NJ)
 Cuellar Lance Roybal-Allard
 Cummings Cummings Rush
 Davis (CA) Larsen (WA) Ryan (OH)
 DeFazio Larson (CT) Sanchez, Linda
 DeGette Lee (CA) T.
 DeLauro Levin Sanchez, Loretta
 Deutch Lewis (GA) Sarbanes
 Dicks Lipinski Schakowsky
 Dingell Loeb sack Schiff
 Doggett Lofgren, Zoe Schwartz
 Donnelly (IN) Lowey Scott (VA)
 Doyle Luján Scott, David
 Edwards Lynch Serrano
 Engel Maloney Sewell

Adams Goodlatte Nugent
 Aderholt Gosar Nunes
 Akin Gowdy Nunnelee
 Alexander Granger Olson
 Amash Graves (GA) Palazzo
 Austria Graves (MO) Paul
 Bachus Green, Gene Pearce
 Barletta Griffin (AR) Peterson
 Barrow Grimm Petri
 Barton (TX) Guinta Pitts
 Bass (NH) Guthrie Platts
 Benishek Hall Poe (TX)
 Berg Hanna Pompeo
 Biggert Harper Posey
 Bilbray Harris Price (GA)
 Bilirakis Hartzler Quayle
 Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA) Reed
 Blackburn Heck Rehberg
 Bonner Hensarling Renacci
 Bono Mack Herger Ribble
 Boren Herrera Beutler Rivera
 Boustany Huelskamp Roby
 Brady (TX) Huizenga (MI) Roe (TN)
 Brooks Hultgren Rogers (AL)
 Broun (GA) Hunter Rogers (KY)
 Brown (FL) Hurt Rogers (MI)
 Buchanan Issa Rohrabacher
 Bucshon Jackson Lee Rokita
 Buerkle (TX) Rooney
 Burton (IN) Jenkins Ros-Lehtinen
 Calvert Johnson (IL) Roskam
 Camp Johnson (OH) Ross (AR)
 Campbell Johnson, Sam Ross (FL)
 Canseco Jones Royce
 Cantor Jordan Runyan
 Capito Kelly Ruppersberger
 Carter King (IA) Ryan (WI)
 Cassidy King (NY) Scalise
 Chabot Kingston Schilling
 Chaffetz Kinzinger (IL) Schmidt
 Chafetz Coble Schrader
 Coffman (CO) Labrador Schweikert
 Cole Lamborn Scott (SC)
 Conaway Lankford Scott, Austin
 Cravaack Latham Sensenbrenner
 Crawford LaTourette Sessions
 Crenshaw Latta Shimkus
 Culberson Lewis (CA) Shuster
 Davis (KY) LoBiondo Simpson
 Denham Long Smith (NE)
 Dent Lucas Smith (TX)
 DesJarlais Luetkemeyer Southerland
 Diaz-Balart Lummis Stearns
 Dold Lungren, Daniel Stivers
 Dreier E. Stutzman
 Duffy Mack Sullivan
 Duncan (SC) Manzullo Terry
 Duncan (TN) Marchant Thompson (PA)
 Ellmers Marino Thornberry
 Emerson Matheson Tiberi
 Farenthold McCarthy (CA) Tipton
 Fincher McCaul Turner
 Fitzpatrick McClintock Upton
 Flake McCotter Walberg
 Fleischmann McHenry Walden
 Fleming McKeon Walsh (IL)
 Flores McMorris Walz (MN)
 Forbes Forbes Rodgers Webber
 Foxx Foxx West
 Franks (AZ) Franks (AZ) Westmoreland
 Frelinghuysen Frelinghuysen Whitfield
 Fudge Gallegly Miller (FL) Wilson (SC)
 Gallegly Miller (MI) Wittman
 Gardner Garret Wolf
 Garret Mulvaney Womack
 Gerlach Gerlach Woodall
 Gibbs Gibbons Yoder
 Gingrey (GA) Neugebauer Young (FL)
 Gohmert Noem Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Baca Butterfield Griffith (VA)
 Bachmann Castor (FL) Hinchey
 Bishop (GA) Davis (IL) Landry
 Black Ellison
 Blumenauer Giffords

McIntyre Paulsen Schock
McKinley Pence Young (AK)

□ 1106

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

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BIGGERT, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 359, reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 159, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 629]

YEAS—252

Adams Chaffetz Gardner
Aderholt Chandler Garrett
Akin Coble Gerlach
Alexander Coffman (CO) Gibbs
Altmire Cole Gibson
Austria Conaway Gingrey (GA)
Bachus Costa Gohmert
Barletta Costello Goodlatte
Barrow Courtney Gosar
Barton (TX) Cravaack Gowdy
Bass (NH) Crawford Granger
Benishkek Crenshaw Graves (GA)
Berg Cuellar Graves (MO)
Berkley Culberson Green, Al
Biggart Davis (KY) Griffin (AR)
Bilbray Denham Grimm
Bilirakis Dent Guinta
Bishop (UT) DesJarlais Guthrie
Blackburn Diaz-Balart Hall
Bonner Doggett Hanna
Bono Mack Dold Harper
Boren Donnelly (IN) Harris
Boustany Dreier Hartzler
Brady (TX) Duffy Hastings (WA)
Brooks Duncan (SC) Hayworth
Buchanan Eillers Hensarling
Bucshon Emerson Herger
Buerkle Farenthold Herrera Beutler
Burton (IN) Fincher Higgins
Calvert Fitzpatrick Himes
Camp Fleischmann Hirono
Canseco Fleming Hochul
Cantor Flores Huelskamp
Capito Forbes Huizenga (MI)
Carney Fortenberry Hultgren
Carter Foxx Hunter
Cassidy Frelinghuysen Hurt
Chabot Gallegly Inslee

Issa Meehan Royce
Jenkins Mica Runyan
Johnson (IL) Miller (FL) Ruppenger
Johnson (OH) Miller (MI) Ryan (WI)
Johnson, Sam Miller, Gary Scalise
Jordan Mulvaney Schilling
Keating Murphy (CT) Schmidt
Kelly Murphy (PA) Schrader
King (IA) Myrick Scott (SC)
King (NY) Neugebauer Sensenbrenner
Kingston Noem Sessions
Kinzinger (IL) Nugent Sherman
Kissell Nunes Shimkus
Kline Nunnelee Shuster
Labrador Olson Simpson
Lamborn Owens Smith (NE)
Lance Palazzo Smith (NJ)
Lankford Pearce Smith (TX)
Larsen (WA) Peters Southerland
Latham Peterson Speier
LaTourette Petri Stivers
Latta Pitts Stutzman
Lewis (CA) Platts Sullivan
LoBiondo Poe (TX) Terry
Loeb sack Pompeo Thompson (PA)
Long Posey Thornberry
Lucas Quayle Tiberi
Luetkemeyer Quigley Tipton
Lummis Reed Tsongas
Lungren, Daniel Rehberg Turner
E. Renacci Upton
Lynch Ribble Walberg
Mack Richardson Walden
Manzullo Rigell Walsh (IL)
Marchant Rivera Waters
Marino Roby Webster
Matheson Roe (TN) West
McCarthy (CA) Rogers (AL) Westmoreland
McCarthy (NY) Rogers (KY) Whitfield
McCaul Rogers (MI) Wilson (SC)
McClintock Rohrabacher Wolf
McCotter Rokita Womack
McHenry Rooney Woodall
McKeon Ros-Lehtinen Yoder
McMorris Roskam Young (FL)
Rodgers Ross (AR)
McNerney Ross (FL) Young (IN)

NAYS—159

Ackerman Flake Moran
Amash Frank (MA) Nadler
Andrews Franks (AZ) Napolitano
Baldwin Fudge Neal
Bartlett Garamendi Olver
Bass (CA) Gonzalez Pallone
Becerra Green, Gene Pascarell
Berman Grijalva Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY) Gutierrez Paul
Boswell Hahn Payne
Brady (PA) Hanabusa Pelosi
Braley (IA) Hastings (FL) Perlmutter
Broun (GA) Heck Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL) Heinrich Polis
Burgess Hinojosa Price (GA)
Campbell Holden Price (NC)
Capps Holt Rahall
Capuano Honda Rangel
Cardoza Hoyer Reichert
Carnahan Israel Reyes
Carson (IN) Jackson (IL) Richmond
Chu Jackson Lee Rothman (NJ)
Cicilline (TX) Roybal-Allard
Clarke (MI) Johnson (GA) Rush
Clarke (NY) Johnson, E. B. Ryan (OH)
Clay Jones Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver Kaptur T.
Clyburn Kildee Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen Kind Sarbanes
Connolly (VA) Kucinich Schakowsky
Conyers Schiff
Cooper Larson (CT) Schwartz
Critz Lee (CA) Schweikert
Crowley Levin Scott (VA)
Cummings Lewis (GA) Scott, David
Davis (CA) Lipinski Serrano
DeFazio Lofgren, Zoe Sewell
DeGette Lowey Shuler
DeLauro Luján Sires
Deutch Maloney Slaughter
Dingell Fincher Stark
Doyle Matsui Stearns
Duncan (TN) Doyle McCollum Sutton
Edwards McDermott Thompson (CA)
Engel McGovern Thompson (MS)
Eshoo Meeks Tierney
Farr Michaud Tonko
Fattah Miller (NC) Towns
Filner Moore Van Hollen
Velázquez

Visclosky Watt Wittman
Walz (MN) Waxman Woolsey
Wasserman Welch Wu
Schultz Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Baca Davis (IL) McKinley
Bachmann Ellison Paulsen
Bishop (GA) Giffords Pence
Black Griffith (VA) Schock
Blumenauer Hinchey Scott, Austin
Butterfield Landry Smith (WA)
Castor (FL) McIntyre Young (AK)

□ 1125

Mr. LEVIN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PAULSEN, Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 629 I was unable to attend today's vote on H.R. 2551—Legislative Branch Appropriations. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PENCE, Madam Speaker, I was absent from the House floor during rollcall votes 615 and 622–629. Had I been present I would have voted “no” on 615, “aye” on 622, “aye” on 623, “aye” on 624, “aye” on 625, “aye” on 626, “no” on 627, “no” on 628, and “yea” on 629.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 25, 2011

Mr. CRENSHAW, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BUERKLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

HONORING GOVERNOR BRUCE SUNDLUN

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

Mr. CICILLINE, Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to honor a great citizen, a good friend, and a wonderful political leader, Rhode Island Governor Bruce Sundlun, who passed away last evening.

My fellow Rhode Islanders and I have lost a great friend and a great leader in Bruce's passing. He will be long remembered for leading Rhode Island through some very difficult times. His commitment to public service and his honorable and courageous service to our country both at home and abroad set him apart as a great American.

Governor Sundlun distinguished himself as a patriotic war hero, a talented business leader, a spirited athlete, and a gifted political leader.

A great friend to me, his courage and passion set him apart as one remarkable man whose spirit will live on in

our memories. His legacy and visionary accomplishments, including leading Rhode Island out of the credit union crisis, establishing Rite Care, a national model for health care for low-income families and children, and his vision for our State's airport expansion at T.F. Green will continue to benefit Rhode Islanders for many years to come.

My thoughts and prayers continue to be with the entire Sundlun family. Governor Bruce Sundlun will be sorely missed.

FAA BILL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I'm excited about the number of Members who welcome guests to the United States Capitol. It is an important place because it belongs to the American people. I'm delighted that the Poindexter family has joined me.

But many of those people who have traveled have traveled by airplanes and have gone through the Nation's airports.

I am the ranking member on the Transportation Security Committee addressing security issues across America; and I am disappointed, but I would like to say a little outraged, that right now the FAA bill is held up on minor issues such as whether or not we'll allow our workers to engage in discussions about their work conditions. It is being held up because the bill cancels FAA and air traffic controllers in small airports and the supplemental support, if you will, the supplemental support that has been given to small airports in rural areas.

It's time to get to work. Our Republican friends need to stop holding up this bill for minor issues so that Americans can fly in safety and security.

□ 1130

THE FUTURE OF MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BUEKLE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I promise I will not take the whole 60 minutes, because I know many folks have flights to get to.

Madam Speaker, one of the reasons I'm here—and we are also working on some additional, shall we say, display items for maybe next week. Maybe I'm out of my mind, but this last couple of weeks I've been actually reading from top to bottom, beginning to end, the Medicare trustees' Federal hospital insurance and Federal supplemental medical insurance trust fund actuarial report for 2011. It's actually more in-

teresting than you would think, because you go through about 270 pages, lots of great information, not that hard to read, so anyone that's actually watching this, I strongly suggest, if you have the stomach for it and you really need a little help in falling asleep, this might be the occasion. Google it, take it off the Internet, but do this for me: This is one of those occasions I'm going to ask you to go to the very end of the report and start with the last three pages, because that's what I'm standing here to talk about is you have a report that basically gives a window of a dozen-some years of actuarial soundness, but when you get to the last three pages, it basically says something like Roseannadanna, that character from Saturday Night Live from 20 years ago: "Never mind."

I brought a couple of the boards we already had printed up to sort of demonstrate what's going on, and then I wanted to talk about this.

Day after day after day after day in the political theater of this Congress, I see Members walk up to the floor, walk up to the press, send out press releases saying, "We don't want to change Medicare as it is in law today." How many times have we heard the attacks on the Republicans saying, "They're trying to change Medicare as we know it"? I need you to think about that comment, because what's in this report is Medicare as it is in law today. You need to understand what the left is defending and the crash that is just a few years away; and I'm standing here today to defend the fact that, as Republicans, we're saving the program. We are actually trying to find a way to make Medicare actuarially sound so that you and I can have it but also our kids and our grandkids can have it.

So let's actually first walk through the numbers, and then I'm going to read parts of these last three pages. I promise it's more interesting than it sounds, and it's more depressing than you can ever imagine, and this is the current law.

All right. A couple of primers on some spending out there.

2010, how much of our spending is mandatory?

2016, you'll start to notice mandatory spending is consuming everything we are.

Another point of reference. Today, when we borrow, we're actually having to borrow to cover all the discretionary. That's defense. That's all the alphabet agencies. We even have to borrow today to cover a portion of the mandatory spending. Think of that. The Medicares, the Social Securities, the Medicaid, the VA benefits, interest on the debt are actually living on borrowed money. I would think that would set off an alarm bell in someone's head that there's something horribly wrong out there.

So let's actually bounce on to this graph and just sort of give you a concept of how fast these numbers are

eroding and why things like the battle over cut, cap, and balance are going on in this body, because there seems a willingness here by many Members—and I've got to be very careful how I phrase this—that I believe telling the public the truth of how difficult these numbers are and how dangerous they are to our Republic may mean they don't get reelected, may mean they have to stand up in front of an audience that for years and years and years they've said, "Don't worry. It's fine." How do you go back in front of that same audience and now tell them, well, maybe the numbers weren't fine, because the truth is in front of us right now.

Here is the 2010 sort of breakdown. Department of Defense, Military, Other Discretionary. We use this one, because this is last year's numbers. It's all done. We know what it was.

Do you see this? That's probably about 62, 63 percent of all spending was in the mandatory category. Think of this. This here, from the President's own numbers, is the 2016 projection, which is four budget cycles away, because, remember, right now we're working on the 2012. This is the 2016.

Do you see the difference in these two boards? Do you see that growth in that blue area? We go from something in the low sixties to 72, and I have one person who keeps telling me it's 73 percent of all spending.

But think of this. In about 13½ years, every dime of this pie chart, every dime of spending, will be consumed by the mandatory portion of our spending. So 13½ years. There's nothing left in defense. There's nothing left in the alphabet agencies. Mandatory spending, the entitlements, consume everything we are. And, remember, this is as the law is written today. So every time you see a Member walk up and say, "I don't want to make changes; I want to keep everything as it is in law today," they're basically saying your future is a crash. Everything will be consumed in these mandatory numbers.

Now let's actually walk through a couple of things that are in these last three pages of the 2011 Medicare actuarial report. Once again, please, I ask you, if you don't believe me, if you're someone who has trouble believing these statements that I come here to the floor and try to walk through, go take it off the Internet yourself and read these last three pages.

Part of the premise here is, to his credit—and I believe he is actually the chief actuary for Medicare, actually wrote a little Statement of Actuarial Opinion, the last three pages, and he puts it in perspective. He basically says, yeah, the numbers in here are fine if you live in a fantasy world and assume Congress will never make certain changes. And understand, baked into these numbers, you'll love this one. I'll read it, and then I'll explain what this means. This is in the second paragraph. I'm going to read the second half of this paragraph:

“They are not reasonable as an indication of actuarial future costs. Current law would require a physician fee reduction of an estimated 29.4 percent on January 1, 2012—an implausible expectation.”

Did you hear that? Built into these numbers, January 1—what is that? Five months from now? January 1, doctors are to get a 29.4 percent cut in their compensation, and that’s built into these numbers because these numbers don’t work without taking that type of hit to the doctors.

How many doctors are going to see Medicare patients come January 2 when they’ve taken a 29.4 percent cut? So what traditionally happens around here is the Members of this body sometime in November, December, we’re going to run to the floor, we’re going to say that’s not fair, we want to make sure Medicare recipients can actually see their doctor, and we’re going to go back and raise up that compensation and keep it flat. We’re going to get rid of that 29.4 percent cut that’s already built into the law. The next day we should have a new actuarial report saying, oh, by the way, the dozen-some years that we said Medicare was fine is crashing, because it’s built on premises that don’t have reality.

I’m trying to find nice ways to phrase this. When you read an actuarial report, it’s based on current law. What happens if built into that current law is absolute fantasy, and that 29.4 percent cut, which I will be one of the people who will walk onto this floor and do my best to stop that because that’s not fair. It’s not fair to the doctors. It’s not fair to the people in the program. But you’ve got to understand. Then when Members of this body walk up here and say, “We want no changes to Medicare,” when they say they want no changes, are they saying they want the law as it is today? They want doctors in January to get a 29.4 percent cut? You can’t have it both ways. You can’t walk up here and say, “We want to keep the law exactly as it is, no protection, no changes.”

“Oh, by the way, you’re never going to see your doctor again after January 2.”

You have to actually go through more of these last three pages, this statement of opinion. It’s devastating. And you start to realize the political theater around here hasn’t been telling our public the truth. They’re more concerned about winning political points than helping the American people understand we have a huge, important program here that’s about to collapse under its own weight. We have the documents. We have the data. We’re trying to step up and be responsible. But by being responsible, you get demagogued, you get attacked, you have people going out and holding up little protest signs. And then you talk to them and say, “Hey, read this,” and they read it, and they look at you with these eyes saying, “I can’t believe my own side’s been lying to me. Why didn’t they fess up and tell us this was coming?”

□ 1140

There are a couple of other things in here. Medicare prices for hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, home health, hospice, ambulatory surgery centers, diagnostic laboratories, and many other services would be less than half of their levels under prior law. That is built into this Medicare actuary report. Think that through. Built into the formulas today, those groupings are going to be receiving half the compensation? How many of them are ever going to treat, take care, diagnose, or provide hospice care for Medicare recipients? That’s what the Republicans are trying to save. We’re trying to fix it. We’re trying not to let that happen.

Anyone that says they do not want changes to Medicare, they are actually supporting the downfall of the program. And that is actually why I stand here. I will be back next week with a series of slides that actually break out a number of segments from this Medicare actuary report, because it’s time we start having Members come to this floor and tell the truth.

One last little thing here. For these reasons, the financial projections shown in this report for Medicare do not represent a reasonable expectation for actual program operations. What the Medicare actuary is basically saying is, What we’ve based much of the rhetoric on around here, if you dig into the numbers, this program has already changed as people know it. It was changed last year when they did the health care takeover vote. It’s already built into the law.

As a Republican, we’re trying to find ways to save this program, make it actuarially sound so it is there for the folks who are on it, for our children, for ourselves, and for the next generation. We are here to do the right thing. And if you don’t believe me, go pull the report, and read through it yourself.

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

AMERICA’S DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I always appreciate the honor and the privilege.

I, like every Member in this Congress, and most Americans, have some strong opinions about the workings and the necessity for this Congress to step up and lead, as we have led, on the issue of the debt ceiling.

And I will start with this: Some weeks ago, the Secretary of the Treasury, Tim Geithner, laid out a date; and he said August 2 is a hard break deadline beyond which we can’t extend our borrowing and our spending and that

the government will not be able to pay its bills, and we will have to default on our debt. That, I think, Madam Speaker, is an irresponsible statement on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury, and we should keep in mind that his first boss is the President of the United States.

So the things that come out of the mouth of the Secretary of the Treasury often reflect the best interests of the President and perhaps are explicit or implied directive that comes from the President. And I happen to have this belief that when someone goes to work for the President, their judgment becomes what they think the President would do if he happened to be doing their job.

I have watched the transition of executive offices over the years, in places like the Governor’s office in Iowa, where I come from and have served in the Iowa Senate before I came here. I watched as the transition in the executive branch took place, and I watched as some of the people that survived the transition did so by accommodating their positions to that of their new chief executive officer, their new Governor.

I watched as the United States of America has transitioned from a George W. Bush administration to a Barack Obama administration. And I have watched as some of the survivors of that transition accommodated their positions to their new President, their new Commander in Chief. So I’m a little cynical about the knowledge base and what is declared to be the deep convictions of some of the appointees of the President.

When I hear the Secretary of the Treasury say, This August 2 date is the date beyond which we can’t go, we can’t borrow beyond that, and so we’ll have to start defaulting on our debt, why does Tim Geithner say that? I say he does because that accommodates the President’s argument that this “we’ve got to put up or shut up date” is a hard date, August 2, beyond which is a financial calamity. I don’t believe that, Madam Speaker. I don’t believe we get into a financial calamity if we go on the other side of August 2.

It may be a fairly accurate calculated date, beyond which we won’t have the borrowing capacity to continue to pay our bills on time. I think that’s probably close to August 2. I don’t know that it’s the accurate date of August 2, however. So I just caution people to think about what it really means when you hear a Cabinet official take a position and promise Americans that they can count on their word. You know, they’re sometimes falling on their sword for the President of the United States.

In fact, the Secretary of the Treasury, Tim Geithner, doesn’t give me a lot of confidence. Just a few weeks ago as he was under oath before the Small Business Committee, I asked him his opinion on several of the top economists that America and the world have

produced throughout history. A couple of those people would be Adam Smith and John Maynard Keynes. And Secretary of the Treasury Tim Geithner's response was—and I remind you, Madam Speaker, under oath—his response was, he is not an economist; therefore, he wouldn't offer an opinion on lead economists in the history of the country and the world because he's not a trained economist.

So when Tim Geithner tells us that we have a deadline of August 2 and it's a potential calamity, is he giving us an economic opinion? He refused to give an economic opinion when he was under oath. So when he's in front of the press, is that a different equation? Is he an economist or isn't he? He says he's not. If he says he's not, then should I accept his word that the Secretary of the Treasury is not an economist?

Therefore, I would have to tell you, Madam Speaker, I would discount his opinion because he's a self-professed noneconomist. And it seems as though America wants to accept the word of the Secretary of the Treasury even though he has put disclaimers out there on his own credibility multiple times. And I will just put another disclaimer out there on his own credibility by saying the President of the United States impacts the opinion of his Cabinet members and his other appointees.

So here's what the President has said, Madam Speaker, and that's this. In so many words, speaking of it, he said, I can't guarantee that the pensions of our military or that Social Security for our seniors will be paid on time. That was a statement that he made a little over a week ago. Yet I listened to that. Madam Speaker, I have to tell you that it wasn't a directly factual statement made by the President. He has to know this. He has to know the truth.

The truth is the President of the United States is the only person who can guarantee that our military pensions are paid on time, and he's the only person that can guarantee our Social Security is paid on time. He's the only person that can guarantee that the revenue stream that's coming in, which is \$200 billion a month, on average, would be used in a priority fashion to service our debt, to pay our military on time, to pay the military pensions on time, to take care of our national security interests, to pay the Social Security on time, and to pay the Medicare bills on time.

□ 1150

Take the seniors off the table, along with our military, as I have clearly advocated when I introduced the Promises Act a little over a week ago. The Promises Act pays our military first, services our debt second; goes no further than that. We did a major press conference on that issue—myself, Congressman GOHMERT, and MICHELE BACHMANN of Minnesota. We laid that principle out.

There are others that have good bills out here. TOM MCCLINTOCK has a good bill that requires that we service our debt, pay the debt on time. It's called the Full Faith and Credit Act. It's mirrored, I believe, off of that of PAT TOOMEY in the Senate. It has a good number of cosponsors.

LOUIE GOHMERT has a good bill that guarantees that our troops are paid on time every time. It doesn't go far enough. It's got a sunset date on it. It doesn't happen to include hitting a debt ceiling. It addresses the funding gap that came from the CR a few months ago, but the concept of it is good, and he's led very well on it.

DAN WEBSTER from Florida has a very good prioritization bill. His bill, and should we send it to the President and it becomes law, services the debt first. That's about \$20 billion a month. It pays the military second. That's about \$11 billion a month. And now that's \$31 billion. If you divide 31 billion by 200 billion, 31 divided by 200 works out to be 15.2 percent. So 15.2 percent of the incoming revenue stream is all that it takes to guarantee that our military is paid on time every time, and that they, in harm's way, defending our liberty with their lives on the line and sacrificing their lives from time to time, should never have to wonder if their earned paycheck is going to be transferred into their account for their family on time every time. That should be a guarantee that this Congress makes, and it should be a guarantee that lasts for all time. My bill does that.

I believe the language in DANIEL WEBSTER's bill does that as well. But, in any case, his services the debt first, pays the military second, provides that the President can direct funding into national security issues third, pays the Social Security fourth and the Medicare bills fifth. I actually think his is the best bill. I would take it and massage it and flip a couple of things within it, but I am not taking a deep objection to it, nor do I think that we wouldn't get the job done with DAN WEBSTER's bill. I think we would.

But I would like to see a prioritization bill be moved here in the House of Representatives and send it over to the Senate. We've already passed Cut, Cap, and Balance. We've said, Here's the debt ceiling increase. You send a constitutional amendment to the States so they can ratify an amendment that guarantees that this Congress would be bound to a balanced budget.

The balanced budget amendment passed here in this House in 1995, and it was messaged down that hallway to the Senate in '95. And it was brought up on the floor of the Senate with the votes counted for passage. One Senator flipped unexpectedly, and the balanced budget amendment failed on the floor of the Senate that day in '95. Had that balanced budget amendment passed, it would have been messaged to the States for ratification.

It requires three-quarters of the States to ratify a constitutional amendment, which clearly would have been the case for a balanced budget amendment. Had the States had that opportunity, I believe they would have ratified a balanced budget amendment. Had they done so, I believe, Madam Speaker, that we would not be having this discussion today. I believe that we would have enshrined in our Constitution a requirement that this Congress be bound by the same standards that most of the States are, balanced budget amendments. And if that had been the case, we would not be having this discussion. We wouldn't have this overspending. We wouldn't have more than \$3 trillion in deficit spending that's been driven by the President of the United States.

Some say Republicans are responsible, too. Republicans spent too much money, too, and in that case, I'd agree with that.

But here's the real comparison, and it's this: During the height of the Iraq war, with expenses going out in armed conflict in the Middle East, when things were going badly there, this Congress came within \$160 billion of balancing the budget. A little bit more economic activity, a little tweak here or there, and we would have seen a balanced budget in the middle of the past decade, in the middle of the Iraq war. We fell \$160 billion short. All right. I'll take that on us. We should have done a better job. We should have had enough cushion that we achieved a balanced budget. We didn't get that done.

But today, the President's deficit is \$1.65 trillion. And I no longer have to say trillion with a "t." I used to have to say billion with a "b." Sometimes people were thinking million when you said billion. But now we talk about trillions, and then the concept of we don't have to say trillion with a "t" anymore. It comes out of our mouths. We're discussing trillions of dollars.

So the President has given us a \$1.65 trillion single-year deficit, more than 10 times greater than the \$160 billion deficit that Republicans had during the height of the Iraq war. That's his responsibility, over \$3 trillion in deficit spending in two short budget years.

By the way, no budget approved by Democrats during that period of time. Nothing brought up in the Senate now. We did pass the Ryan budget. We voted on an RSC budget. I stuck with the toughest and the strongest budget that we could bring to this floor, one that balanced in less than 9 years. I'm a little embarrassed to say that. I'm a little embarrassed to say a budget that balances in less than 9 years, but it's easier to say that than it is a budget that balances in 26 years. And that's the budget that Democrats voted against because it didn't spend enough money.

The Ryan budget balances in 26 years, when my sons are ready for retirement. That's too long. I want something much shorter than that. I'd like

to find a way to balance this budget tomorrow if I could, but the price to do that would be too many calamities across this country. So we need to get there as fast as we can before the financial markets leave us. We need to get there before we become the Greece of the world. This isn't going to wait 26 years to be resolved.

And if you want to push the American economy and our credit over the edge, just adopt the ideas that come out of the Democrat side of the aisle or out of the HARRY REID majority in the Senate—the ideas that we should extend the debt ceiling without restraint; whatever the President asks for, give it to him; let him borrow and spend money—and somehow or another, the magic of Obamanomics is going to create this huge economic chain letter of spending. There's always another sucker in a chain letter, isn't there? The President believes that. He believes there's always another sucker in a chain letter. And so he wants to borrow and borrow and borrow and spend and spend and spend and take something like FDR's New Deal to the infinite power and apply it to today's economy, and somehow the magic of the consumer-driven economy will save us from our lack of discipline, and the economy will start to grow again.

I'll submit, Madam Speaker, another viewpoint on this. I think this. I think that last summer was not "recovery summer" as it was declared to be by the President of the United States. Nobody is saying this summer is "recovery summer" with 9.2 percent unemployment. I would submit instead that we have to recover from Obamanomics before we actually will be in recovery.

We may have already recovered from the downward spiral of the recession that was the financial crisis that came to us in the fall of 2008. We may have already recovered from that, but we've not recovered from Obamanomics. We've not recovered from the economic stimulus plan. We've not recovered from the \$3 trillion in unnecessary spending. We have interest. We have to service this debt.

I think there are a good number of Americans by now that have lived through this, and on the other side of this recession that we've been in, they will be learning this again, this thing that I know from experience, and it's this: If you are too highly leveraged, another loan—borrowing more money with more interest to pay and more principal to pay—doesn't sometimes help you. Sometimes when you're too highly leveraged, you just simply have to go broke and declare that you're insolvent, and now maybe you get a chance to start again.

But businesses have been beaten down, beaten down, beaten down, and along comes a natural disaster, like, for example—to inject it into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the natural disaster of the Missouri River floods of 2011 that go on right now. We have victims that are underwater now and that

are so far behind that a disaster loan at low interest rates over a long term doesn't help them because they won't be able to service their loan.

□ 1200

They won't have the cash flow to do it. They will just have another interest payment; they will just have another principal payment, and it weighs them down to the point where they can't recover.

This Federal Government could find itself in the same position. The Federal Government has to pay the interest; the Federal Government has to pay the principal. Who's going to pay that? The American people. It has to come out of the profits of the private sector in order for that to happen.

And when we look at the growth in government spending and government spending-created jobs when it's created from borrowed money, it's got to come from somewhere. Where does it come from? It comes from the private sector. What does the private sector produce that can be tapped and taxed by, let's say, Tim Geithner, the IRS? Well, first of all, the Federal Government taxes all productivity in America. Every single thing that's productive the Federal Government has figured out how to tax.

If you punch a time clock in the morning—let's say Monday morning, 8 o'clock, Americans by the millions step up and punch that time clock. From that instant forward, Uncle Sam has his hand out. It just comes out automatically. He hears the time clock, and his hand goes out. It's like a Pavlovian reflex that comes from Uncle Sam. There's a mystical little image of Uncle Sam there beside that time clock, and when he hears that noise, it's like Pavlov's dog. When he heard the bell ring, he salivated because he got fed when the bell rang. And when the time clock kicks in, Uncle Sam's hand goes out.

And all the money that you earn from that moment forward until he gets his fill goes into Uncle Sam's hand for that day. And some time—oh, maybe, if you're lucky, before noon—he gets enough of it that he can put his hand in his pocket and walk away for the day. Uncle Sam has taxed—he has punished, actually—your productivity because there is a disincentive to produce if the government is going to take your production from you and put it in its pocket.

Now, we don't mind sharing some of this. I mean, we go to church and provide our donations there, and Americans are very generous people when it comes to charity. There is no one more generous than Americans when it comes to that. But it is discouraging to have the Federal Government take the first dollar from the first hour and every dollar from every hour until they get all that they want. But that's what happens.

But out of that, out of that first lien on all productivity—and by the way,

Madam Speaker, it's not just those people who punch the time clock; it's those people that work on commission, too. If your commission check is, say, 10 percent of what you sell, Uncle Sam is going to get his out of that before you get your commission. You all know that. If you have earnings, savings or investment, Uncle Sam is going to get his tax out of that, too. It is a punishment for productivity.

The Federal Government taxes all productivity in America, and they tax it first. They have the first lien on all earnings, savings and investment in America. And then out of that—and by the way, that private sector that I'm talking about produces goods and services that have a marketable value here in this country and abroad. That's our export market. That's what has value. And the rest of all of this is just what supports it and what runs off of taxes on it, but you have to increase the productivity of your goods and services that have a marketable value domestically and abroad if you're going to recover from this economy.

The private sector in America has to produce those goods and services in a volume and in a competitive way adequate to recover now from Obamanomics, to recover from the more than \$3 trillion in irresponsible spending. And it has to have enough confidence that the government is not going to step in and punish that productivity and tax that productivity by increasing taxes on it or putting that heavy burden of regulation on it, and someone put out a number here a couple of weeks ago that the annual burden of regulation is something like \$1.7 trillion a year in America.

I can tell you, Madam Speaker, what it was like for me when I started a business up in 1975. I didn't have any money, I didn't have any capital, but I thought I knew how to do something that had a marketable value, and I had enough confidence to step up and do that; but my fear was, not that I couldn't do the work or that I couldn't market, sell my skills or that I couldn't manage the books or fix the equipment or get it moved to the location or do the job, do all the things that were part of the function of the business that I started.

My fear was that the government would come in and punish me in a way that I didn't expect, that the government would come in and maybe do an IRS audit at a time that—we all feared the IRS then. I think we do now. That happened. It happened over and over again. It looked like the IRS wanted to haunt me there for a while. And to this day, I don't think that I did anything other than comply with all of those laws. I was punished anyway.

Another fear I had was: What about government regulation? How could I possibly know which government regulator would come swooping in on me and shut my business down and punish me with penalties that I couldn't anticipate? Fortunately, I was never really at that point where the regulators

came in and shut me down in that fashion, but many businesses have been. The weight of this regulation—if that's the number, \$1.7 trillion a year—is a tremendous amount of American capital that is consumed in trying to comply with regulators.

I would pose this question, Madam Speaker: Out of the millions of businesses that there are, let's just say, does anyone know of a single business in America that has ever uttered a statement or put up on their Web site or printed a business card that would say words to the effect of: "We are in compliance with all government regulations"? Can anybody think of a single business that has made such a statement or taken such a stand? I'd say not.

Now, I ask that question because it is a good question that calls us to examine why it is that no business claims that they're complying with all government regulations. The reason is because it's impossible, Madam Speaker.

Years ago, I had a task of doing seminars in five different States at State conventions. And one of the things that I began to do was ask my colleagues who were in similar business—and these were self-employed people. Most of them started the businesses themselves. Sometimes they were second- and third-generation businesses as King Construction is today, a second-generation business.

But I would ask the question, How many agencies regulate our trade, Earth-moving business? How many agencies regulate our trade? And so they would say, well, the EPA does and the DNR does and the IRS does and the DOT does and the tax man does. And as we began writing that down on a—it was a chalkboard in those days—we came to this conclusion that we were directly regulated by 43 different agencies. So I would begin to ask the question—in a closed room, no press—are you in compliance with these EPA regulations? And then we would have a long discussion about how hard it was.

And they were never comfortable, even back then in the eighties, that they were in compliance with the EPA regulations, because they could always be read in a different way by the next generation of environmental extremists that would get a job. Where would you go? What if you're genetically born to be an environmental extremist? Where would you look for a job? The EPA. And wouldn't you think that you had a cause that was as worthy as the cause of your father or your mother, who advanced the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act and a number of the other environmental legislation that passed through here without a lot of restraint in the seventies, and had some justification then, and did clean up our waters and our sewers and our landfills and continue to do so to this day?

They had a cause. They were on a crusade of environmental clean-up back in the seventies, and now their

children have jobs working for the EPA, and they have a belief and a conviction and a crusade that is as powerful to them as it was to their parents or their successors, the earlier generation.

But we've cleaned up the environment a lot since the seventies. Most people now enjoy clean water and good sanitary sewer systems and a pretty good system of handling the waste that comes out of society. But the people that are involved as regulators don't see it that way because they have a cause, and now they think they need to trudge forward on a cause. They will never be satisfied because that's what they do.

So regulations are never going to be all complied with; they keep changing the rules as you go forward. Now they want to regulate anybody that has a 1,000-gallon fuel tank, that it has to have a storage levee or dike built around it or some type of a structural containment for that, as if there's going to be a spill in every location and it can't be cleaned up. Well, we know they can be cleaned up. We don't have a problem, but they have a solution for us regardless. That's just the EPA. And we can go on down the line.

Is anybody in compliance with every IRS opinion?

□ 1210

The old story goes this way. If you want an argument, just ask two lawyers their opinion. Well, if you want an argument, just ask two representatives of the IRS their opinion and you will get two different opinions, almost as a rule. Anything that's halfway contentious, you'll get two different opinions, which means no one can be confident they are in compliance with the IRS rules because the rules aren't clear enough. Even the people who enforce them can't agree what they are. We can go on down the line.

In my State, the Department of Natural Resources, they do enforce the EPA rules. There are conflicting opinions there, and the conflicting opinions go on and on and on. But, Madam Speaker, it's not just 43 agencies. Those are the 43 that we identified that regulated my trade back in the 1980s. Now there's a Web site called Constitution Daily that counted these all up a couple of years ago, and they came up with 682 different agencies. Now, I'll admit, these are departments and divisions of agencies, but 682 entities that regulate in America—682. No one person could memorize them all. It's impossible to know all of the regulations that they have written.

We have ObamaCare now coming at us, grinding up and consuming American liberty. And what do we get out of that? 2,600 pages of legislation, and the regulations at this point have reached over 8,700 pages of regulations just on ObamaCare. And we saw here the other day that the CEO of Home Depot said he believes that ObamaCare, itself, will generate over 150,000 pages of regulation.

Now, it makes it real clear, even if you are a huge, huge corporation, you cannot analyze all of this and be sure that you are in compliance with regulations. So what do businesses do? One is they don't start up because of fear of all of this. Who in their right mind would start up a business right now that employed 51 people, for starters? They would be under the requirement to establish the health insurance plan that the government would approve for every one of their employees. So instead, they sit on their capital and they don't invest, and part of it is the tax burden.

Another thing we know is if this Congress doesn't act between now and the end of 2012, we will see a huge tax increase. That was part of the negotiations last fall that bridged us over until we get past another Presidential election. So we have a huge tax increase ahead of us when the Bush brackets expire, and it triggers back in all of those brackets—all of that going on—while there is \$23.6 billion that is automatically appropriated, that \$23.6 billion of the \$105.5 billion that is automatically appropriated, and I say deceptively appropriated in ObamaCare, itself.

So we have ObamaCare regulations going in place. The roots of ObamaCare are going down. The American people are starting to think that we don't have the determination here in this House to repeal ObamaCare.

I come here, Madam Speaker, to remind you and anybody that might be listening to this deliberation here on the floor of the House that this House has passed the repeal of ObamaCare. Every Republican voted to repeal ObamaCare. We sent it over to the Senate. The Senate also held a vote, and every Republican in the Senate voted to repeal ObamaCare. However, they didn't pass the repeal in the Senate, and so the repeal failed. Well, that had something to do with the President, who has a lot of belief in his signature piece of legislation. His future and his destiny are wrapped up in ObamaCare.

However, we know that the American people have said that they want all of ObamaCare ripped out by the roots. They want it gone, lock, stock, and barrel, with not one shred, not one DNA particle of ObamaCare left behind. The American people understand that ObamaCare is a malignant tumor that is metastasizing and consuming the liberty of the American people, and it must be repealed. This House is resolute in their repealing of ObamaCare.

We have also passed out of this House with a significant majority the legislation that cuts off all funding that would be used to enforce or implement ObamaCare. We did that as a part of the CR that came out of here that finally the President signed. They stripped the funding out of it and voted it out in the Senate at the direction of HARRY REID.

So, Madam Speaker, this House is resolute. The American people are resolute. And I will make this prediction

that I think needs to be understood, and that is this: If President Obama is reelected in 2012, that will guarantee that all of ObamaCare will be implemented and enforced. That operation of its implementation will be completed by 2014. That's kind of the schedule that it's on now. If the President is reelected, we get ObamaCare as the law of the land in perpetuity.

If he is not and we elect another President, a different President, that will be on the foundation that we will repeal ObamaCare under the signature of the next President of the United States.

I see that the Speaker of the House has arrived on the floor, and I'd be happy to yield to whatever cause that might be.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is a huge gulf between Washington, D.C., and the American people. They are dealing with tough times. They're struggling to pay their bills. They look to Washington, and they see politicians who can't stop spending money, their money.

Listen, we're broke, and we need to stop the out-of-control spending spree that's going on in Washington, D.C.

The House has acted. We passed a bill that raised the debt limit, cuts spending, puts real reforms in place, and requires that Congress send to the States a balanced budget amendment. It's called Cut, Cap, and Balance. We've done our job.

The Democrats who run Washington have done nothing. They can't stop spending the American people's money. They won't, and they have refused. The Senate majority leader says that they won't offer a plan to cut spending or a plan to raise the debt limit. Frankly, that's irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, where is their plan?

President Obama talks about being the adult in the room. Where is his plan to cut spending and raise the debt limit?

Listen, we're in the fourth quarter here. We're fighting for jobs; we're fighting for the country's future, and we're fighting for the American people.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER). The gentleman has approximately 12 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very happy that the Speaker arrived on the floor to make that point. The point is this: We have passed Cut, Cap, and Balance. We have done our job. Now the challenge is for the United States Senate and the President of the United States to do their job.

I would prefer they just accept the model that has been messaged down that hallway over to the Senate, and I'd prefer that the President would endorse that and step up in the next few minutes and say let's get this done. This can be done in a very short period

of time. All we have to do is agree. Instead, the President and the Democrats in the majority in the Senate seem to want to insist upon tax increases being part of any package that might come through.

Well, this goose that lays the golden egg is the free enterprise private sector goose. This goose has to live off of some profits, and they have to have profit in order to have jobs.

I would add to the Speaker's statement the question about it has been about jobs. We've done our job. This is about jobs. But I think we fail to remind the American people that wages are what pay for jobs. Nobody is going to say, I have a job, but it doesn't pay. The money has to come from somewhere. Where does it come from?

That needs to be stated and restated that the money for wages that pays for jobs has to come out of profit. Nobody can operate at a loss, so companies have to make some money. If they don't have an opportunity to do so because of the burden of taxes or because of the burden of regulation or the burden of the indecision in not knowing what the government is going to do next, which keeps a lot of that capital on the sidelines, they are not going to expand or do new hires. In fact, they're not going to provide wages and benefit packages of increases unless they have profit.

□ 1220

So I'm one of those people that thinks I want businesses to make money. I want them to make money, and I want them to expand the jobs, and I want them to invest the money with confidence they can make more. If it goes to their head too far and they become too vertically integrated or too monopolistic, then it's up to the entrepreneurs out there to take a look and say, I think I can gather the capital together and compete against them and provide a good or a service that has a better value—and make money doing it. And in doing so, that profit turns into jobs.

I am one who has met payroll for over 1,440 consecutive weeks. I made it every week on time. There were times that we didn't do very well in our household because I paid me last. I paid the employees first because they're the frontline troops. I paid the interest at the bank second because I had to have the capital to operate. You set those priorities when you go through those things. But jobs come from profit. And let's have a scenario that allows businesses to invest and to have confidence in the future. And Cut, Cap, and Balance does lay out the right scenario.

I know that Speaker BOEHNER has been concerned about hitting this August 2 deadline that I think is not as hard a deadline as Tim Geithner believes it is. I think the Secretary of the Treasury is carrying water for the President of the United States and putting statements out there. I think the President of the United States is willfully scaring seniors.

I think he's doing so when he says that he can't guarantee that military pensions or Social Security would be paid on time. Mr. Speaker, yes, they can. The only person on the planet that can guarantee they would be paid on time is the President of the United States. So you couldn't be any more wrong than when he says he can't guarantee it. Yes, he can. Does he know this truth? Can he not understand his job? He seems to exert his power where it doesn't exist. Doesn't he know that he can exert his power where it does exist?

I'll just tell this anecdote that was part of a political commercial, and I'll let people draw their own conclusions on this. Back in 1996, when Bill Clinton was up for reelection, there was a commercial that was run, and it was the face and voice of—a lot of us think of him as Moses since he passed away—Charlton Heston. He looked into the camera, and he was speaking presumably to President Clinton when he said, Mr. President, when you say something that's wrong and you don't know that it's wrong, that's a mistake. But when you say something that's wrong and you know that it's wrong, that's a lie. That was what Charlton Heston said back in 1996.

I reflect upon those words today, and I make this point that I know the truth. The American people need to know the truth. And that truth is the President of the United States can set the priorities on how to spend the \$200 billion a month on average that comes in in revenue stream. All he has to do is step outside the Oval Office, step up to the microphones in the East Room or outside in this nice, beautiful, warm summertime we have in Washington, D.C., and say, I'm going to set those priorities.

If we can't make a deal with Speaker BOEHNER, who was just here on the floor, and with HARRY REID and MITCH MCCONNELL and all the folks that have to vote in the Senate—and by the way, the people that have to vote here in the House—if we can't make a deal, here's what I'd do. The President could do this in the next minute. I'm going to make sure our troops get paid first—on time every time. He can say that. He can say, And right behind that \$11 billion a month comes \$20 billion a month out of the funding stream we have. Whether we borrow or not, I'm going to guarantee that we service our debt, \$20 billion. And then, I want to make sure to take care of the national security issues. Those things will change, but I'll work those priorities. Right behind that we'll pay Social Security, and right behind that we'll pay Medicare.

If the President stood up and said that, we would have confidence that he isn't going to be in the business of scaring seniors or putting doubt into the minds of our military while they are dodging bullets in places like Afghanistan. We would have confidence. But instead, he says he can't guarantee. Mr. Speaker, we know he can.

We know he can guarantee. We should push that on him out of this House to let him know where we stand so the American people understand there is a moral standard here. One is: Tell the truth. The second moral standard is: Pay our military. The third moral standard is: Guarantee the full faith and credit of the United States Government. I've laid out the rest of these priorities, Mr. Speaker.

Cut, Cap, and Balance is an important position to stand on. This leverage that's here now must be used or we shirk our responsibility. Had the leverage been stronger back in 1995, that extra vote in the Senate that I spoke about some minutes ago would have been there, I believe. I believe the balanced budget amendment would have been sent to the States, and I believe the States would have ratified it. If that had been part of the Constitution the day I came here in January of 2003, I wouldn't have had to walk around on this floor and go find the chairman of the Budget Committee and say, Where's our balanced budget? And I wouldn't have gotten the answer back that I did get that day, We can't balance the budget. It's too hard. Well, if it was too hard in January of 2003, how hard is it now? It is a lot harder.

Yes, we can balance the budget. The States do that. The question becomes: When we send a balanced budget amendment to the States, do they ratify it? A lot of them would right away. Some of them would hold a special session to ratify a balanced budget to send that message as quickly as possible. But then you get out there to some of those States that have decided that they want to do irresponsible spending. California and Illinois come to mind. A lot of States went to austerity. They decided, We're going to borrow money, and we're going to ask the Federal Government to bail us out. In those States, if they're needed for ratification, there will have to be a changing of the political guard within their State legislatures. That means constitutional conservatives will step up, step out of their normal walk of life, advance themselves as candidates to run for State legislatures on the agenda of: I will go there, and I will push to ratify a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. Those candidates that stand on that position will be elected in significant numbers in the States where they're needed. And over a period of time we have a chance that the State legislatures would ratify—three-quarters of them—a balanced budget amendment. If that happens, it would be a wonderful gift for our posterity. It would be one of the best things that we could do in a generation, Mr. Speaker. And I urge that the American people weigh in on this and demand that the Senate and the President embrace Cut, Cap, and Balance.

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

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are a lot of things going on right now. One of them should be the business of the country. This body this week passed what many have said was truly historic. A truly historic bill passed the House of Representatives. It was not exactly what I wanted. I thought there was too much in it in the way of debt ceiling increase. I thought there was not enough in the way of budget cuts.

But what we found in the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill was that it included a provision that, before the debt ceiling would ever be increased again, we would have to have a constitutional amendment pass the House of Representatives with two-thirds and pass the Senate with two-thirds, which would not send it to the President for him to veto, as apparently he wants to do, but it would send it to the States directly. There's no provision for the President to sign a constitutional amendment after it passes the House and Senate with two-thirds of the vote. It goes to the States. If three-fourths ratify it, it's a part of the Constitution.

□ 1230

But in order to get the debt ceiling raised, we would have to have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution pass the two-thirds in the House and Senate. That seemed like an appropriate thing to do because, as many of us have said, the only way we're voting for a debt ceiling increase is if there is a real game changer as part of that that we can't get any other way that will set this country on the course to being fully fiscally responsible.

One of the reasons so many of us on both sides of the aisle ran for Congress was to come try to make sure that the liberties and the opportunities that we had growing up would be available to future generations. The only reason that I was born in the greatest country in the history of mankind was because prior generations did smart things, did things that the Bible would say are blessed things. They did things that caused future generations to be blessed. It wasn't because I deserved it. I'd done nothing in my mother's womb to deserve to have the liberties and opportunities I'd had, but it was because prior generations sacrificed. So many laid down their lives so that we would have these opportunities.

So we have an open process.

It's supposed to be.

We've got people in the gallery, Mr. Speaker. We've got people who are free to come to the U.S. Capitol because we're in the people's House right now. There are people across Capitol Hill—

Members who have their televisions on. People don't come to the floor like they once did to listen to speeches here, because they can sit in the comfort of their own offices and do other work and have C-SPAN on and listen. That has been going on for 30 years, and it has been a helpful thing. You can see what's going on on the floor and not just around Capitol Hill but all over the country. Most of us came here to try to make sure that those same opportunities are afforded to others.

There are a lot of different motivations, a lot of noble motivations for running for Congress, but I think most of us came here for that purpose. We disagree on the way to do it, but it is shocking that there could be so much disagreement over the absolute historic, unwavering principle that any nation that continually spends more than it brings into its government will cease to exist as a government. There is no historic element contrary to that. You can't find it. If a country, if a government, keeps spending more than it brings in, it is going to cease to exist.

The only question remains: When does that happen?

There are movements around the world to try to end the dollar as being the world's reserve currency. When that happens, the dollar is going to fall farther than it ever has, and it may not recover. That's why I think some countries want to see that happen. That's probably why George Soros wants to see that happen. We also are told that our rating of our indebtedness, our bonds, may be downgraded if we don't get our indebtedness under control. It only makes sense that that would happen if we don't get our spending under control.

It should be a no-brainer, but apparently that is a malady that exists here in Washington. Under the rules of the House of Representatives, I certainly can't say that there is anybody in the House or Senate who has no brain. We know, biologically, you have to have a brain, but it is possible that you can have a brain and not use it fully. I don't know how you explain the vote that took place right through that door and down that hall at the end of the Senate today. I don't know how to explain that. It's not that the Senate today had too much work to get done or too many bills to take up that they just didn't have time to try to save the country from ceasing to exist because it can't stop spending.

So it wasn't because there are too many other bills to take up. They have no bill to deal with the financial issues of this country. There is no bill down there that is going to be brought to the floor that will save this country from its own government's stupidity. According to the House rules, it's not that there is anybody stupid here in the House and Senate, but as a group, sometimes we do very stupid things. I would submit that what has happened today, from an historic standpoint, is a statement that, although nobody in a

body, according to the House rules, is stupid, a body can do a stupid thing.

So, even though there are no other bills being brought to the Senate floor to take up and vote on today, even though there are bills that have been filed to take care of this very issue, there is a Cut, Cap, and Balance bill in the Senate that has been filed to address this issue. Many have signed onto bills that will address these issues. They're down there, but they're not bringing them to the floor. There's not an overwhelming amount of work to be done on the Senate floor today, so they bring up the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill—not for debate.

Why would anybody be afraid of debating a bill that so many believe could help us save the country for future generations? Why would you be afraid to bring that up?

If you don't want to talk about it, if you don't want to have a debate on the House or the Senate floor on some bill that so many believe will help us save the country for future generations, you make a procedural move called a "motion to table," and that is what happened in the Senate today.

What courage that took.

It must have taken a lot of courage, and I'm not kidding about that when you know that there are so many people in the Senate body who want to talk about a game changer, who want to talk about what they believe with all their hearts could set us on a course to fiscal responsibility, that could save the country for future generations. You know all those people wanted to talk about it. It takes a lot of courage to stand up and say, "I move to table that bill." Now, I don't know what the motivation is that would cause someone to stand up and say, "I move to table. I second that." I don't know. I don't know why you would move to table.

I don't know the motivation, but I know it takes courage when right at half of the 100 people in the Senate want to take this bill up and talk about it and debate it and maybe amend it—because I would love to amend it. I would love to knock down the \$2.4 trillion in debt ceiling increase. I'd love to raise the amount of cuts. There are a number of things I'd like to tighten up in that bill, but it was the best bill we had available. What a great idea. Bring it to the floor. Let's talk about it. Let's amend it. Let's get it done.

The thing is, when you're in the majority of the House or the Senate and if you don't like a bill and if you bring it to the floor on an open rule, you can amend it on the floor. You can have the debate on whether or not it ought to be amended. We just went through that, and we voted for and against a lot of different amendments this week, many of which I didn't think we necessarily needed to vote on, but that's part of the process.

Why would anyone in the Senate be afraid of having that process on the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill?

I don't get it.

I know it took courage to move to table when all the polls show America is concerned about its future. Poll after poll shows that American adults in around the 70 percentage area believe that the next generation will not have the opportunities that our generation had. You know those feelings are out there in America. You know that there is a group that wants to change the way we do business in Washington, so we have to live within the amount of money that comes in and not spend more than that. You know that feeling is out there. You know that this is a bill that could change the way we do business.

Why wouldn't you want to even allow it to the Senate floor to talk about it?

It took courage to move to table. Here are the courageous Senators who voted to table, which means to prevent debate on the Cut, Cap, and Balance bill in the Senate. It truly took courage for these people in the face of 60, 70—some have indicated 80—but 60, 70 percent of America that wants us to get our financial house in order. There is a bill that will mandate that we do that. So it takes courage to prevent that bill from coming to the floor, not for a vote on the bill, but just to debate the bill, to talk about it in front of God and everybody on the Senate floor. It took courage.

□ 1240

I don't know the motivation for all of these people voting to prevent debate and prevent the bill from coming to the floor. I just know that these people had courage to prevent what the majority of the American people believe needs to be discussed and debated and voted on.

And these are the Senators with that courage to prevent what the majority of the American people wanted done:

From Hawaii, Senator AKAKA; from Montana, Senator BAUCUS; and from Alaska, Senator BEGICH; from Colorado, Senator BENNET; from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN; from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL; from California, Senator BOXER; from Ohio, Senator BROWN; Washington State, Senator CANTWELL; from Maryland, Senator CARDIN; from Delaware, Senator CARPER; from Pennsylvania, Senator CASEY; from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD; from Delaware, Senator COONS; from Illinois, Senator DURBIN; from California, Senator FEINSTEIN; from Minnesota, Senator FRANKEN.

And then these are the people who had the courage to say: We will not allow the debate on the floor of the Senate that might lead to a balanced budget amendment being passed. We're not going to allow that to come to the Senate floor.

So let me go through the remainder of the Senators.

Senator HAGAN from North Carolina, Senator HARKIN from the State of Iowa, Senator INOUE from Hawaii, Senator JOHNSON from South Dakota, Senator KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota,

Senator KOHL from Wisconsin, Senator LANDRIEU from Louisiana, Senator LAUTENBERG from New Jersey, Senator LEAHY from Vermont, Senator LEVIN from Michigan, Senator LIEBERMAN from Connecticut, Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia, Senator McCASKILL from Missouri, Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey, Senator MERKLEY from Oregon, Senator MIKULSKI from Maryland, Senator MURRAY from Washington.

And again, I attribute nothing but courage to these people for voting to prevent what a vast majority of American people want to have debated on the Senate floor. They were able to have the courage to say: We're not going to allow debate. We're not going to allow the chance that you might get this bill passed that could save America for future generations.

Further courageous Senators: Senator NELSON from Florida, Senator NELSON from Nebraska, Senator PRYOR from Arkansas, Senator REED from Rhode Island, Senator REID from Nevada, Senator ROCKEFELLER from West Virginia, Senator SANDERS from Vermont, Senator SCHUMER from New York, Senator SHAHEEN from New Hampshire, Senator STABENOW from Michigan, Senator TESTER from Montana, Senator UDALL from Colorado, Senator UDALL from New Mexico, Senator WARNER from Virginia, Senator WEBB from Virginia, Senator WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island, and Senator WYDEN from Oregon.

It took a lot of courage to take a stand and vote in the Senate that: we will not allow debate on this floor over a balanced budget amendment. We're not going to allow it despite the vast majority of Americans knowing that we have to get our fiscal house in order, knowing that a balanced budget amendment would force this body and the Senate body to do just that, knowing that that would prevent the White House from ever demanding that we spend \$3.8 trillion when we're only bringing in \$2.1 or \$2.2 trillion, knowing that it would force Congress and the government to live within their means. They had the courage to stand up and say: We're not going to allow that debate. We're not going to allow the risk that you might pass a bill that forces us to be fiscally responsible. It took a courageous stand, and they stood and took that stand.

Now, to have the President of the United States stand before the American public and say, I can't guarantee that seniors will get their Social Security checks, just requires a little bit of research to find out that apparently the President, just like all of us in Congress, we rely on our staffs; we rely on those around us to get us information so that we can speak truthfully from the information we glean for ourselves that our staffs help us gather.

That tells you, though, that whoever is helping the President is not giving him truthful, accurate information because the fact is the President is the

only person in this country who can guarantee that Social Security checks will go out just as the law requires. I can guarantee that the money is there and that it will be good even if this Congress does nothing for 3 years. Even if everything else falls apart, we can guarantee that the Social Security trust fund has, right now, \$2.6 trillion in treasury notes in the Social Security trust fund that can be converted to cash, that can, by law, only be used for Social Security benefits and expenses.

So, the only reason that I or anyone else here in the House could not absolutely unforeseen guarantee that seniors will get their Social Security checks is because there is one element that could prevent that on the 2nd or 3rd of August, and that's if the President or Timothy Geithner ordered that checks would not go out, knowing—well, I don't know if the President knows. He may not have been given accurate information. I know Timothy Geithner knows that there is \$2.6 trillion in the Social Security trust fund, that in 1985 there was a shortfall, and there was not enough cash to pay Social Security payments, and so they sold some of the treasury notes to get cash to make sure all of the Social Security checks were paid. 1985.

Some were apparently concerned that might not have been legal. So in 1996, a Republican majority in Congress passed a law that basically says, hey, if there is a shortfall some month, then since there are trillions of dollars in the treasury notes in the Social Security trust fund, the administration can sell those treasury notes, just enough to make up the shortfall and assure that Social Security checks will go out. They made that a matter of law so that the administration may do that.

What I've been proposing that we should make as a part of a prioritization bill that passed—we bring before the House and pass it, bring before the Senate, and these same courageous people would probably table that, too, but it would say not that Social Security is a group of bills with others that must be paid, because by law Social Security is separate. By law, it is paid with Social Security payroll taxes; and by law, if there's not enough cash to do that some month, you may take the treasury notes and sell just enough to make up that shortfall.

Since the United States bonds and treasury notes are still about the most desirable financial bond note to be purchased in the world, especially when you look at the alternatives—Greece, Portugal, Spain, France—not a lot of good choices. So they're buying our notes, and they would. That would continue at least until we quit paying our bills properly.

□ 1250

But I think the law ought to be changed to say not “may” but “must,” so that in the future no President could ever go before the American pub-

lic and say, “I can't guarantee Social Security checks won't go out,” because he is the one person in America that is the only person in America, he and his Secretary of the Treasury, that can stop them from going out, and if we make that “may” a “must” or a “shall,” then he has no option. Then we can guarantee that Social Security checks will not be interrupted, because then we would know that the President has no option. He cannot interrupt the money that is there from going to Social Security recipients. It has to go, or he violates the law, and that could be grounds, if he stepped in—heck, if he stepped in even now and said, “look, the money's there in the trust fund, but I want to make a political issue out of this and I need a crisis in order to do that, so I'm going to step in and prevent the Social Security checks from going out this month,” there would have to be action taken against the President. That is just irresponsible. I think it's totally inappropriate for a President to scare our seniors.

I also think it's totally inappropriate to scare our military, and that's why I've been pushing for months a bill to ensure that people in harm's way never have to have it cross their mind that their check may not go home to their families. They should never have to have that cross their mind, never have it be a thought. I thought about that a month or so ago as I accompanied the body of one of our heroes from New York to Gladewater, Texas. The family, the military member, should never have to worry that their check won't be there. If there is a shutdown, if the government decides, we've got money here, but we're not going to pay our bills, well, we ought to make sure that a number of things get done.

We keep being told that, gee, what if we default? There is absolutely, unequivocally no reason we would default on our debt unless for some strange reason the President and the Treasury Secretary, either/or, decide that they want to create and instigate such a financial crisis that they get whatever they want. That's the only reason there would be a default.

As Steve Moore from the Wall Street Journal said yesterday, there's nothing that magic about August 2. There is no way that the President or Tim Geithner would be insane enough not to pay what we owe as it comes due. It's one thing for Secretary Geithner not to pay his taxes for 4 years in a row. It's quite another to put a nation at risk by refusing to send out the payments for the debts as they come due for the U.S.

It should also be noted that there are hundreds of billions of dollars that the United States owes to the United States. So if the United States doesn't pay itself, what are we going to do—send out a notice that the United States didn't pay the United States, so we're deadbeats now? I mean, come on. There is so much political gamesmanship going on, and we were sent here to

deal with the critical issues of this country, and being financially responsible is one of those things.

Now, I doubt that very many people actually look at the back of their dollar bills, and I know they're having more and more trouble getting those dollar bills; but if you look at the back of the dollar bills, on either side, you see the two sides of the United States great seal that was adopted initially in the first version around the time of the revolution. The eagle has changed a little bit over the centuries but was basically this by 1790.

Some people think that “e pluribus unum,” which is on the light fixture up here, Latin meaning “out of many, one,” come from all over the world and come to America, we become one people, we speak one language, we become one people, “e pluribus unum.” Some think that's the national motto. It's not. It's part of the great seal and has been since the Revolution. “E pluribus unum” is on the ribbon that runs through the eagle's mouth.

You've got 13 stars that cause us to remember the 13 original States.

You've got a pyramid symbolizing this masterful, huge work, and above the pyramid is an eye in a triangle with a glow around it. The eye was put in the great seal back in the 1700s to symbolize the eye of God, the all-seeing eye of God. It's why there's the halo, the glow, around it. And above those words in Latin are the words “annuit coeptis.” They're also above one of the doors in the Senate, so that every Senator can look up, and if they know what the Latin means, they should be deeply touched and should be reminded of how important our job is, because “annuit coeptis” on the back of every dollar bill everywhere in America means this: He, God, has smiled on our undertaking.

The reason that the Senate desired to have “annuit coeptis” above one of the doors is so Senators would be reminded that at this country's inception, He, God, smiled on our undertaking. I can't help but wonder, today, as the all-seeing eye of God symbolized here looks at what is going on with our financial responsibility and our refusal to even debate becoming financially responsible in the Senate, if He, God, continues to smile on our undertaking.

Some bank, for a joke at one time, had said, “In God we trust. From all others, we accept cash.” In God We Trust is our national motto. And as I mentioned to Prime Minister Netanyahu as he came down the aisle before he took the podium here and spoke recently, I said, “Keep in mind the entire time you're addressing us, our national motto is above your head.” He said, “I had already thought about that.”

Everybody in this body ought to think about it. Our trust is in God, but does He have any trust in us after what has been done, spending so much more than the amount we've been entrusted with as stewards? We've got to do better.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

□ 1300

To close, I want to finish with a short prayer that was prayed by the U.S. Senate Chaplain in the 1940s, Peter Marshall:

“May our prayer, O Christ, awaken all Thy human reminiscences, that we may feel in our hearts the sympathizing Jesus. Thou hast walked this earthly vale and hast not forgotten what it is to be tired, what it is to know aching muscles, as Thou didst work long hours at the carpenter’s bench. Thou hast not forgotten what it is to feel the sharp stabs of pain, or hunger or thirst. Thou knowest what it is to be forgotten, to be lonely. Thou dost remember the feel of hot and scalding tears running down Thy cheeks.

“O, we thank Thee that Thou wert willing to come to Earth and share with us the weaknesses of the flesh, for now we know that Thou dost understand all that we are ever called upon to bear. We know that Thou, our God, art still able to do more than we ask or expect. So bless us, each one, not according to our deserving, but according to the riches in glory of Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.”

From the Senate history.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from improper references to the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 25, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Gary L. Ackerman, Sandy Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alex-

ander, Jason Altmire, Justin Amash, Robert E. Andrews, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Tammy Baldwin, Lou Barletta, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Karen Bass, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Rick Berg, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Mo Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Ann Marie Buerkle, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Francisco “Quico” Canseco, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Hansen Clarke, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. “Gerry” Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Chip Cravaack, Eric A. “Rick” Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Mark S. Critz, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Jeff Flake, Charles J. “Chuck” Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, John Garamendi, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Gabrielle Giffords, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Janice Hahn, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Jane Harman*, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Nan A. S. Hayworth, Joseph J. Heck, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller*, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie Hirono, Kathleen C. Hochul, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Tim Huelskamp, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Dale E. Kildee, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Larry Kissell, John Kline, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug Lam-

born, Leonard Lance, Jeffrey M. Landry, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher J. Lee*, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Connie Mack, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Carolyn McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. “Buck” McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Mick Mulvaney, Christopher S. Murphy, Tim Murphy, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, John W. Olver, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Benjamin Quayle, Mike Quigley, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Silvestre Reyes, Reid J. Ribble, Laura Richardson, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, David Rivera, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter J. Roskam, Dennis Ross, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Robert T. Schilling, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. “Bobby” Scott, Tim Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland, Jackie Speier, Cliff Stearns, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott Tipton, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Joe Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Daniel Webster, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Allen B. West, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Frederica Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

2585. A letter from the Planning and Regulatory Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): Exclusion of Combat Pay From WIC Income Eligibility Determinations (RIN: 0584-AE04) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2586. A letter from the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Child and Adult Care Food Program Improving Management and Program Integrity (RIN: 0584-AC24) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2587. A letter from the Deputy Director for Policy, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2588. A letter from the Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rules and Regulations Implementing the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009 [WC Docket No. 11-39] received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2589. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-53; Introduction [Docket FAR 2011-0076, Sequence 5] received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2590. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Equal Opportunity for Veterans [FAC 2005-53; FAR Case 2009-007; Item I; Docket 2010-0101, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL67) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2591. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Unique Procurement Instrument Identifier [FAC 2005-53; FAR Case 2009-023; Item II; Docket 2010-0094, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL70) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2592. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive/Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; TINA Interest Calculations [FAC 2005-53; FAR Case 2009-034; Item VI; Docket 2010-0098, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL73) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2593. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reorganization of Title 30, Code of Federal Regulations [Docket No. ONRR-2011-0015] (RIN: 10112-AA06) received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2594. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulation Division, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Civil Money Penalty Amount for Inflation [Docket No. FR-5490-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD02) received July 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under Clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1938. A bill to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-140, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Ms. FOX: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2117. A bill to prohibit the Department of Education from overreaching into academic affairs and program eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; with an amendment (Rept. 112-177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HUNTER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2218. A bill to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; with an amendment (Rept. 112-178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 2623. A bill to establish a National Commission to Review the National Response Since the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 2624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified tuition and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2625. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to human subject research to improve protections for human subjects and, where appropriate because of the type research involved, to reduce regulatory burdens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2626. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain high-performance loudspeakers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2627. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty certain electrical transformers rated at 40VA; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. RIGELL):

H.R. 2628. A bill to prohibit the awarding of Federal grants and contracts to 4-year institutions of higher education that fail to offer academic credit for the successful comple-

tion of courses offered by a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2629. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to modify the 9-1-1, E9-1-1, and Next Generation 9-1-1 program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.R. 2630. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of emergency service volunteers as independent contractors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H. Res. 365. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should cut the United States' true debt burden by reducing home mortgage balances, forgiving student loans, and bringing down overall personal debt; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H. Res. 366. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Passport Month"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. TIBERI):

H. Res. 367. A resolution urging the people of the United States to observe October of each year as Italian and Italian American Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY
STATEMENT

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

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2623.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 2624.

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

The Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution: Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2625.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2626.

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

“clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.”

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2627.

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

“clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.”

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2628.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2629.

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

the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution Federal powers, as enumerated in section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 2630.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 100: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 110: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 179: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 181: Mr. RUNYAN and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 186: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 198: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 432: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 452: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 593: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HALL, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 615: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 645: Mr. QUAYLE and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 687: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 969: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 997: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
 H.R. 1093: Mr. HARPER and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 1116: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 1146: Mr. BROWN of Georgia.
 H.R. 1161: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1164: Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 1173: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 1179: Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 1240: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1244: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1254: Mrs. BONO MACK.
 H.R. 1288: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1327: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1370: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
 H.R. 1380: Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 1386: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 1449: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 1465: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 1546: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 1591: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 1732: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1734: Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 1776: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1817: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1834: Mr. SCHILLING.

H.R. 1905: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1916: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1996: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2020: Ms. BUERKLE.

H.R. 2033: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2040: Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 2071: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 2117: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 2124: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 2140: Mr. GALLEGLEY.

H.R. 2195: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2214: Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. DENT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KELLY, Mr. REED, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2223: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2236: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2264: Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 2319: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2324: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2369: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2401: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2402: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 2426: Ms. FOXF, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

H.R. 2437: Mr. HANNA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 2492: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2494: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2500: Ms. MOORE, Mr. HALL, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2529: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2540: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2544: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LEE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2563: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2587: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. HURT.

H.J. Res. 47: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.J. Res. 69: Mr. RUSH and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 130: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H. Res. 177: Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 207: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 295: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 352: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H. Res. 364: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BARROW, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. CRITZ on House Resolution 310: Earl Blumenauer, David E. Price, Collin C. Peterson, Edolphus Towns, Loretta Sanchez, Corrine Brown, Heath Shuler, and Jim McDermott.

Petition 2 by Mr. GOHMERT on H.R. 1297: Bill Posey, Sue Wilkins Myrick, André Carson, Trent Franks, Mike Pence, Tim Scott, Jason Altmire, Marsha Blackburn, David P. Roe, Rob Bishop, Thomas J. Rooney, and Cynthia M. Lummis.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2584

OFFERED BY: MRS. CHRISTENSEN

AMENDMENT No. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VII—DEREK M. HODGE VIRGIN ISLANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Derek M. Hodge Virgin Islands Improvement Act of 2011”.

SEC. 702. TAX-FREE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM CERTAIN RETIREMENT PLAN ASSETS INVESTED UNDER A VIRGIN ISLANDS INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to pension, profit-sharing, stock bonus plans, etc.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 409B. TREATMENT OF DISTRIBUTIONS FROM CERTAIN RETIREMENT PLAN ASSETS INVESTED UNDER A VIRGIN ISLANDS INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If an individual under the age of 61 makes a one-time designation of an amount of qualified retirement savings as being under investment by the Virgin Islands Investment Program for at least 30 years, then, as of the close of the 10th year, such amount (and any earnings properly allocable to such amount) shall be treated for purposes of this title—

“(1) as a designated Roth account in the case of qualified retirement savings described in subsection (b)(1), or

“(2) as a Roth IRA in the case of qualified retirement savings described in subsection (b)(2).

No amount shall be includible in gross income by reason of the change in treatment under the preceding sentence.

“(b) QUALIFIED RETIREMENT SAVINGS.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified retirement savings’ means—

“(1) amounts attributable to elective deferrals under an applicable retirement plan, and

“(2) amounts held in an individual retirement plan which is not a Roth IRA.

“(c) VIRGIN ISLANDS INVESTMENT PROGRAM.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘Virgin Islands Investment Program’ means a program of the Virgin Islands which meets the requirements of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5).

“(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT ACCEPTED FOR MANAGEMENT.—A program meets the requirements of this paragraph if the amount accepted for management under the program does not exceed \$50,000,000,000.

“(3) FEES AND TAXES.—A program meets the requirements of this paragraph if—

“(A) the fees charged by investment managers under the program do not exceed the fees customarily imposed by investment managers for managing like qualified retirement savings outside the Virgin Islands Investment Program,

“(B) the program imposes an annual tax (in addition to the fees permitted under subparagraph (A)) equal to—

“(i) 1.5 percent of the amount designated for management under the program for the first 10 years of the account, and

“(ii) 1 percent of the amount designated for management under the program for the remainder of the life of the account without regard to account balance, and

“(C) the 1 percent tax is imposed notwithstanding the Roth designation.

“(4) INVESTMENT MANAGER.—A program meets the requirements of this paragraph if

the investment managers under the program are chosen by the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

“(5) SEPARATE ACCOUNTING.—A program meets the requirements of this paragraph if the program—

“(A) establishes separate accounts for each type of qualified retirement savings held for the benefit of each individual and any earnings properly allocable to such assets, and

“(B) maintains separate recordkeeping with respect to each account.

“(d) USE OF 1 PERCENT ANNUAL TAX.—

“(1) REVENUES TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DURING FIRST 20 YEARS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Revenues from the tax referred to in subsection (c)(3)(B) shall be collected, held, and distributed for the benefit of the Virgin Islands in a manner similar to section 7652(b) (relating to rum excise tax).

“(B) DISTRIBUTIONS TO VIRGIN ISLANDS.—Funds and accrued interest described in subsection (d)(1)(A) may be paid from escrow to the Virgin Islands for expenditure only if—

“(i) the expenditure is pursuant to a qualified infrastructure development plan, and

“(ii) the expenditure is approved by the Secretary of the Interior as being pursuant to such plan.

“(C) QUALIFIED INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘qualified infrastructure development plan’ means a plan for improving and enhancing the infrastructure of the Virgin Islands which is—

“(i) developed and approved by the committee described in subparagraph (D), and

“(ii) approved by the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

“(D) COMMITTEE.—The committee described in this subparagraph is a committee—

“(i) comprised of 5 members, each serving a term of either three or five years—

“(I) 2 of whom are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, one for a 3-year and one for a 5-year term,

“(II) 2 of whom are appointed by the Virgin Islands legislature, one for a 3-year and one for a 5-year term, and

“(III) 1 of whom is appointed by the Secretary of the Interior for a 5-year term, and

“(ii) with respect to which a vacancy is filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

“(2) REVENUES TO THE UNITED STATES AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.—

“(A) DURING FIRST 20 YEARS.—Revenues from the fee referred to in subsection (c)(3)(B) imposed on designated assets after the first 10 years under management by the Virgin Islands Investment Program shall be collected by the United States Treasury in a manner similar to section 7652, upon which—

“(i) $\frac{1}{3}$ of the proceeds shall be distributed to the Virgin Islands for the first 10 years of management, and

“(ii) half of the proceeds shall be distributed to the Virgin Islands for the next 10 years of management.

“(B) AFTER THE FIRST 20 YEARS.—Beginning in the 21st year, the entire 1 percent tax collected shall be retained by the United States Treasury.

“(C) MINIMUM HOLDING PERIOD.—No withdrawals may be made by an investor from

the account during the minimum holding period of ten years. Should the investor choose to withdraw money from the account during the minimum holding period, the investor would forfeit the tax advantages of the Fund. Any funds so withdrawn would be included in gross income and subject to Federal income tax, minus payments of the 1 percent tax.

“(3) EARLY WITHDRAWAL.—Should an investor withdraw the entire balance of the funds after the 10-year minimum holding period but before the end of the 30 years, his account will be liable for the entire 1 percent tax for each of the remaining years.

“(e) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) ELECTIVE DEFERRALS; APPLICABLE RETIREMENT PLAN.—The terms ‘elective deferrals’ and ‘applicable retirement plan’ have the respective meanings given such terms by section 402A.

“(2) VIRGIN ISLANDS.—The term ‘Virgin Islands’ means the United States Virgin Islands.

“(3) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The term ‘Secretary of the Interior’ means the Secretary of the Interior or his designee.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part I is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 409B. Treatment of distributions from certain retirement plan assets invested under a Virgin Islands investment program.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.