

Olson	Rothman (NJ)	Sutton
Olver	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Owens	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Pallone	Rush	Thompson (PA)
Pascarella	Ryan (OH)	Tiberi
Pastor (AZ)	Sánchez, Linda	Tierney
Paulsen	T.	Tipton
Pelosi	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
Perlmutter	Sarbanes	Towns
Peters	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Peterson	Schiff	Turner
Pingree (ME)	Schmidt	Van Hollen
Platts	Schock	Velázquez
Polis	Schrader	Visclosky
Price (NC)	Schwartz	Walden
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Walz (MN)
Rahall	Scott, David	Wasserman
Rangel	Serrano	Schultz
Reed	Sewell	Waters
Reichert	Sherman	Watt
Reyes	Shuler	Waxman
Richardson	Simpson	Welch
Richmond	Sires	Whitfield
Rivera	Slaughter	Womack
Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Woolsey
Ros-Lehtinen	Speier	Wu
Ross (AR)	Stark	Yarmuth
Ross (FL)	Stivers	Young (AK)

considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 375, I call up the bill (S. 627) to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 375, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 112-184, modified by the amendments printed in part B of the report, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

S. 627

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Budget Control Act of 2011”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—

Sec. 1. *Short title; table of contents.*

TITLE I—TEN-YEAR DISCRETIONARY CAPS WITH SEQUESTER

Sec. 101. *Enforcing discretionary spending limits.*

Sec. 102. *Definitions.*

Sec. 103. *Reports and orders.*

Sec. 104. *Expiration.*

Sec. 105. *Conforming amendments to the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.*

TITLE II—VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Sec. 201. *Vote on the balanced budget amendment.*

Sec. 202. *Consideration by the other House.*

TITLE III—DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS

Sec. 301. *Debt ceiling disapproval process.*

TITLE IV—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

Sec. 401. *Establishment of Joint Select Committee.*

Sec. 402. *Expedited consideration of joint committee recommendations.*

Sec. 403. *Funding.*

Sec. 404. *Rulemaking.*

TITLE V—PELL GRANT AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM CHANGES

Sec. 501. *Federal Pell Grants.*

Sec. 502. *Termination of authority to make interest subsidized loans to graduate and professional students.*

Sec. 503. *Termination of Direct Loan repayment incentives.*

Sec. 504. *Inapplicability of title IV negotiated rulemaking and master calendar exception.*

TITLE I—TEN-YEAR DISCRETIONARY CAPS WITH SEQUESTER

SEC. 101. ENFORCING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 251. ENFORCING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

“(a) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) SEQUESTRATION.—Within 15 calendar days after Congress adjourns to end a session there shall be a sequestration to eliminate a budget-year breach, if any.

“(2) ELIMINATING A BREACH.—Each non-exempt account shall be reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the enacted level of sequestrable budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to eliminate a breach.

“(3) MILITARY PERSONNEL.—If the President uses the authority to exempt any personnel account from sequestration under section 255(f), each account within subfunctional category 051 (other than those military personnel accounts for which the authority provided under section 255(f) has been exercised) shall be further reduced by a dollar amount calculated by multiplying the enacted level of non-exempt budgetary resources in that account at that time by the uniform percentage necessary to offset the total dollar amount by which outlays are not reduced in military personnel accounts by reason of the use of such authority.

“(4) PART-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS.—If, on the date specified in paragraph (1), there is in effect an Act making or continuing appropriations for part of a fiscal year for any budget account, then the dollar sequestration calculated for that account under paragraphs (2) and (3) shall be subtracted from—

“(A) the annualized amount otherwise available by law in that account under that or a subsequent part-year appropriation; and

“(B) when a full-year appropriation for that account is enacted, from the amount otherwise provided by the full-year appropriation.

“(5) LOOK-BACK.—If, after June 30, an appropriation for the fiscal year in progress is enacted that causes a breach for that year (after taking into account any sequestration of amounts), the discretionary spending limits for the next fiscal year shall be reduced by the amount or amounts of that breach.

“(6) WITHIN-SESSION SEQUESTRATION.—If an appropriation for a fiscal year in progress is enacted (after Congress adjourns to end the session for that budget year and before July 1 of that fiscal year) that causes a breach for that year (after taking into account any prior sequestration of amounts), 15 days later there shall be a sequestration to eliminate that breach following the procedures set forth in paragraphs (2) through (4).

“(7) ESTIMATES.—

“(A) CBO ESTIMATES.—As soon as practicable after Congress completes action on any discretionary appropriation, CBO, after consultation with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall provide OMB with an estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority for the current year, if any, and the budget year provided by that legislation.

“(B) OMB ESTIMATES AND EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCES.—Not later than 7 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after the date of enactment of any discretionary appropriation, OMB shall transmit a report to the House of Representatives and to the Senate containing the CBO estimate of that legislation, an OMB estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority for the current year, if any, and the budget year provided by that legislation, and an explanation of any difference between the 2 estimates. If during the preparation of the report OMB determines that there is a significant difference between OMB and CBO, OMB shall consult with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate regarding that difference and that consultation shall include, to the extent practicable, written communication to those committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before the issuance of the report.

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Johnson (IL)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann	Ellison	Payne
Buerkle	Giffords	Wilson (FL)
Carson (IN)	Hinchey	
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1458

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. DOLD 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. 2584) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 377

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Ms. Hochul.

(2) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—Ms. Hahn.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be

“(C) ASSUMPTIONS AND GUIDELINES.—OMB estimates under this paragraph shall be made using current economic and technical assumptions. OMB shall use the OMB estimates transmitted to the Congress under this paragraph. OMB and CBO shall prepare estimates under this paragraph in conformance with scorekeeping guidelines determined after consultation among the House and Senate Committees on the Budget, CBO, and OMB.

“(D) ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph, amounts provided by annual appropriations shall include any discretionary appropriations for the current year, if any, and the budget year in accounts for which funding is provided in that legislation that result from previously enacted legislation.

“(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

“(1) CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.—When the President submits the budget under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, OMB shall calculate and the budget shall include adjustments to discretionary spending limits (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the budget year and each outyear to reflect changes in concepts and definitions. Such changes shall equal the baseline levels of new budget authority and outlays using up-to-date concepts and definitions minus those levels using the concepts and definitions in effect before such changes. Such changes may only be made after consultation with the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate and that consultation shall include written communication to such committees that affords such committees the opportunity to comment before official action is taken with respect to such changes.

“(2) SEQUESTRATION REPORTS.—When OMB submits a sequestration report under section 254(e), (f), or (g) for a fiscal year, OMB shall calculate, and the sequestration report and subsequent budgets submitted by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall include adjustments to discretionary spending limits (and those limits as adjusted) for the fiscal year and each succeeding year, as follows:

“(A) EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS; OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—If, for any fiscal year, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that—

“(i) the President designates as emergency requirements and that the Congress so designates in statute on an account by account basis; or

“(ii) the President designates for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism and that the Congress so designates in statute on an account by account basis; the adjustment shall be the total of such appropriations in discretionary accounts designated as emergency requirements or for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, as applicable, and the outlays flowing in all fiscal years from such appropriations.

“(B) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND REDETERMINATIONS.—(i) If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies an amount for continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such expenses for that fiscal year and the additional outlays flowing therefrom, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2012, \$623,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2013, \$751,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2014, \$924,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2015, \$1,123,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2016, \$1,166,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(VI) for fiscal year 2017, \$1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(VII) for fiscal year 2018, \$1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, \$1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IX) for fiscal year 2020, \$1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(X) for fiscal year 2021, \$1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(ii) As used in this subparagraph—

“(I) the term ‘continuing disability reviews’ means continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act; and

“(II) the term ‘additional new budget authority’ means the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of \$273,000,000, in an appropriation Act and specified to pay for the costs of continuing disability reviews under the heading ‘Limitation on Administrative Expenses’ for the Social Security Administration.

“(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL.—

“(i) If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies an amount for the health care fraud abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services (75–8393–0–7–571), then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such program for that fiscal year and the additional outlays flowing therefrom, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2012, \$270,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2013, \$299,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2014, \$329,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2015, \$361,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2016, \$395,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(VI) for fiscal year 2017, \$414,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(VII) for fiscal year 2018, \$434,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(VIII) for fiscal year 2019, \$454,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IX) for fiscal year 2020, \$475,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(X) for fiscal year 2021, \$496,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(ii) As used in this subparagraph, the term ‘additional new budget authority’ means the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of \$311,000,000, in an appropriation Act and specified to pay for the costs of the health care fraud and abuse control program.

The adjustment for outlays shall only be for the outlays flowing from the additional new budget authority and the total outlays adjustments made for any fiscal year shall not exceed the total adjustments made for that fiscal year in new budget authority.

“(c) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMIT.—As used in this part, the term ‘discretionary spending limit’ means—

“(1) with respect to fiscal year 2012, for total discretionary spending: \$1,043,000,000,000, in new budget authority of which new budget authority for function 050 shall be between \$535,440,000,000 and \$568,560,000,000;

“(2) with respect to fiscal year 2013, for total discretionary spending: \$1,047,000,000,000 in new budget authority of which new budget authority for function 050 shall be between \$537,440,000,000 and \$570,560,000,000;

“(3) with respect to fiscal year 2014, for total discretionary spending: \$1,066,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

“(4) with respect to fiscal year 2015, for total discretionary spending: \$1,086,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

“(5) with respect to fiscal year 2016, for total discretionary spending: \$1,107,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

“(6) with respect to fiscal year 2017, for total discretionary spending: \$1,131,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

“(7) with respect to fiscal year 2018, for total discretionary spending: \$1,156,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

“(8) with respect to fiscal year 2019, for total discretionary spending: \$1,182,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

“(9) with respect to fiscal year 2020, for total discretionary spending: \$1,208,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and

“(10) with respect to fiscal year 2021, for total discretionary spending: \$1,234,000,000,000 in new budget authority; as adjusted in strict conformance with subsection (b).”.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 250(c) is amended as follows:

(1) Strike paragraph (4) and redesignate succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

(2) In paragraph (7)(C) (as redesignated), strike “the food stamp program” and insert “the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program”.

(3) Strike paragraph (13) (as redesignated) and insert the following new paragraph:

“(13) The term ‘outyear’ means a fiscal year one or more years after the budget year.”.

(4) At the end, add the following new paragraphs:

“(19) The term ‘emergency’ means a situation that—

“(A) requires new budget authority and outlays (or new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom) for the prevention or mitigation of, or response to, loss of life or property, or a threat to national security; and

“(B) is unanticipated.

“(20) The term ‘unanticipated’ means that the underlying situation is—

“(A) sudden, which means quickly coming into being or not building up over time;

“(B) urgent, which means a pressing and compelling need requiring immediate action;

“(C) unforeseen, which means not predicted or anticipated as an emerging need; and

“(D) temporary, which means not of a permanent duration.”.

SEC. 103. REPORTS AND ORDERS.

Section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (c)(2), strike “2002” and insert “2021”.

(2) In subsection (f)(2)(A), strike “2002” and insert “2021”.

SEC. 104. EXPIRATION.

(a) REPEALER.—Section 275 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING CHANGE.—Sections 252(d)(1), 254(c), 254(f)(3), 254(f)(4), 254(g), and 254(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not apply to the Congressional Budget Office.

SEC. 105. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AND IMPROVEMENT CONTROL ACT OF 1974.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended as follows:

(1) Strike subsection (a) and insert the following:

“(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate may make appropriate budgetary adjustments of new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom in the same amount as required by section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.”.

(2) Strike subsections (b) and (e) and redesignate subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(3) At the end, add the following new subsections:

“(d) EMERGENCIES.—If a reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, contains a provision providing new budget authority and outlays or reducing revenue, and a designation of such provision as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall not count the budgetary effects of such provision for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

“(e) ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause the discretionary spending limits as set forth in section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act to be exceeded.”

(b) MOTION TO STRIKE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—(1) In the House of Representatives, if a reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, contains a provision providing new budget authority and outlays or reducing revenue, and a designation of such provision as an emergency pursuant to this section, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall not count the budgetary effects of such provision for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) In the House of Representatives, a proposal to strike a designation under paragraph (1) shall be excluded from an evaluation of budgetary effects for purposes of title III and title IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(3) An amendment offered under paragraph (2) that also proposes to reduce each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by the pending measure that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available shall be in order at any point in the reading of the pending measure.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) The terms ‘emergency’ and ‘unanticipated’ have the meanings given to such terms in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.”

(d) APPEALS FOR DISCRETIONARY CAPS.—Section 904(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by striking “and 312(c)” and inserting “312(c), and 314(e)”.

TITLE II—VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

SEC. 201. VOTE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

After September 30, 2011 and not later than December 31, 2011, the House of Representatives and Senate, respectively, shall vote on passage of a joint resolution, the title of which is as follows: “Joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.”

SEC. 202. CONSIDERATION BY THE OTHER HOUSE.

(a) HOUSE CONSIDERATION.—

(1) REFERRAL.—If the House receives a joint resolution described in section 201 from the Senate, such joint resolution shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. If the committee fails to report the joint resolution within five legislative days, it shall be in order to move that the House discharge the committee from further consideration of the joint resolution. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to discharge the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except twenty minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a mo-

tion is adopted, the House shall proceed immediately to consider the joint resolution in accordance with paragraph (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After the joint resolution has been referred to the appropriate calendar or the committee has been discharged (other than by motion) from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the joint resolution. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(b) SENATE CONSIDERATION.—(1) If the Senate receives a joint resolution described in section 201 from the House of Representatives, such joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate. If such committee has not reported the joint resolution at the close of the fifth session day after its receipt by the Senate, such committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar.

(2) Consideration of the joint resolution and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 20 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal. All time used for consideration of the joint resolution, including time used for quorum calls and voting, shall be counted against the total 20 hours of consideration.

(3) If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution, the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the seventh session day after such joint resolution has been reported or discharged or immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

TITLE III—DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS

SEC. 301. DEBT CEILING DISAPPROVAL PROCESS.

Subchapter I of chapter 31 of subtitle III of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 3101(b), by striking “or otherwise” and inserting “or as provided by section 3101A or otherwise”; and

(2) by inserting after section 3101, the following:

“§3101A. Presidential modification of the debt ceiling

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) \$900 BILLION.—

“(A) CERTIFICATION.—If, not later than December 31, 2011, the President submits a written certification to Congress that the President has determined that the debt subject to limit is within \$100,000,000,000 of the limit in section 3101(b) and that further borrowing is required to meet

existing commitments, the Secretary of the Treasury may exercise authority to borrow an additional \$900,000,000,000 subject to the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval enacted pursuant to this section. Upon submission of such certification, the limit on debt provided in section 3101(b) (referred to in this section as the ‘debt limit’) is increased by \$400,000,000,000.

“(B) RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Congress may consider a joint resolution of disapproval of the authority under subparagraph (A) as provided in subsections (b) through (f). The joint resolution of disapproval considered under this section shall contain only the language provided in subsection (b)(2). If the time for disapproval has lapsed without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval under this section, the debt limit is increased by an additional \$500,000,000,000.

“(2) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—

“(A) CERTIFICATION.—If, after the debt limit is increased by \$900,000,000,000 under paragraph (1), the President submits a written certification to Congress that the President has determined that the debt subject to limit is within \$100,000,000 of the limit in section 3101(b) and that further borrowing is required to meet existing commitments, the Secretary of the Treasury may exercise authority to borrow an additional amount equal to \$1,600,000,000,000 if the amount of deficit reduction achieved pursuant to the enactment of the joint committee bill as set forth pursuant to section 401(b)(3) of the Budget Control Act of 2011 is greater than \$1,600,000,000,000, subject to the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval enacted pursuant to this section.

“(B) RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Congress may consider a joint resolution of disapproval of the authority under subparagraph (A) as provided in subsections (b) through (f). The joint resolution of disapproval considered under this section shall contain only the language provided in subsection (b)(2). If the time for disapproval has lapsed without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval under this section, the debt limit is increased by the amount authorized under subparagraph (A).

“(b) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for the \$400,000,000,000 increase in the debt limit provided by subsection (a)(1)(A), the debt limit may not be raised under this section if, within 60 calendar days after the date on which Congress receives a certification described in subsection (a)(1) or within 15 calendar days after Congress receives the certification described in subsection (a)(2) (regardless of whether Congress is in session), there is enacted into law a joint resolution disapproving the President’s exercise of authority with respect to such additional amount.

“(2) CONTENTS OF JOINT RESOLUTION.—For the purpose of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution—

“(A)(i) for the certification described in subsection (a)(1), that is introduced on September 6, 7, 8, or 9, 2011 (or, if the Senate was not in session, the next calendar day on which the Senate is in session); and

“(ii) for the certification described in subsection (a)(2), that is introduced between the date the certification is received and 3 calendar days after that date;

“(B) which does not have a preamble;

“(C) the title of which is only as follows: ‘Joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the President’s exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as submitted under section 3101A of title 31, United States Code, on _____’, with the blank containing the date of such submission; and

“(D) the matter after the resolving clause of which is only as follows: ‘That Congress disapproves of the President’s exercise of authority to increase the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 3101A(a) of title 31, United States Code.’

“(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(1) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification described in subsection (a)(2), the Speaker, if the House would otherwise be adjourned, shall notify the Members of the House that, pursuant to this section, the House shall convene not later than the second calendar day after receipt of such certification.

“(2) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than 5 calendar days after the date of introduction of a joint resolution described in subsection (a). If a committee fails to report the joint resolution within that period, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar.

“(3) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution reports it to the House or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order, not later than the sixth day after introduction of a joint resolution under subsection (a), to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on a joint resolution addressing a particular submission. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

“(4) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

“(d) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN SENATE.—

“(1) RECONVENING.—Upon receipt of a certification under subsection (a)(2), if the Senate has adjourned or recessed for more than 2 days, the majority leader of the Senate, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate that, pursuant to this section, the Senate shall convene not later than the second calendar day after receipt of such message.

“(2) PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.—Upon introduction in the Senate, the joint resolution shall be immediately placed on the calendar.

“(3) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time during the period beginning on the day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (a) and, for the certification described in subsection (a)(1), ending on September 14, 2011, and for the certification described in subsection (a)(2), on the 6th day after the date on which Congress receives a certification under subsection (a) (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

“(B) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration of the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion fur-

ther to limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(C) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution, the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall occur immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

“(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

“(e) AMENDMENT NOT IN ORDER.—A joint resolution of disapproval considered pursuant to this section shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

“(f) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before passing the joint resolution, one House receives from the other a joint resolution—

“(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

“(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

“(2) TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint resolution under this section, the joint resolution of the House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

“(3) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the joint resolution in the Senate, the Senate then receives the companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

“(4) CONSIDERATION AFTER PASSAGE.—(A) If Congress passes a joint resolution, the period beginning on the date the President is presented with the joint resolution and ending on the date the President signs, allows to become law without his signature, or vetoes and returns the joint resolution (but excluding days when either House is not in session) shall be disregarded in computing the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1).

“(B) debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.”

“(5) VETO OVERRIDE.—If within the appropriate calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1), Congress overrides a veto of the joint resolution with respect to authority exercised pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the limit on debt provided in section 3101(b) shall not be raised, except for the \$400,000,000,000 increase in the limit provided by subsection (a)(1)(A).

“(6) SEQUESTER.—(A) If within the 60-calendar day period described in subsection (b)(1), Congress overrides a veto of the joint resolution with respect to authority exercised pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a), OMB shall, immediately, sequester pro rata amounts from all discretionary and direct spending accounts as defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)) (as in effect September 30, 2006) equal to \$400,000,000,000. No reduction of payments for net interest (functional category 900) shall be made under any order issued under this paragraph.

“(B) Section 255 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not apply to this section, except that payments for

military personnel accounts (within subfunctional category 051), TRICARE for Life, Medicare (functional category 570), military retirement, Social Security (functional category 650), veterans (functional category 700), and net interest (functional category 900) shall be exempt.

“(g) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection and subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) are enacted by Congress—

“(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

“(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.”

TITLE IV—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

SEC. 401. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this title:

(1) JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.—The term “joint committee” means the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction established under subsection (b)(1).

(2) JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE BILL.—The term “joint committee bill” means a bill consisting of the proposed legislative language of the joint committee recommended under subsection (b)(3)(B) and introduced under section 402(a).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a joint select committee of Congress to be known as the “Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction”.

(2) GOAL.—The goal of the joint committee shall be to reduce the deficit by \$1,800,000,000,000 or more over the period of fiscal years 2012 to 2021.

(3) DUTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) IMPROVING THE SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM FISCAL IMBALANCE.—The joint committee shall provide recommendations and legislative language that will significantly improve the short-term and long-term fiscal imbalance of the Federal Government.

(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEES.—Not later than October 14, 2011, each committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate may transmit to the joint committee its recommendations for changes in law to reduce the deficit consistent with the goal described in subsection (b)(2) for the joint committee’s consideration.

(B) REPORT, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 23, 2011, the joint committee shall vote on—

(I) a report that contains a detailed statement of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the joint committee and the CBO estimate required by paragraph (5)(D)(ii); and

(II) proposed legislative language to carry out such recommendations as described in subclause (I) which shall include a statement of the deficit reduction achieved by the legislation over the period of fiscal years 2012 to 2021.

Any change to the Rules of the House of Representatives or the Standing Rules of the Senate included in the report or legislative language shall be considered to be merely advisory.

(ii) APPROVAL OF REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—The report of the joint committee and the proposed legislative language described in clause (i) shall require the approval of a majority of the members of the joint committee.

(iii) ADDITIONAL VIEWS.—A member of the joint committee who gives notice of an intention

to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of final joint committee vote on the approval of the report and legislative language under clause (ii), shall be entitled to 3 calendar days in which to file such views in writing with the staff director of the joint committee. Such views shall then be included in the joint committee report and printed in the same volume, or part thereof, and their inclusion shall be noted on the cover of the report. In the absence of timely notice, the joint committee report may be printed and transmitted immediately without such views.

(iv) TRANSMISSION OF REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE.—If the report and legislative language are approved by the joint committee pursuant to clause (ii), then not later than December 2, 2011, the joint committee shall submit the joint committee report and legislative language described in clause (i) to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Majority and Minority Leaders of both Houses.

(v) REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE TO BE MADE PUBLIC.—Upon the approval or disapproval of the joint committee report and legislative language pursuant to clause (ii), the joint committee shall promptly make the full report and legislative language, and a record of the vote, available to the public.

(4) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The joint committee shall be composed of 12 members appointed pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) DESIGNATION.—Members of the joint committee shall be appointed as follows:

(i) The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(ii) The minority leader of the Senate shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the Senate.

(iii) The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(iv) The minority leader of the House of Representatives shall appoint 3 members from among Members of the House of Representatives.

(C) CO-CHAIRS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—There shall be 2 Co-Chairs of the joint committee. The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint one Co-Chair from among the members of the joint committee. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint the second Co-Chair from among the members of the joint committee. The Co-Chairs shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section.

(ii) STAFF DIRECTOR.—The Co-Chairs, acting jointly, shall hire the staff director of the joint committee.

(D) DATE.—Members of the joint committee shall be appointed not later than 14 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section.

(E) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the joint committee. Any vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled not later than 14 calendar days after the date on which the vacancy occurs in the same manner as the original designation. If a member of the committee leaves Congress, the member is no longer a member of the joint committee and a vacancy shall exist.

(5) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To enable the joint committee to exercise its powers, functions and duties, there are authorized to be disbursed by the Senate the actual and necessary expenses of the joint committee approved by the co-chairs, subject to Senate rules and regulations.

(B) EXPENSES.—In carrying out its functions, the joint committee is authorized to incur expenses in the same manner and under the same conditions as the Joint Economic Committee as authorized by section 11 of Public Law 79-304 (15 U.S.C. 1024 (d)).

(C) QUORUM.—7 members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of voting, meeting, and holding hearings.

(D) VOTING.—

(i) PROXY VOTING.—No proxy voting shall be allowed on behalf of the members of the joint committee.

(ii) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—The Congressional Budget Office shall provide estimates of the legislation (as described in paragraph (3)(B)) in accordance with sections 308(a) and 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 639(a) and 601(f)) (including estimates of the effect of interest payment on the debt). In addition, the Congressional Budget Office shall provide information on the budgetary effect of the legislation beyond the year 2021. The joint committee may not vote on any version of the report, recommendations, or legislative language unless such estimates are available for consideration by all members of the joint committee at least 48 hours prior to the vote as certified by the Co-Chairs.

(E) MEETINGS.—

(i) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 45 calendar days after the date of enactment of this section, the joint committee shall hold its first meeting.

(ii) AGENDA.—The Co-Chairs shall provide an agenda to the joint committee members not less than 48 hours in advance of any meeting.

(F) HEARINGS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The joint committee may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, require attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, and documents, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths the joint committee considers advisable.

(ii) HEARING PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CO-CHAIRS.—

(1) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The joint committee Co-Chairs shall make a public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted not less than 7 days in advance of such hearing, unless the Co-Chairs determine that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

(2) WRITTEN STATEMENT.—A witness appearing before the joint committee shall file a written statement of proposed testimony at least 2 calendar days prior to appearance, unless the requirement is waived by the Co-Chairs, following their determination that there is good cause for failure of compliance.

(G) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon written request of the Co-Chairs, a Federal agency shall provide technical assistance to the joint committee in order for the joint committee to carry out its duties.

(c) STAFF OF JOINT COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Co-Chairs of the joint committee may jointly appoint and fix the compensation of staff as they deem necessary, within the guidelines for Senate employees and following all applicable Senate rules and employment requirements.

(2) ETHICAL STANDARDS.—Members on the joint committee who serve in the House of Representatives shall be governed by the House ethics rules and requirements. Members of the Senate who serve on the joint committee and staff of the joint committee shall comply with Senate ethics rules.

(d) TERMINATION.—The joint committee shall terminate on January 13, 2012.

SEC. 402. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) INTRODUCTION.—If approved by the majority required by section 401(b)(3)(B)(ii), the proposed legislative language submitted pursuant to section 401(b)(3)(B)(iv) shall be introduced in the Senate (by request) on the next day on which the Senate is in session by the majority leader of the Senate or by a Member of the Senate designated by the majority leader of the Sen-

ate and shall be introduced in the House of Representatives (by request) on the next legislative day by the majority leader of the House or by a Member of the House designated by the majority leader of the House.

(b) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which the joint committee bill is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than December 9, 2011. If a committee fails to report the joint committee bill within that period, it shall be in order to move that the House discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. Such a motion shall not be in order after the last committee authorized to consider the bill reports it to the House or after the House has disposed of a motion to discharge the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. If such a motion is adopted, the House shall proceed immediately to consider the joint committee bill in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3). A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After the last committee authorized to consider a joint committee bill reports it to the House or has been discharged (other than by motion) from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint committee bill in the House. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to the joint committee bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The joint committee bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint committee bill and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint committee bill to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the joint committee bill. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall not be in order.

(4) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(c) EXPEDITED PROCEDURE IN THE SENATE.—

(1) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—A joint committee bill introduced in the Senate under subsection (a) shall be jointly referred to the committee or committees of jurisdiction, which committees shall report the bill without any revision and with a favorable recommendation, an unfavorable recommendation, or without recommendation, not later than December 9, 2011. If any committee fails to report the bill within that period, that committee shall be automatically discharged from consideration of the bill, and the bill shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) MOTION TO PROCEED.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order, not later than 2 days of session after the date on which a joint committee bill is reported or discharged from all committees to which it was referred, for the majority leader of the Senate or the majority leader's designee to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill. It shall also be in order for any Member of the Senate to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill at any time after the conclusion of such 2-day period. A motion to proceed is in order even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to. All points of order against the motion to proceed to the joint committee bill are waived.

The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint committee bill is agreed to, the joint committee bill shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(3) **CONSIDERATION.**—All points of order against the joint committee bill and against consideration of the joint committee bill are waived. Consideration of the joint committee bill and of all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith shall not exceed a total of 30 hours which shall be divided equally between the Majority and Minority Leaders or their designees. A motion further to limit debate on the joint committee bill is in order, shall require an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn, and is not debatable. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal. All time used for consideration of the joint committee bill, including time used for quorum calls and voting, shall be counted against the total 30 hours of consideration.

(4) **NO AMENDMENTS.**—An amendment to the joint committee bill, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint committee bill, is not in order.

(5) **VOTE ON PASSAGE.**—If the Senate has voted to proceed to the joint committee bill, the vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint committee bill, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill shall occur not later than December 23, 2011.

(6) **RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.**—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint committee bill shall be decided without debate.

(d) **AMENDMENT.**—The joint committee bill shall not be subject to amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(e) **CONSIDERATION BY THE OTHER HOUSE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If, before passing the joint committee bill, one House receives from the other a joint committee bill—

(A) the joint committee bill of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint committee bill had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint committee bill received from the other House shall supplant the joint committee bill of the receiving House.

(2) **REVENUE MEASURE.**—This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint committee bill received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(f) **RULES TO COORDINATE ACTION WITH OTHER HOUSE.**—

(1) **TREATMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.**—If the Senate fails to introduce or consider a joint committee bill under this section, the joint committee bill of the House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

(2) **TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES IN THE SENATE.**—If following passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate, the Senate then receives the joint committee bill from the House of Representatives, the House-passed joint committee bill shall not be debatable. The vote on passage of the joint committee bill in the Senate shall be considered to be the vote on passage of the joint committee bill received from the House of Representatives.

(3) **VETOES.**—If the President vetoes the joint committee bill, debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour equally

divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

(g) **LOSS OF PRIVILEGE.**—The provisions of this section shall cease to apply to the joint committee bill if—

(1) the joint committee fails to vote on the report or proposed legislative language required under section 201(b)(3)(B)(i) by November 23, 2011; or

(2) the joint committee bill does not pass both Houses by December 23, 2011.

SEC. 403. FUNDING.

Funding for the joint committee shall be derived in equal portions from—

(1) the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the contingent fund of the Senate from the appropriations account “Miscellaneous Items”, subject to Senate rules and regulations.

SEC. 404. RULEMAKING.

The provisions of this title are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

TITLE V—PELL GRANT AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM CHANGES

SEC. 501. FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.

Section 401(b)(7)(A)(iv) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(7)(A)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II), by striking “\$3,183,000,000” and inserting “\$12,183,000,000”; and

(2) in subclause (III), by striking “\$0” and inserting “\$8,000,000,000”.

SEC. 502. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INTEREST SUBSIDIZED LOANS TO GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS.

Section 455(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INTEREST SUBSIDIZED LOANS TO GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B) and notwithstanding any provision of this part or part B, for any period of instruction beginning on or after July 1, 2012—

“(i) a graduate or professional student shall not be eligible to receive a Federal Direct Stafford loan under this part; and

“(ii) the maximum annual amount of Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford loans such a student may borrow in any academic year (as defined in section 481(a)(2)) or its equivalent shall be the maximum annual amount for such student determined under section 428H, plus an amount equal to the amount of Federal Direct Stafford loans the student would have received in the absence of this subparagraph.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an individual enrolled in course work specified in paragraph (3)(B) or (4)(B) of section 484(b).”.

SEC. 503. TERMINATION OF DIRECT LOAN REPAYMENT INCENTIVES.

Section 455(b)(8) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)(8)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by amending the header to read as follows: “(A) **INCENTIVES FOR LOANS DISBURSED BEFORE JULY 1, 2012.**—”; and

(B) by inserting “with respect to loans for which the first disbursement of principal is made before July 1, 2012,” after “of this part”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “with respect to loans for which the first disbursement of principal is made before July 1, 2012” after “repayment incentives”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) **NO REPAYMENT INCENTIVES FOR NEW LOANS DISBURSED ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2012.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary is prohibited from authorizing or providing any repayment incentive not otherwise authorized under this part to encourage on-time repayment of a loan under this part for which the first disbursement of principal is made on or after July 1, 2012, including any reduction in the interest or origination fee rate paid by a borrower of such a loan, except that the Secretary may provide for an interest rate reduction for a borrower who agrees to have payments on such a loan automatically electronically debited from a bank account.”.

SEC. 504. INAPPLICABILITY OF TITLE IV NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING AND MASTER CALENDAR EXCEPTION.

Sections 482(c) and 492 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1089(c), 1098a) shall not apply to the amendments made by this title, or to any regulations promulgated under those amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 2 hours, with 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) each will control 30 minutes; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the measure before us.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it's about 1½ minutes after 3 p.m. on July 28, 2011. At this moment, we begin the debate on one of the most crucial items that we have had or will have before us.

Since 1962, on 75 different occasions, the United States Congress has chosen to increase the debt ceiling to ensure that we paid our past obligations. It has been done 75 times without ever having any strings attached whatsoever.

Last November, we all know that there was an overwhelming message

that was sent by the American people to Washington, DC; and that message was, number one, create jobs, get our economy back on track, and in so doing, rein in the dramatic increase in the size and scope and reach of government that we witnessed in the past several years. We all know that in the last 4 years we've had an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending. And so the message that was sent was: That has to come to an end.

So Speaker BOEHNER, when asked by the President of the United States to move an increase in the debt ceiling, said that he was willing to do that. He recognized, as I believe an overwhelming majority of both Democrats and Republicans in this institution recognize, it is absolutely essential that we increase the debt ceiling. We have to do everything that we can to ensure that Social Security checks get to those retirees. We have to make sure that the many other obligations that we have are in fact met.

And on that one issue of Social Security, we know that on July 12 the President of the United States in a speech said that if we don't see an increase in the debt ceiling by August 2, he could not guarantee that on August 3 those Social Security checks would go to our retirees. And so, Mr. Speaker, what happened was Speaker BOEHNER said we want to make sure that those Social Security checks get out. We want to make sure that we increase the debt ceiling so our Nation doesn't default and follow the pattern of Greece, Portugal, Ireland, and other countries in the world that have gone through tremendous economic devastation.

But what the Speaker said is that, while we are going to, in increasing the debt ceiling, meet those obligations of the past, we are not going to do it the way it has been done the last 75 times. We are going to get to the root cause of why it is that we have to increase the debt ceiling, and that is the runaway spending that Democrat and Republican, alike, decries regularly. And so the Speaker said that he would increase the debt ceiling, but he wanted to ensure that we cut spending in an amount that was greater than the level of the debt ceiling increase.

And so he began discussions, recognizing that Republicans—those who won this majority last November—only controlled the United States House of Representatives. Speaker BOEHNER does not look at the world through rose-colored glasses. He knows that the Republicans don't control the United States Senate and he knows that he has to work with President Obama. But he does know that the last statement that was made by the American people in November of last year was we've got to have a dramatic change in the course that we have been on. And so he began negotiating. He began discussions. He began working over the past several weeks and months to try to put together a bipartisan effort so that Democrats and Republicans, alike,

could come together and ensure that those Social Security checks get out and that the other obligations that we have are in fact met and that we do increase our debt ceiling.

We've all followed, and the American people are following very closely, the global markets are following closely, this debate and the discussions that are taking place. It came to a head last weekend when we know that the President of the United States had requested a 50 percent increase in the level of taxes to be increased from \$800 billion to \$1.2 trillion, and the Speaker of the House said that that was a non-starter. So the Speaker said that he wanted to work with the bipartisan leadership of the United States Congress, both Houses of Congress. And so last weekend we know that Speaker BOEHNER and the Democratic Majority Leader of the United States Senate, HARRY REID, came together and fashioned, by and large, the measure that is before us today.

Now, I'm the first to say that HARRY REID no longer supports this measure. HARRY REID has indicated that he does not support it. We have this letter from the 53 Senators. We have word that they're going to table this measure when it passes the House of Representatives. But it's important, Mr. Speaker, for everyone to recognize that what is before us today is, by and large, a measure that is not what Speaker BOEHNER would write if he were doing it on his own. It's a measure that is the byproduct of bipartisan discussion and, as the Speaker likes to say, the ability to find common ground.

We are, today, in a position where we face, in just a few days, the prospect of those Social Security checks not going out. And, Mr. Speaker, that's why I don't like this measure, but I'm voting for it. I'm voting for it because I want to get those Social Security checks out, I want to make sure that the United States of America does not default, and I believe that that's the responsible thing for us to do.

What we have before us in the House of Representatives is the closest thing to a bipartisan agreement. First of all, we know that, by and large, there have been no other plans put forward, but the plan that does exist—there are very few plans put forward. The plan that has been put forward by Senator REID is one that does not enjoy bipartisan support and it was not put together in a bipartisan way. This one was, by and large, even though it does not have the support of Senator REID any longer, was put together based on the discussions they had. I believe that this measure is deserving of strong bipartisan support here in the House of Representatives and from our colleagues in the United States Senate as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, in the name of sanity and in the name of ensuring that we maintain the solvency and the strength of the greatest nation the world has ever known, that we pass this measure and

that we send it to our colleagues in the United States Senate so that they can do the same, and so that when it's placed on the desk of the President of the United States, he will have his opportunity to ensure that what he predicted as a possibility for August 3, that being that Social Security checks do not go out, will not happen.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1510

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts seek to control the time of the gentlewoman from New York?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to open debate, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is no common ground here, nor was it sought. We find ourselves at an unprecedented place today. America stands on the brink of default. It stands there, my friends, because the leadership of this House has failed to act in a timely and responsible way. This is an unprecedented status for America, an intolerable place, and Americans are understandably outraged at this politically caused impasse that confronts us, the consequences of which for every American and our country have been correctly characterized as "catastrophic."

For more than two centuries, an American default has been unthinkable. The men and women who came before us in this Chamber built up the full faith and credit of the United States until it became the bedrock of the world's economy. Despite their differences, they agreed that the honor that comes from paying our bills responsibly and on time was a moral obligation.

Now our Nation is on the verge of breaking that trust. If America fails to pay its bills and default comes, the wound to the global economy, to jobs across this country, to our standing among nations, that wound will be entirely self-inflicted. It cannot and must not come to that.

Americans have overwhelmingly called on us to come to a balanced, bipartisan solution, one that pays our bills, reduces our deficit, and draws common contributions from all Americans—not only the vulnerable and the unconnected, but also those who have enjoyed our Nation's prosperity.

That is the consensus of the vast majority of the people who sent us here. They understand that "my way or the highway" is no way to govern. They understand that all of us who had a hand in accumulating our debt must share the work of paying it off. They understand that the prosperity and prestige of our country are at stake right now. And they are relying on the

ability of this body to put partisanship aside.

There will, in fact, be bipartisan opposition to this bill, but I predict there will be no Democrat for this bill because bipartisanism was not sought.

So I am deeply concerned that the short-term plan offered by Speaker BOEHNER would put us right back, right back here on the precipice of imminent default in just a few months, casting a pall of uncertainty over our economy and leading to a job-destroying credit downgrade.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Each of us, ladies and gentleman of this House, has a duty to end this impasse. Let's live up to that duty by voting down this partisan legislation.

And then let's come together on a balanced, bipartisan solution to reduce our deficit and pay our bills. I suggest to my friend from California that Majority Leader REID has offered just such a plan. In fact, it incorporates exactly what Speaker BOEHNER suggested in his speech in New York City. Let us embrace that plan. After this fails, let the Senate send it to us.

This is a moment of great crisis for our country and for our citizens, a crisis that demands our putting aside partisanship and politics for the good of our people. We're not there yet, but it is my great hope that we as a body can live up to that challenge. Our fellow citizens expect it, our duty demands it, our oath requires it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my very good friend from Maryland, the distinguished whip, that bipartisanism has been sought, and I am seeking it right now. So I hope very much that we will be in a position where we will be able to enjoy bipartisan support for this.

I yield 2 minutes to my very good friend, the gentlewoman from Hinsdale, Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), a hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a single Member of Congress or the administration who did not know that this day was coming. Washington was spending tax dollars faster than ever before, and the debt ceiling was caving in.

The question is: How do we respond? Do we protest? Do we argue? Or do we govern?

Last November, the voters asked for change. That's how this House stopped the largest tax increase in history and cut spending this year to levels not seen since 2008.

Today, we have the opportunity to take the next step by passing the Budget Control Act. This is a balanced compromise that will avert a default and stop the cycle of debt that is draining our economy. It makes nearly \$1 trillion in immediate cuts—more than the

debt increase—caps future spending, and lays the groundwork for additional savings in a balanced budget amendment.

In a perfect world, some of us would like more cuts. Those on the left also want a bigger plan—or at least a big enough debt increase to carry the President beyond the next campaign.

But the American people care about jobs, not politics. They want solutions that will restore confidence, credit, and growth in the United States. And neither a default nor a 2-year budget gimmick will accomplish that task. This bill will.

I urge my colleagues on both sides to recognize that good politics is about doing what's right for the American people. Let's take this opportunity, cut spending, and put America back on a sound fiscal path to prosperity.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we are 5 days away from a historic, unprecedented, and needless default. Instead of acting responsibly and in a bipartisan way to raise the debt ceiling, the Republican majority continues to hold the American economy hostage to press their agenda.

Even though the debt ceiling was raised seven times under President Bush, even though 110 current Members of the majority have voted to raise the debt ceiling in the past, the majority continues its dangerous game of brinksmanship.

Included in this bill is \$917 billion in cuts mostly to critical public investments like education, infrastructure, biomedical research, law enforcement, and food safety. They will all be slashed. And yet these programs, which are called discretionary programs, they are only 3.1 percent higher than they were 5 years ago, less than what it was under both Ronald Reagan and the first Bush administration.

It is disingenuous for this majority to pretend that these public investments, critical to job creation and economic growth, are the source of our deficit problems. The primary reason the deficits have grown is because revenues are lower than they have been in 60 years—15 percent lower thanks to the Bush tax breaks for the wealthy—and because we initiated two wars on the Nation's credit card.

If the majority was serious about deficit reduction, they would allow for additional revenue by asking the wealthiest Americans and corporate special interests to share in the sacrifice rather than seeking to protect them—which they do—in this legislation.

The majority is not serious. This bill is not about deficit reduction. It is about using the threat of default to enact a radical agenda, one that will cost jobs and undermine the American economy, where middle class families would have an opportunity for a decent retirement.

In a few months they are coming back, \$1.6 trillion in cuts to Social Se-

curity, Medicare, and Medicaid. This form of hostage taking is not responsible leadership. It's the wrong direction for our country. I urge my colleagues to vote against this incredible, outrageous piece of legislation, and I call on the majority to quit playing political games.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my good friend that I believe that the majority is serious, and I believe that the Democrats are serious in their quest to ensure that we don't default. This is their opportunity to step up to the plate and make sure that it doesn't happen.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Gold River, Mr. LUNGREN, the hardworking chairman of the Administration Committee.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, what is incredible, what is outrageous, what is unprecedented is the amount of debt that we are incurring on a daily basis and have been doing for some time. Those who are being held hostage are our children and our grandchildren and their futures. The question we have is whether or not we are going to reach a balanced approach.

□ 1520

What do I say a balanced approach would be? A balanced approach is when we are once again creating jobs in this economy.

What those on the other side have led us to believe is that the answer to our problems is to follow the European experience over the last 30 to 40 years, and that is to rely more on government, higher taxes, with the net result of a shrinking private economy and fewer jobs.

What is unprecedented is that we are now in the longest period of continuous unemployment that we've seen since the Great Depression. What is unprecedented is that if you call this a recovery, it is the most jobless recovery in the history of modern-day United States. What it is, is very much like what we've seen in Europe over the last 30 years.

So the question before us is do we follow the European experience with greater reliance on government; greater balance, which translated means "taxes," when we know that not a single economist of any repute would tell us that the answer to our jobless situation is to tax those who create the jobs?

That's why this is such an important vote for us today. That is, we will show that the way to the future is the American way; the way we've done it in the past: reliance on the private sector, allowing the ingenuity, the creativity, the risk-taking, the courage of the American people to bring us back to prosperity.

Those on the other side, the gentlewoman from New York just suggested that the way to do that is through the expansion of government programs.

That's not the essence of how we create jobs.

We are in an unprecedented period of time; that is true, Mr. Speaker. We must act in an unprecedented way, and that is to follow the Boehner plan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Robert Greenstein, the president of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, says that if enacted, the Boehner bill could well produce the greatest poverty and hardship produced by any law in modern history.

CENTER ON BUDGET
AND POLICY PRIORITIES

July 25, 2011.

STATEMENT: ROBERT GREENSTEIN, PRESIDENT,
ON HOUSE SPEAKER BOEHNER'S NEW BUDGET
PROPOSAL

The plan is, thus, tantamount to a form of "class warfare." If enacted, it could well produce the greatest increase in poverty and hardship produced by any law in modern U.S. history.

This may sound hyperbolic, but it is not. The mathematics are inexorable.

The Boehner plan calls for large cuts in discretionary programs of \$1.2 trillion over the next ten years, and it then requires additional cuts that are large enough to produce another \$1.8 trillion in savings to be enacted by the end of the year as a condition for raising the debt ceiling again at that time.

The Boehner plan contains no tax increases. The entire \$1.8 trillion would come from budget cuts. Because the first round of cuts will hit discretionary programs hard—through austere discretionary caps that Congress will struggle to meet—discretionary cuts will largely or entirely be off the table when it comes to achieving the further \$1.8 trillion in budget reductions.

As a result, virtually all of that \$1.8 trillion would come from entitlement programs. They would have to be cut more than \$1.5 trillion in order to produce sufficient interest savings to achieve \$1.8 trillion in total savings. To secure \$1.5 trillion in entitlement savings over the next ten years would require draconian policy changes.

Policymakers would essentially have three choices: 1) cut Social Security and Medicare benefits heavily for current retirees, something that all budget plans from both parties (including House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan's plan) have ruled out; 2) repeal the Affordable Care Act's coverage expansions while retaining its measures that cut Medicare payments and raise tax revenues, even though Republicans seek to repeal many of those measures as well; or 3) eviscerate the safety net for low-income children, parents, senior citizens, and people with disabilities. There is no other plausible way to get \$1.5 trillion in entitlement cuts in the next ten years.

The evidence for this conclusion is abundant.

The "Gang of Six" plan, with its very tough and controversial entitlement cuts, contains total entitlement reductions of \$640 to \$760 billion over the next ten years not counting Social Security, and \$755 billion to \$875 billion including Social Security. (That's before netting out \$300 billion in entitlement costs that the plan includes for a permanent fix to the scheduled cuts in Medicare physician payments that Congress regularly cancels; with these costs netted out, the Gang of Six entitlement savings come to \$455 to \$575 billion.)

The budget deal between President Obama and Speaker Boehner that fell apart last Friday, which included cuts in Social Security cost-of-living adjustments and Medicare benefits as well as an increase in the Medicare

eligibility age, contained total entitlement cuts of \$650 billion (under the last Obama offer) to \$700 billion (under the last Boehner offer). The Ryan budget that the House passed in April contained no savings in Social Security over the next ten years and \$279 billion in Medicare cuts.

To be sure, the House-passed Ryan budget included much larger overall entitlement cuts over the next 10 years. But that was largely because it eviscerated the safety net and repealed health reform's coverage expansions. The Ryan plan included cuts in Medicaid and health reform of a remarkable \$2.2 trillion, from severely slashing Medicaid and killing health reform's coverage expansions. The Ryan plan also included stunning cuts of \$127 billion in the SNAP program (formerly known as food stamps) and \$126 billion in Pell Grants and other student financial assistance.

That House Republicans would likely seek to reach the Boehner budget's \$1.8 trillion target in substantial part by cutting programs for the poorest and most vulnerable Americans is given strong credence by the "Cut, Cap, and Balance" bill that the House recently approved. That bill would establish global spending caps and enforce them with across-the-board budget cuts—exempting Medicare and Social Security from the across-the-board cuts while subjecting programs for the poor to the across-the-board axe. This would turn a quarter century of bipartisan budget legislation on its head; starting with the 1985 Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law, all federal laws of the last 26 years that have set budget targets enforced by across-the-board cuts have exempted the core assistance programs for the poor from those cuts while including Medicare among programs subject to the cuts. This component of the "Cut, Cap, and Balance" bill strongly suggests that, especially in the face of an approaching election, House Republicans looking for entitlement cuts would heavily target means-tested programs for people of lesser means (and less political power).

In short, the Boehner plan would force policymakers to choose among cutting the incomes and health benefits of ordinary retirees, repealing the guts of health reform and leaving an estimated 34 million more Americans uninsured, and savaging the safety net for the poor. It would do so even as it shielded all tax breaks, including the many lucrative tax breaks for the wealthiest and most powerful individuals and corporations.

President Obama has said that, while we must reduce looming deficits, we must take a balanced approach. The Boehner proposal badly fails this test of basic decency. The President should veto the bill if it reaches his desk. Congress should find a fairer, more decent way to avoid a default.

At this point I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this smoke-and-mirrors bill before us today actually stands to increase—yes, increase—the deficit of the United States of America by over \$100 billion.

Let me walk the Speaker through the math here. This is why credit ratings matter: countries that have AA credit ratings—this is a group of them—pay an average interest on their sovereign debt of 3.75 percent. Countries with a AAA rating—this is a 10-year bond, but it would carry across 3-year, 5-year, 30-year in similar degrees—countries with AAA pay 2.98 percent. That's 1.75 per-

cent, almost a 2 percent difference between AAA and AA.

In passing this bill today, which only has a 6-month extension, we are jeopardizing our AAA rating that will be incredibly hard to ever earn back. And in addition to paying 2 extra percentage points on your variable rate home mortgage that middle class families can't afford, 2 points more on your credit card debt, 2 points more on your car debt, in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the government, the biggest borrower in the country, will pay more interest on the debt. Over 10 years that 1.75 percent difference, which is just taking the average between AAA and AA, costs over \$100 billion a year in extra interest on the debt. Over a 10-year period, over \$1 trillion of additional interest paid on the Federal debt.

So what are we doing? Cutting \$915 billion and risking adding over \$1 trillion in additional expenditures.

This smoke-and-mirrors effort before us today risks increasing the Federal deficit at a time when we all know we need to decrease Federal spending, we need to decrease our deficit. The last thing we need is to set motion forward to actually up our interest rate, jeopardize our credit rating because of the short-term nature, and increase the interest payments on our Federal debt.

I encourage my colleagues to look at these numbers and vote "no" on the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to my friend that he is absolutely right: if we go into default, if we don't extend the debt ceiling, we are, in fact, going to see an increase in interest rates. The fact of matter is the ratings agencies like Standard & Poor's say that we not only have to increase interest rates but we have to put into place a deficit reduction plan that will pay down our debt, and that's exactly what's happening.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to our hardworking colleague from the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentlewoman from Brentwood, Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the Budget Control Act of 2011, what I like to call Cut, Cap, and Balance 3.0.

Last week the House passed Cut, Cap, and Balance 1.0 in bipartisan fashion. Not surprisingly, Senator REID and his Democrat colleagues in the Senate failed to even allow for a vote. Speaker BOEHNER then offered Cut, Cap, and Balance 2.0, which, according to the CBO, failed to generate sufficient savings to accompany the debt ceiling increase. So the Speaker went back to the drawing board, found more cuts and reductions, and I applaud him for that.

Today the House will once again ensure that our Nation will take another step by enacting legislation that cuts spending more than any increase in the debt ceiling, does not raise taxes on

America's families and job creators during a time of economic hardship, and ensures an up-or-down vote on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. And I thank my constituents and the small business owners who have called to encourage me in this process to say let's get this job done.

Let it be known that this is merely a small foundational step to ensure that we put this Nation on the road to fiscal health, and it is historic. By passing the Budget Control Act, we will take away President Barack Obama's blank check. For the first time, debt limit legislation will cut spending, lock in these cuts, cap future spending, does not raise taxes, ensures that balanced budget amendment vote, and keeps our attention on the Nation's fiscal problems.

House Republicans are saying the buck stops here. Let's get to work addressing our Nation's fiscal woes and cutting the spending problem in Washington, D.C.

For that, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Budget Control Act.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a recent New York Times editorial entitled "The Republican Wreckage."

[From The New York Times, July 25, 2011]

THE REPUBLICAN WRECKAGE

House Republicans have lost sight of the country's welfare. It's hard to conclude anything else from their latest actions, including the House speaker's dismissal of President Obama's plea for compromise Monday night. They have largely succeeded in their campaign to ransom America's economy for the biggest spending cuts in a generation. They have warped an exercise in paying off current debt into an argument about future spending. Yet, when they win another concession, they walk away.

This increasingly reckless game has pushed the nation to the brink of ruinous default. The Republicans have dimmed the futures of millions of jobless Americans, whose hopes for work grow more out of reach as government job programs are cut and interest rates begin to rise. They have made the federal government a laughingstock around the globe.

In a scathing prime-time television address Monday night, President Obama stepped off the sidelines to tell Americans the House Republicans were threatening a "deep economic crisis" that could send interest rates skyrocketing and hold up Social Security and veterans' checks. By insisting on a single-minded approach and refusing to negotiate, he said, Republicans were violating the country's founding principle of compromise.

"How can we ask a student to pay more for college before we ask hedge fund managers to stop paying taxes at a lower rate than their secretaries?" he said, invoking Ronald Reagan's effort to make everyone pay a fair share and pointing out that his immediate predecessors had to ask for debt-ceiling increases under rules invented by Congress. He urged viewers to demand compromise. "The entire world is watching," he said.

Mr. Obama denounced House Speaker John Boehner's proposal to make cuts only, now, and raise the debt ceiling briefly, but he embraced the proposal made over the weekend by the Senate Majority Leader, Harry Reid, which gave Republicans virtually everything they said they wanted when they ignited this artificial crisis: \$2.7 trillion from govern-

ment spending over the next decade, with no revenue increases. It is, in fact, an awful plan, which cuts spending far too deeply at a time when the government should be summoning all its resources to solve the real economic problem of unemployment. It asks for absolutely no sacrifice from those who have prospered immensely as economic inequality has grown.

Mr. Reid's proposal does at least protect Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. And about half of its savings comes from the winding down of two wars, which naturally has drawn Republican opposition. (Though Republicans counted the same savings in their budgets.)

Mr. Boehner will not accept this as the last-ditch surrender that it is. The speaker, who followed Mr. Obama on TV with about five minutes of hoary talking points clearly written before the president spoke, is insisting on a plan that raises the debt ceiling until early next year and demands another vote on a balanced-budget amendment, rejected by the Senate last week. The result would be to stage this same debate over again in an election year. Never mind that this would almost certainly result in an immediate downgrade of the government's credit.

We agreed strongly when Mr. Obama said Americans should be "offended" by this display and that they "may have voted for divided government but they didn't vote for a dysfunctional government." It's hard not to conclude now that dysfunction is the Republicans' goal—even if the cost is unthinkable.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the biggest problem in this country is not that the American Government is about to breach its debt ceiling; it's that too many American families have already breached their debt ceilings. We have a jobs crisis in this country, and this should be our principal focus.

Now, somewhere in America today, some decision-makers are not getting much help with that jobs crisis. A hospital that's thinking about adding a rehab lab and adding a couple hundred jobs wonders how much Medicare revenue it's going to get. This bill says wait 6 months and we'll let you know.

An entrepreneur who has a software company who is about to finally get off the ground is thinking about borrowing some money to hire more people, but she doesn't know what the interest rates are going to be. This bill says wait 6 months and we'll let you know.

And, yes, there's a diabetic, a person who's worried about whether they should keep their house or not because their health care bills are rising and they're worried that Medicare may not pay as many of their diabetic bills as they have right now. And we're saying to her wait six months; we'll let you know.

We can't wait to solve this problem. The Republicans should listen to their own leadership, who spoke out against a short-term fix to this problem: "We feel very strongly that one of the reasons why we continue to see an ailing economy is that people have very little

confidence, have very little certainty in terms of where we are headed."

I completely agree with Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR, who said that in June. We should listen to Mr. CANTOR's advice. We should adopt a long-term plan and put America back to work, get back to the negotiating table today.

□ 1530

Mr. DREIER. I yield 2 minutes to our thoughtful and hardworking colleague from Allentown, Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Budget Control Act. First and foremost, we, the United States House of Representatives, have an obligation to govern. We have a tremendous responsibility to the American people to consider this plan that ensures our Nation does not default on our Nation's commitments while at the same time places this country on a sustainable fiscal path.

Let me be clear: Defaulting on America's obligations to our creditors, to our seniors, disabled veterans, activity military personnel, college students, and many others is not an option. This bill prevents a default and it pays our bills. Congress must act swiftly to deter a ratings downgrade of our U.S. Government, a downgrade that will affect families and small businesses across the country. Only a sound, credible plan that places us on that sustainable trajectory will prevent that downgrade, driven in part by an unprecedented spending binge by this administration which has blown up the fiscal balance sheet.

A previous speaker said a few moments ago that we're playing games. I can assure you this is no game. This is serious stuff. And speaking of serious, the White House has still refused to offer a serious specific plan in writing that we can review. In fact, in a stinging rebuke of the administration, the nonpartisan Director of the CBO, Doug Elmendorf, said, "We don't estimate speeches."

The Senate has dug in its heels, too. It would be nice if they passed the bill, any bill. It's been 800 days since there's been a budget. It's time for them to act and to move to prevent this type of a fiscal calamity that many have predicted.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation. It's a step forward. It may not be the final product, but it moves this process forward. I encourage the Senate to take it up.

Most importantly, we have a sacred duty and a solemn obligation to lead and to act. We do have that affirmative obligation to govern for the benefit of our country and for the American people. The world is watching. Americans are watching. It's time for us to lead and demonstrate American exceptionalism.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

We're here today, at long last, to vote on the Republican default plan. After 200 days without a jobs agenda, after 200 days of saying that those hardest hit by the recession should bear the burden of unbalanced cuts, after 200 days of rhetoric and walking away, my Republican colleagues have finally brought their top secret default plan to the floor for a public debate and a vote.

So, what did they offer up? Courageous leadership? A grand bargain? Sadly, no. When you walk out of negotiations and spend more time talking to the press than to the President, I'm not sure we expected more.

We have before us the same tired policies that got us into this mess—cut taxes for millionaires, give kickbacks to special interests, pay for it all with cuts to the middle class. And never forget the central tenets of the conservative agenda: end Medicare and privatize Social Security.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will no doubt come to the floor to say the bill explicitly protects Medicare and Social Security from cuts. That claim is blatantly false. It's a desperate campaign speech to counter the backlash that comes when the American people read the bill, like they read the Ryan budget.

So I would ask my colleagues to take another careful look at the bill before us. It is only 57 pages long. There is even a summary online through the Rules Committee Web site. After that careful examination, I would ask you to come before my constituents, before the American people, to myself, and promise us with a straight face that you have no intention of using this legislation to dismantle Medicare and cut Social Security in the next 12 months. You can't.

I don't support these policies, and I cannot support a plan that puts us back in the same bitter, vilifying debate in January. It may be good politics, but it's not good government. I'm tired of it, my constituents are tired of it, and anyone who's watched the nightly news for the last 6 months is tired of it.

Washington loves to kick the can down the road. That's how we got here in the first place. This is our moment. We need a plan, not another Republican manifesto. There are better plans out there. Let us vote on them.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill and get back to work.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to a good friend and Presidential candidate, the gentleman from Livonia, Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman from California.

We hear a lot of talk about plans. We hear a lot of talk about secret default plans, Senate plans, the Reid plan, but we've yet to hear about the President's plan.

We live in a period of time where we are engaged in a struggle against economic stagnation, where 30 million people can't trade jobs because there are no better ones out there, where 14 million people are unemployed. We live in a period of time where inflation is rising, real wages are declining. In short, we live in a period of time in which we are being neither led nor governed.

We are seeing postures, not plans—with one exception. The House Republicans have endeavored to meet the duty that was entrusted to them by the American people, which is to put forward a plan that will prevent the default of the United States and a diminishment of our economic credibility in the world. Unfortunately, what we get in response is not an attempt at honest bipartisan collaboration. Instead, it is more political rhetoric, more partisanship, more posturing.

At this point in time we have before us a plan that can work. It is not a perfect plan. People on both sides of the aisle have their qualms with it. And yet it is a plan that can be helpful to the American people, that can be helpful to ensuring that our economy does not further deteriorate, a plan that can make sure that Big Government no longer crushes the aspirations of the American people to grow this economy, to find employment, to secure their pursuit of happiness around their hearth and home.

For that, I will support this bill, and I would urge my colleagues to do it, because the American people deserve no less.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. What's not safe under the Boehner default plan?

Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare are not safe under the Boehner default plan. In just 7 months, it forces nearly \$1.6 trillion in cuts from these programs. They will be unrecognizable.

Jobs are not safe under the Boehner default plan. It will force 2 million Americans to lose their jobs, putting greater strain on struggling families.

Our economy is not safe under the Boehner default plan. This short-term deal could lead to an automatic tax increase for every American with a mortgage, car loan, or credit card. It would leave a cloud of uncertainty. Businesses won't invest and our economy won't grow.

Nothing is safe under the Boehner default plan except tax breaks for Big Oil, companies that ship jobs overseas, and the rich.

We must reject this ideological approach and come together on a balanced solution that will ensure that every American will have a safe and secure future.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 12¼ min-

utes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 17 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, according to Grover Norquist, who's apparently the real Republican strategist, this is about ensuring that Democrats will never again have the revenue to govern as Democrats. But what does he mean by that? Is he talking about when Roosevelt rescued us from the Great Depression in the 1930s or when we saved the world for democracy in the forties or when we built the middle class with the GI Bill in the late forties? Or when we won the race to space in the early sixties or when we started Medicare and passed civil rights laws in the mid-sixties? Or when President Clinton raised taxes, balanced the budget, generated 20 million new jobs, cut poverty, grew the middle class, passed on projected surpluses as far as the eye could see, and enabled those at the top tax rates to take home more after-tax income than in any prior time in American history?

□ 1540

The fact is that Democrats have made this Nation great by investing in all our people and by raising the revenue necessary to meet our obligations and to secure our future. This is the alternative. This is about an ideology that lowers our sights, diminishes our stature and sells short our future. That is why it should be rejected.

Mr. DREIER. In light of the disparity here, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague, Mr. LYNCH.

Mr. LYNCH. I rise today in opposition to the Budget Control Act because I honestly believe that this Nation is better than this bill reflects.

Just so we're clear on the differences here between our positions, this amendment seeks to place the overwhelming burden of this crisis on the backs of senior citizens, and it forces seniors especially to make enormous sacrifices while, at the same time, it allows the richest Americans and oil companies and hedge fund operators to escape any responsibility or sacrifice.

This is not how we should be treating America's Greatest Generation, who survived the Great Depression, who fought in World War II, and who made the sacrifices in their time when their country called upon them. This is not the way to treat the frail elderly or any senior, who, at the end of their working lives, are now on a fixed income.

The way we deal with this crisis will say a lot about America. I think Hubert Humphrey said it best when he said that the true test of any society is

how we treat those citizens in the dawn of life, our children; those in the twilight of life, our elderly; and those in the shadow of life, our poor and disabled.

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

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

Mr. LYNCH. I just want to say, as Republicans are rallying to the ramparts to save the millionaires from suffering from any loss of a tax loophole, I take a full measure of pride at where the Democrats in this House are standing on this issue. I urge my colleagues to stand with seniors and to vote “no” on this amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that last November sent 87 new Republicans to the House of Representatives. To one of them, I yield 2 minutes, the very thoughtful gentleman from Newburgh, Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for America’s financial future.

We are at a time when we need to make every effort to save our Nation’s credit rating. The rating agencies have said that raising the debt ceiling is not enough. While I would have preferred the Cut, Cap, and Balance plan, the Budget Control Act vote today and the balanced budget amendment vote tomorrow is the best remaining approach to reduce spending and help avoid a downgrade.

We can institute real reforms today as a first step on a long path to fiscal stability. However, the bill isn’t perfect. I wanted more, and frankly, all of our constituents deserve more. The reality is our friends on the other side of the aisle won’t allow it.

With years of reckless spending by the Federal Government, instead of making tough choices to address our spending problems, the other side wants to raise taxes on the American people to continue funding Washington, D.C.’s spending spree. In addition, they want us to give the President a blank check to get him through the 2012 election. Well, that’s not going to happen. The United States has always maintained a AAA credit rating, and the threat of inaction by our colleagues in the U.S. Senate and no plan offered by the administration puts that at risk.

The House has and will take action.

We need to send a clear message to the American people that we are willing to make the tough choices and work together on behalf of our Nation’s citizens. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill and to take the first step to restoring fiscal responsibility to our Nation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Congress’ approval rating is now down around 10 percent, and

given the debate on this politically induced default crisis, I have to ask myself: Who are these crazy 10 percent? The American people are looking at this institution right now, and they’re asking: What on Earth are you thinking?

They’re sick of these games and they’re sick of us. They want this default crisis resolved now, and they definitely don’t want to repeat it 6 months from now. They understand that a real solution means a real compromise. Our constituents have made it clear that they want shared sacrifice where millionaires, billionaires and oil companies contribute their fair share. They want their Social Security and Medicare benefits to be protected.

Yet this bill, the Republican default agenda, does none of that. In fact, this reckless bill is actually a stealth attack on Medicare and Social Security because it requires large cuts next year that can only come from those programs. The Boehner plan would increase borrowing costs across the entire spectrum of American society, including local and State governments, businesses, and our citizens—producing, essentially, a backdoor tax hike on the American people. It does all this damage to seniors and middle class families while sparing the wealthy from even the slightest inconvenience.

We weren’t elected to Congress to run our economy and our country into the ground—to fail to respond to a crisis of our own creation, but here we are. The American people deserve better and are demanding better. We need to defeat this bill so we can move on to a real solution.

Mr. DREIER. At this juncture, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, frustrated in that, as we sit here on the brink of the financial unknown, families in my district are left hanging, worrying about jobs.

The bill we’re debating today fails to address America’s number one priority of creating jobs. Instead, it puts us in the exact same position 6 months from now, threatening working families with deep, unbalanced, unfair cuts while protecting tax cuts for millionaires and big corporations that ship jobs overseas.

It has been 200 days of this new Republican-led Congress, and what have we seen? We have seen them target Medicare, working families, the environment, and education—we’ve even seen them use up time to target energy-efficient light bulbs—but what we haven’t seen them do is target job creation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on this risky plan and to responsibly raise our debt limit so America can pay its bills and so this Congress can get serious about creating good-paying jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 10¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. I don’t think there is a question. It is very clear that we have to act to prevent a default and a downgrade of our Nation’s credit rating. Sadly, the House Republican leadership’s plan is not a serious plan to avoid such a downgrade.

It’s more smoke and mirrors. We’ve heard that talked about lately. It will put us right back in the same position in a few months, requiring another vote to raise the debt limit, putting America into a further area where we might be able to see the potential downgrade, costing Americans \$100 billion a year and \$1 trillion over 10 years.

A short-term increase in the debt limit has already been rejected by economists and credit rating agencies, which have made it clear that this plan will likely result in an unprecedented downgrade to our credit rating, leaving higher interest rates for mortgages and student loans for all Americans. In addition, this reckless plan leaves the door open to the same damage as did the Ryan plan.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield for just one second, Mr. Speaker?

I would just like to ask the gentleman if he might cite where that is from, the quote of that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Mexico didn’t yield.

Mr. DREIER. Oh, I’m sorry. I thought the gentleman had yielded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico controls the time.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order. I don’t believe that I did yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico controls the time.

Mr. LUJÁN. After that interruption, may I ask how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield my friend an additional 15 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 25 seconds.

Mr. LUJÁN. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker.

In addition, this reckless plan leaves the door open to the same damage as the Ryan’s plan, to attack Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, while protecting tax breaks for billionaires and corporations.

It is important that we talk to the American people about this and that we have this conversation. I urge my colleagues to reject the partisan

gamesmanship and seek a responsible and balanced solution to this crisis.

□ 1550

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm very happy to yield 2 minutes to the next Governor of Indiana, the gentleman from Columbus, Mr. PENCE.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to rise in support of the Budget Control Act of 2011, which is a negotiated compromise between the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and the Republican and Democratic leadership of the United States Senate.

Let me say that again: the Budget Control Act that we will bring to the floor today is a compromise. At a time when people across America long for a Washington, D.C., that is able to reach across the aisle, lower the volume, solve the problem, this legislation comes to the floor. And I'm proud to support it.

The truth is it is a difficult time for people across my beloved Indiana and all across this country. Our economy is struggling. Unemployment is at 8.3 percent in Indiana, 9.3 percent nationally. And I believe that runaway Federal spending by both political parties is a cause and a barrier to our economic recovery today. We simply must put our fiscal house in order.

Now, I know the administration wanted us simply to raise the debt ceiling without conditions, but that was rejected I think almost unanimously in the United States Senate, and we rejected it as well in this body.

What needs to be done today is we need to recognize that if you owe debts, pay debts. We have to raise the Nation's debt ceiling so that we have the money to pay the Nation's bills. But we also owe a debt to this generation of Americans struggling in this economy and to the next generation of Americans that we can only repay through fiscal discipline and reform, and the Budget Control Act does that.

The Budget Control Act does two things that I believe are worth highlighting.

Number one, it ensures in this first installment that there will be a dollar in budget cuts for every dollar in increase in borrowing authority by the United States. That's crucial.

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

Mr. DREIER. I would like to yield my friend an additional minute.

Mr. PENCE. Secondly, the agreement around the Budget Control Act also ensures that there will be a vote in this body now tomorrow and a vote in the United States Senate this fall on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

There are other aspects of this bill that are meritorious—hard-spending caps, more enforceable than spending

caps of the past; the creation of a bipartisan commission to negotiate spending discipline and reforms for the next installment of a debt ceiling increase.

But for my part, making sure that any increase in the debt ceiling is matched dollar for dollar with spending cuts in this bill and for the first time in 15 years bringing a bipartisan version of the balanced budget amendment to this floor of the House and soon to the floor of the Senate are worthy of note. And they should endorse this approach.

This is a very serious time, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the Budget Control Act as evidence that Congress can still compromise. We can still come together across the aisle. We can find a way to pay the Nation's bills and do so in a way that reflects our commitment to fiscal discipline and reform.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado, a former member of the Rules Committee, and we miss him, Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I think we've got to go back 10 years and just talk about where we were at that time.

Under Bill Clinton, this country had a surplus. Revenues exceeded expenses. Things were going along great. We were adding jobs by the millions. Then we have a Republican administration. Two tax cuts, couple trillion dollars, lower revenue. Two wars, couple trillion dollars, more expense. A crash on Wall Street, \$3 trillion in expense to this country.

That's where this expense comes from. That's why we have bills to pay. We had a tough 10 years, most of it under Republican administration. We've got to pay those bills. But the Republican leadership has brought us to the brink of default—something the United States has had full faith and credit for 235 years and they want to bring that right to the brink of default.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are better than that. We have a responsibility. We can't live in turmoil. We need to rebuild the American Dream for people who want a shot at getting ahead in this life, not this brinksmanship.

This is a bad bill and must be defeated.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia who serves on the Financial Services Committee, Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. America, we really need to pay close attention here.

First of all, this is a terrible bill at the wrong time. Here we are, the number one issue facing the American people is jobs, and this bill is a major job-killer of the highest magnitude. It will average a loss of 40,000 public service jobs in the public sector each month. All we have to do is look at the record

from the month of June. In the month of June, the private sector created 58,000 jobs; but because of massive cuts in the public sector, there was a loss of 40,000 jobs each month.

In addition to that, this bill will drastically end Medicare. It will reduce Medicaid payments to the States, and it will severely cut back the checks to our Social Security recipients by an average of \$1,000 each month.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

And will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Well, since you've yielded 30 seconds, which you actually have already taken my last 30 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. I will yield the gentleman additional time if he needs it.

I just am asking my friend where in this bill he can point to where cuts in Medicare are going to take place. I've gone through it and I've not seen it.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. You know perfectly well, Mr. DREIER, that the announced cuts in this bill and the setting up with this commission, and, also, your party has already set your record on a road. Your number one target has been to end Medicare.

But let me go back, and I just wanted to answer your question.

It's very important, Mr. Speaker, that we also understand that the other dangerous part about this bill is that in 6 months we will be right back here again which will add greater instability to the markets and further undermine our credibility ratings.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds simply to say that there are in fact exemptions that are in this bill to ensure that Social Security and Medicare are not touched, and we need to remember that. When it comes to this sequestration process, it is not touched.

And for those who are saying that this measure will in fact bring about those cuts, they have not read the bill and are mischaracterizing it.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I must respond.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I would like to ask my friend from California a question, and then I would yield.

Is the gentleman saying that the text says that if the commission set up by this bill reports back a cut in Social Security benefits that that may not be enacted by the commission?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me say it's the sequestrations in this bill. Obviously, a bipartisan commission that comes forward—

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reclaim my time.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about the sequestrations. I'm talking about the fact that this commission's instructed to find \$1.8 trillion in cuts and Medicare and Social Security are not exempted from those cuts. This is a roadmap, this is a users guide as to how to cut Social Security and Medicare. We reject it.

I yield to my friend.

□ 1600

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me say this is not a commission. Members should not refer to this as a commission, because the idea of a commission, some sort of outside entity, we're talking about our colleagues in the House and Senate who will be members of the Joint Select Committee who have a responsibility, as colleagues, to report this back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 10 more seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman is correct. This is not a commission. It is a committee that is empowered to cut Medicare and Social Security. We will not stand for it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say to my friend this is not a committee that is empowered to cut Social Security and Medicare. It is a committee, a joint select committee, that is empowered, for the first time, to submit to both Houses of Congress recommendations that we will have an up-or-down vote on.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill. This is nothing more than political posturing by the Republican majority. And I think it's important for the American people to understand that this majority has asked us time and time again to vote to end Medicare, to cut Social Security, to cut Medicaid, and they're doing it once again. No question about it. What's being offered up by this majority is nothing short of recklessness, absolutely nothing.

The Speaker and the Republican Party know that the President and the Senate are going to reject the bill. I don't even know why we're here on this floor, Mr. Speaker. Rather than spending the last several months developing a real plan that would avoid default, the Republicans have spent months stripping away health care protections, attacking the EPA, jeopardizing jobs, not creating jobs. And here we are,

once again, ready to end Medicare, Social Security, cut away Medicaid benefits, and attack the most vulnerable in our communities.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, if it weren't sad, it would be laughable. The plan would require \$2.7 trillion in deficit reduction over the next 10 years, cut \$915 billion at the offset, and another \$1.8 trillion in December. They're coming after Americans' Social Security checks. They're coming after Medicare. They're coming after Medicaid. That's what this majority is doing. Let's not be fooled by it. It's time for the American people to stand up.

The bill threatens our ability to pay our obligations. They're not interested in paying our obligations. These are debts that we've already incurred. And yet they won't take the money that they've given away to the wealthiest 2 percent of this country. No, they can't give up theirs. The oil and gas companies can't give up theirs. The companies that have offshored jobs can't give up theirs; but they're asking the American people to sacrifice Social Security, Medicare, education, Medicaid.

It's unfair, and we won't stand for it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say to my very good friend from Maryland, she has just adequately, very accurately described the measure that has been proposed by the Senate majority leader, HARRY REID.

With that, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my very good friend from Lafayette, Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a hardworking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I think there was a gross distortion of what's being proposed here. And again, the previous speaker just condemned the Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID's bill in the U.S. Senate. That's the only Democratic bill we've had. So it seems to me that there's a little bit of a fight going on on the other side of the aisle between their House Members and the Senate.

To my friend from New Jersey, this committee that's formed is a committee of active sitting Members of the House and Senate. So in order for anything to be recommended by this committee, it would require, in all likelihood, all of the Democrats to support it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDREWS. If that committee wanted to close tax loopholes, would they need a simple majority or a two-thirds vote of the House?

Mr. BOUSTANY. It would be a simple majority.

Mr. ANDREWS. So it's your position that a simple majority of both Houses could raise taxes?

Mr. BOUSTANY. That's right. That's what we need. We need that to force some movement.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time it's my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished assistant leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, while the clock is ticking, the Republican majority is dickering and the American people are hurting. Our financial markets are on pace for their worst week in nearly a year. State governments are bracing for downgrades in their borrowing capacities, and the gap between those in our society who have a lot and those who have very little is growing.

The Republican majority continues their efforts to divert attention from the self-inflicted crisis with manufactured controversies, holding the American economy hostage to their reckless and dispassionate demands. As the clock ticks toward default and the pain it would bring to middle-income families and those who aspire to become middle income, my friends on the other side continue to play politics. Speaker BOEHNER does not even pretend that this is a serious attempt to solve the problem. He sold this bill to his conference by telling them that it wasn't bipartisan. And with divided government, a plan that isn't bipartisan is no plan at all. It's just a game.

The President and the Democrats in Congress as well as the American people have advocated a balanced approach to reduce the deficit by growing the economy and protecting the most vulnerable, including Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security beneficiaries. We have been willing to make tough, politically difficult compromises.

This bill on the floor today, just like the bill from last week, is yet another partisan time-waster. Our constituents are not interested in any of us voting to cut Medicare or cap Social Security or balancing the budget on the backs of Medicaid recipients. A 6-month extension is another waste of time.

We must resolve this matter now and ensure the full faith and credit of the United States. Let's defeat the Boehner bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of my friend how many speakers he has remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am the final speaker.

Mr. DREIER. I would encourage my friend to proceed, and then I will offer some closing remarks.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 3/4 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this bill does nothing to solve our long-term fiscal challenges because everybody here knows that this isn't going anywhere. Instead, it's a political stunt. Instead, it hurdles us closer and

closer to a devastating default. For years, Presidents and Congresses of both parties have raised the debt ceiling, recognizing that endangering the full faith and credit of the United States would be a grave mistake.

It's amazing to me how many Republicans I've heard who dismiss the potential of default as no big deal. No big deal? Tell that to the family who would have to pay higher interest rates on their mortgage, their car loan, their student loan. It would be a very big deal to them.

Many of my friends on the other side of the aisle didn't just stand by as we created these massive deficits. They were active participants. They voted for two huge tax cuts—mostly for wealthy people—that weren't paid for, two wars that weren't paid for, a massive prescription drug program that wasn't paid for, and now their solution is to punish the very Americans who can least afford it, all in the name of keeping their rich friends and their special interests happy.

The Boehner plan is unbalanced and unfair. It slashes programs like Social Security and Medicare that benefit the middle class and the poor. But the Republicans insist on protecting tax breaks for oil and gas companies. Just today, ExxonMobil announced profits of \$10.7 billion for the second quarter. Do they really need special tax breaks? The American people sure don't think so.

Poll after poll shows that a vast majority of American citizens prefer a balanced approach. Yes, we need to cut spending. Yes, we need to reform our government. But everybody needs to chip in to do their part, including the very wealthy who have benefited the most.

□ 1610

Now, there are certainly places to save. How about ending wars that aren't paid for? Right now, we borrow \$10 billion every month for military operations in Afghanistan alone, to prop up a corrupt and incompetent Karzai government.

How about ending wasteful subsidies to big agriculture companies?

How about asking billionaire hedge fund managers to pay the same tax rates as their secretaries?

The truth is that the best way to deal with our long-term fiscal situation is to grow our economy. That means creating jobs and putting people back to work. The last election, I thought, was about jobs. We haven't talked about jobs at all since the new Republican majority came to power. That means investing in things like education and infrastructure and green technology and medical research. That's the kind of economic future the American people deserve.

The Boehner default plan would take us exactly in the wrong direction, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject it.

[From Bloomberg, July 26, 2011]

REPUBLICAN LEADERS VOTED FOR DEBT DRIVERS THEY BLAME ON OBAMA

(By Lisa Lerer)

House Speaker John Boehner often attacks the spendthrift ways of Washington.

"In Washington, more spending and more debt is business as usual," the Republican leader from Ohio said in a televised address yesterday amid debate over the U.S. debt. "I've got news for Washington—those days are over."

Yet the speaker, House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell all voted for major drivers of the nation's debt during the past decade: Wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts and Medicare prescription drug benefits. They also voted for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, or TARP, that rescued financial institutions and the auto industry.

Together, according to data compiled by Bloomberg News, these initiatives added \$3.4 trillion to the nation's accumulated debt and to its current annual budget deficit of \$1.5 trillion.

As Congress nears votes to raise the \$14.3-trillion debt ceiling to avert a default on U.S. obligations when borrowing authority expires on Aug. 2, both parties are attempting to claim a mantle of fiscal responsibility. They both bear some of the blame: Many Democrats contributed to the expenses that are forcing lawmakers to boost the nation's debt limit, as have Republican leaders at odds over how much borrowing authority to hand President Barack Obama and when.

"There's plenty of blame to go around," for the debt, said Robert Bixby, executive director of the Concord Coalition, an Arlington, Virginia-based group that advocates for balanced budgets. "If there had been no Barack Obama, we would still be bumping up against the debt limit."

DEBT HAS DOUBLED

Since 2001, the debt has grown from \$5.8 trillion.

Republicans say the long-term growth of entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, along with depressed tax revenues due to the worst recession since the Great Depression, drive the current debt level.

"Blaming Bush for the structural deficits we've known would come since the early 1990s is beyond irresponsible," said Brad Dayspring, a spokesman for Cantor.

In his address yesterday, Boehner accused Obama of going on the "largest spending binge in American history."

Obama's 2011 annual budget, Republicans note, drove federal spending to a record \$3.8 trillion. Non-defense discretionary spending also grew by 24 percent during the first two years of the Obama administration, they say, adding \$734 billion in spending over the next 10 years.

RECESSION WORSENEDE DEFICIT

The recession, Obama said in a televised address from the White House yesterday, lowered revenue and required his administration to "spend even more" on tax cuts, unemployment insurance and state and local aid. "These emergency steps also added to the deficit," he said.

Some Democrats also supported the Bush administration programs. In the Senate, Obama voted to finance the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and TARP. He signed legislation extending the Bush-era tax cuts for two years in December.

"Both sides are claiming they're fiscally responsible," said Rudolph Penner, director of the Congressional Budget Office under President Ronald Reagan. "But I don't see much difference in that regard."

BUSH TAX CUTS

The 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, which lowered tax rates on income, dividends and capital gains, increased the federal budget deficit by \$1.7 trillion over a decade, according to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, a non-partisan left-of-center group in Washington that studies fiscal policy.

The two-year extension of those tax cuts that Obama signed will cost \$857.8 billion, according to the Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation.

Boehner has defended the tax cuts, arguing that they didn't lead to the deficit.

"The revenue problem we have today is a result of what happened in the economic collapse some 18 months ago," he told reporters on June 10, according to The Hill newspaper.

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have cost almost \$1.3 trillion since the terrorist attacks on Sept. 11, 2001, according to a March 29 analysis by the Congressional Research Service. Operations in Iraq have cost \$806 billion, and in Afghanistan \$444 billion. The analysis shows the government has spent an additional \$29 billion for enhanced security on militia bases and \$6 billion remains unallocated.

MEDICARE DRUG BENEFIT

The 2003 Medicare prescription program approved by President George W. Bush and a Republican-dominated Congress has cost \$369 billion over a 10-year time frame, less than initially projected by Medicare actuaries.

Nine Senate Republicans, including Nebraska's Chuck Hagel, along with 25 Republicans in the House, voted against the bill. Hagel argued that it failed to control costs and would add trillions in debt for future generations.

"Republicans used to believe in fiscal responsibility," Hagel wrote in a 2003 editorial in the Omaha World Herald. "We have lost our way."

TARP, the \$700-billion bailout of banks, insurance and auto companies, has cost less than expected. McConnell, Boehner, Cantor and Ryan all voted in October 2008 for the program, which stoked the rise of the Tea Party movement.

Many institutions have repaid the government. The latest estimated lifetime cost of the program is \$49.33 billion, according to a June 2011 report by the Treasury Department. That figure includes the \$45.61 billion cost of a housing program which the administration never expected to recoup.

Rank-and-file Republicans are eager to pin the blame on Democrats, frequently pointing to the economic stimulus signed by Obama in 2009. The total cost of the stimulus will be \$830 billion by 2019, according to a May 2011 Congressional Budget Office report.

That's half the cost of the Bush tax cuts and less than two-thirds of what has been spent on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, as I listen to my friend from the other side of the aisle, Mr. MCGOVERN, talk about what has caused the problem that we're in right now, he failed to mention the failed stimulus bill. He failed to mention the failed health care bill, both horribly expensive.

But I think it's important for us to look at the facts on one of the items that he mentioned. They continue, Mr. Speaker, to engage in this class warfare, us versus them, the multibillionaires, all this sort of stuff over and over and over again.

We happen to recognize that we're all in this together, and there should, in fact, be shared sacrifice. That's why I think it's important for us to look at the facts. Let's look at the facts here.

As we continue to hear people decry the so-called Bush tax cuts, which, as we all know, are no longer Bush tax cuts, they are the Bush-Obama tax cuts. They became that last December when President Obama supported the extension of them.

Let's look at what happened with the 2003 growth-oriented tax cuts. In 2003, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government had \$1.782 trillion in revenues. That was in 2003 before the growth-oriented 2003 tax cuts went into effect.

Mr. Speaker, in 2007, the Federal Government had a 44-percent increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury, by virtue of those 2003 tax cuts. They went from \$1.782 trillion to \$2.567 trillion. That's a \$785 billion increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury after the now Bush-Obama tax cuts were put into place. So this malarkey about the notion of those who are successful are not paying their fair share of taxes is absolutely preposterous.

Now, I want to take the time that I have remaining to shatter a few myths that are out there. First of all, we know right now that we're facing a crisis. Both Democrat and Republican alike in these remarks have made it clear that we're facing a crisis. I have yet to hear anyone—I think maybe the minority whip mentioned the Reid plan. All anyone's done on the other side of the aisle is malign the Boehner plan and mischaracterize it quite frankly, Mr. Speaker. But I think it's important to look at what it is that we face.

We know that the President of the United States said that if we don't increase the debt ceiling by August 2, on August 3, he does not know whether or not the Social Security checks will actually go out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we all want to make sure that the Social Security checks go out. This is going to be our one opportunity to vote for a measure that will ensure that we increase the debt ceiling so that those checks will go out and, for the first time in the 75 times that the debt ceiling has been increased since 1962, we're going to get to the root cause of the problem.

In the past 4 years we've had an 82-percent increase, an 82-percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending. And guess what?

The American people last November said that has to come to an end. And you know what? It's going to come to an end when we pass this measure.

I also want to say that we know that the threat of default is out there, and if we don't take action, we know that our credit rating will be downgraded. We know that that will happen. All of the rating agencies have predicted that.

They've also said that simply increasing the debt ceiling is not ade-

quate. We need to make sure that we get ourselves on a path that reduces the debt and reduces our deficits.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what we need to do is we need to recognize also that those agencies have said these proposals are that path. Now, there was a report that S&P had said that in fact if we didn't have \$4 trillion in cuts, which I frankly wish we could, but in light of the fact that this is a bipartisan effort, we're not going to get that high, but they said that if we didn't have \$4 trillion in reductions, that we would still threaten the credit rating.

Well, yesterday, Deven Sharma, the president of Standard and Poor's, testified before the Financial Services Committee and said while we must get on a path towards reducing the deficit and debt, it was inaccurate to say that it had to be a \$4 trillion level. And that's why, as my friends have been quoting these different sources, I was trying to get them on record to say who, in fact, is saying this.

We have to increase the debt ceiling, and we have to get ourselves on a path that will, in fact, reduce our annual deficits and the national debt. The plan that we have before us is far from perfect. Speaker BOEHNER doesn't like it, I don't like it, I don't know of any Republican who likes it. But Speaker BOEHNER and the rest of us recognize that we have a Democratic President and we have a Democratic United States Senate. And so if we are going to increase the debt, and we are going to, for the first time ever, change the course on the issue of debt ceiling increases by cutting spending, we have to pass this measure.

It grew from this bipartisan compromise last weekend. HARRY REID no longer supports it. I've not heard anyone on the other side of the aisle say that they support it, but it was a bipartisan compromise that was the basis on which Mr. BOEHNER is proceeding.

Let's support this measure, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

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

Mr. Speaker, I come today in strong support of the Budget Control Act, a legislative approach that cuts out-of-control Washington spending and is a responsible and necessary plan to avoid a default on our Nation's debt.

As we all know, under President Obama we are experiencing our third straight year of deficits in excess of \$1 trillion. In 4 years, President Obama's actions and projected budgets will add more than twice to our debt than was added during the previous 8 years. All told, the debt will double under President Obama's watch and reach a staggering \$26 trillion by 2021. That's double the debt in half the time when compared with the previous administration. Congress must act to cut spending and get our debt under control, and

that's what the legislation before us does.

First, the bill cuts more than \$900 billion in Federal spending and meets the expectations of the American people that we cut spending more than we increase the debt limit.

Second, the bill guarantees the House and Senate will vote on a balanced budget amendment. More than half of the States have a balanced budget requirement, and it's time Washington's books are balanced as well.

And third, the bill also demands reforms to the way Washington works by setting up a joint House and Senate committee to find at least \$1.6 trillion in additional savings. Its work product would enjoy expedited consideration in the House and Senate and could not be filibustered.

I'd also like to take a moment to point out that, despite what you've heard from the critics of this approach, that this is the most common way the debt limit is increased, for a short duration and tied to spending reforms. And history is pretty clear on this point.

Over the last 25 years, Congress and the President have acted 31 times to increase the debt limit. Twenty-two of those 31 times were for less than a year. Only 3 of those 31 increases lasted longer than 2 years.

These debt limit increases are often tied to spending reforms and are preceded by very short-term increases. Three examples of those include:

In 1987, there were three short-term debt limit increases prior to a longer term increase that included deficit targets and automatic sequestration provisions.

In 1990, there were six very short-term increases before a longer term increase that included PAYGO, discretionary caps, and other programmatic changes.

And in 1996, there were two very short-term increases to ensure full funding of Social Security and other Federal funds before a longer-term increase included in the Contract with America Advancement Act.

□ 1620

So what we're doing today is what has happened before.

I would also point out that the increase in the debt limit and the binding process to achieve spending reform in Washington is exactly what the financial markets need and expect from us.

Time is short, and this bill may be our last best chance to prevent a default. If we fail to act and the government defaults on its debt, the financial and economic shock waves that will ripple across this country are both unpredictable and unimaginable.

Finally, I want to say a few words about something that's not in this bill, and that's tax increases. While the President continues to insist that tax increases be a part of any debt limit legislation, he has failed to convince even his own party that tax hikes are a

good idea. In December of last year, when Democrats controlled both the House and the Senate, Congress refused to raise taxes. And now even Senator REID's own plan to increase the debt limit, which the President has now thrown his support behind, does not include tax increases.

Given the need to avoid default today and get our fiscal house in order for the future, we must pass the Budget Control Act. I urge a "yes" vote on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. You know, as I've been listening to this debate, I think it's critical that the House needs some truth in speaking.

This bill is not bipartisan. The vote will soon show that. This bill is not a compromise. It does not seek bipartisan common ground. Indeed, it is orchestrated only to find enough common ground among House Republican partisans.

This bill does not reflect compromise. It would compromise, indeed, Medicare and Social Security. It forces massive cuts, consistent with the ideological Republican budget that was unanimously opposed by Democrats.

This bill does not promote certainty for our Nation's economy. Instead, it brings more uncertainty for families facing major financial decisions, for businesses deciding whether to invest or hire, for markets unsure when the next shoe might drop.

This bill is not balanced. Instead, it embraces the Republicans's one-dimensional mantra just again expressed by the chairman of our committee: no end to unjustified tax loopholes or to tax breaks for the very wealthiest, even as so many middle class families have been losing ground.

In a few words, our Nation's economy and jobs are too much to risk on a bill that is a bridge to nowhere between our two Houses.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1½ minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, we must act now to enact critical spending reforms. While the White House has refused to offer a plan, the Budget Control Act would accomplish this goal.

Will it solve all of our economic problems? No. But instead of discussing how much more Washington will spend, we're now talking about reducing our spending and how to live within our means, just like all Americans must do. For example, the Budget Control Act would cut nearly \$1 trillion in spending over the next 10 years, establish firm spending caps, and require the Senate to vote on a balanced budget amendment.

I urge the Senate and President Obama to stop playing politics and support this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another member of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding the time.

This argument today is not about new spending. The argument today is about paying our bills. This is the credit card that has come due for the irresponsibility that we witnessed in this Chamber and across this Congress for 8 years of the Bush administration: two wars and \$2.3 trillion worth of tax cuts, a prescription D Medicare drug bill that came due.

Lawrence Lindsey, the President's chief economic advisor at the time, said it was going to cost \$300 billion in Iraq. They fired him. Dick Cheney said \$60 billion in Iraq and in and out in 6 to 8 months. Ten years later, we're in Iraq.

We have created 2.2 million new veterans. They are going to need our care for years to come in our health centers for the VA. It's going to be expensive. Paul Wolfowitz: In and out of Iraq in 2 months, a few billion dollars. The bill, our friends, has come due.

We cannot send a message to markets anywhere that the full faith and credit of the United States of America is at risk. In the aftermath of World War II, when finances were strained as never before, President Truman had the vision not only to pay off the debt of World War II, but to embrace the Marshall Plan, one of the greatest achievements in American history.

Think of what Mr. Lincoln, who served in this Chamber, by the way, think of what Mr. Lincoln might have said in the midst of the Civil War, America's worst moment, that America would forfeit its expenditures as the bill has come due.

Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Hamilton met in New York with one of the most fateful decisions in American history, to accept the debt of the States, which moved us away from the Articles of Confederation to a constitutional system. And now, at this moment, a political party in our history that always embraced fiscal responsibility, the bill has come due, and it's our obligation to pay it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Chairman CAMP, the bill, ladies and gentlemen, has come due.

Because Congress holds the purse strings, we just ran the numbers. Since World War II, Democrats in Congress have run up 90 percent of the debt that's held by the public. Ninety percent of the debt that we owe to foreign countries, to other corporations, to you and me have been run up by one side of the aisle. Wouldn't it be great if Democrats joined us in paying the bills that they ran up? But they won't.

Today, Republicans will take responsibility for their mess. We're going to make sure this country pays its bills, but we're going to make sure we start cutting up the credit cards, we change the financial behavior of this country, and that we actually give our kids and grandkids a future that they can count on, that they can afford, a country that's much stronger than the one we're facing today if we don't address this debt problem.

As a conservative, you can't cut soon enough or deep enough for me, but the Budget Control Act starts us on the right step. It cuts \$2.7 trillion in two steps. We cut more than we allow to be borrowed, we make sure there are no tax increases on our children, on our small businesses, on your families. We make sure there is finally a real straight up-and-down vote on a constitutional amendment to finally balance Washington's budget. We get more than half of the spending cuts in the Republican budget proposed by our Budget Chairman PAUL RYAN. More than half of those cuts are put in place because of this bill.

It doesn't solve the problems of America, but I'll tell you what: If you vote this bill down, all we've done is write a blank check to the President; we've given everyone a free ride in Washington until next election, and they will not be held accountable, no one in Congress, for getting our financial house in order.

This bill is the first step. It's the right step. It's where we need to move forward.

□ 1630

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my neighbors in Texas are saying work together to resolve this crisis without jeopardizing Medicare and Social Security. Adopt a balanced approach that balances the budget by closing some tax loopholes at the same time we cut spending.

But agreeing has not been possible so far when so many of our House colleagues pride themselves on being disagreeable. Instead of protecting the full faith and credit of these United States in the same manner as our Republican colleagues voted to do seven times for President George W. Bush, today's bill really represents little more than a ransom note from those who are using this critical issue to hold our country hostage.

As their price for ensuring our national creditworthiness, they demand that we jeopardize the security for the very young with educational opportunities, and for the old with Social Security and Medicare. Their ransom demands do not share the sacrifice, but they sure do spread the pain—to the young, to the old, to those who are trying to climb up the economic ladder or just not slide backwards.

They talk about tightening the belt. The only belt they're really tightening is right around the neck of the hostages that they've taken.

I believe now is the time to stand firm for those families and to affirm that America will always pay our bills by rejecting this bill and then moving forward with more reasonable legislation.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about the past and how we got here. The American people get it. We have debt, serious debt, a threat to our national security and a threat to our economic prosperity; and a default, putting the full faith and credit of the United States on the line, would make that worse.

This House has passed Cut, Cap, and Balance. We stood up to our responsibility and passed a bill. Now we have a second bill because it didn't get through the Senate. We have a second bill brought forward consistent with our principles. We're going to cut more than we're going to borrow. We're going to cap spending with real statutory caps, and we're going to ensure that there will be a vote on a balanced budget amendment in both Houses. That's what the American people want. They're demanding it. This is a solid first step to getting debt under control. We need to move forward now.

Let me be clear: this House must act now. The time is running out. The Senate must act on this bill, and the President must sign it. Let's uphold our responsibilities. We have a responsibility to the American people. Let's uphold our responsibility and do what's right for the country.

Mr. LEVIN. Could I inquire of our time, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this proposal that is brought to us today can be characterized by three words: reckless, hypocritical, and abusive.

It's reckless because for the first time in history we're having people play an elaborate game of fiscal chicken, threatening the full faith and credit of the United States for their own ideological agenda; 102 times we have increased the debt limit since 1917, seven times for George Bush, even though he was fighting unfunded wars and proposing massive tax cuts. People are already paying the price right now as we are starting to see the stock market slide, premiums are increased for ensuring our debt, and there is doubt about where we are going forward.

It is hypocritical because the Republicans have refused to actually back up some of their fanciful rhetoric in their Cut, Cap, and Balance amendment that would require massive cuts to budgets.

Earlier this week, one of our friends from the Republican Study Committee had the temerity to offer an amendment to the bill that is being debated this week on appropriations for Interior and EPA that would have been 11 percent. And what did the Republicans do when faced with a bill that would actually make them impose the cuts that they envision? They ran away from it; 104 of them voted with responsible Democrats saying we're not going to go that way. They don't want to go that way. They're not stepping up and actually doing the cutting. They want to do it far in the future.

Last, it's abusive. We have a divided government. The American public wants a balanced solution. They welcome tax reform and modest closing of loopholes to be able to avoid massive cuts in the future and to be able to get on a path to fiscal responsibility. But the Republican minority has decided, no, it is our way or the highway even if it means threatening our fiscal future. Reject this sham.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, we need to cut spending today and reduce the deficit and avoid the dangerous prospects of putting America for the first time in default.

The bill before us today will accomplish that without raising taxes on the American people. With unemployment being what it is today, in terms of looking at small businesses, it also will not raise taxes on small businesses who are the job providers. I support the Budget Control Act because the time is now for Congress and the President to do what is in the best interest of the American people.

Our economy is struggling. Our current national debt is over \$14 trillion, and we're adding \$4.5 billion a day to our deficit and debt. Let me break that down. That is \$188 million per hour to our deficits and debt, \$4.5 billion a day.

This reckless pattern of borrowing and spending has put our country on the road to bankruptcy. Washington needs to show the American people that we can deal with these challenges today and in the future. I urge my colleagues to support the Budget Control Act.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest amount of respect for the chairman of our committee, the Ways and Means Committee. But I think you're wrong on what you're trying to do today.

Do you remember May 31 of this year, Mr. Chairman? We took a vote

May 31. In fact, we took a vote on raising the debt limit. The vote was based upon a resolution introduced in this House by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; and he said when he introduced the piece of legislation on this floor that he hoped it would fail. He said we're not going to get enough votes to get this done. And so he set out to undermine his own resolution.

Now JFK said: I do not shrink from this responsibility; I welcome it.

I welcome my responsibility today and what I have to do. I'm going to have a pleasure to vote "no" because I know what has happened since May 31, a day of infamy. So we'll make it known that the bill couldn't pass so the American people understand that. The American people don't want us to tell them what they need or what they want. They should tell us what they need and what they want. We think we know, and most of the time we don't know on either side of the aisle.

They're choosing to extend the state of political and economic turmoil another 6 months in this bill. We want to go through the holidays doing this back and forth? Won't that be sweet. We'll make people think we're working.

It has been over 200 days and still not one piece of job legislation from the majority on this floor. Decades of the majority's policies exploded the deficit. You know what the cause of it is. The cost of just the Bush tax cuts will be 40 percent of the Federal debt by 2019. And when you add in the two wars, it'll be 47 percent. Who are we kidding here? The Republican budget bill this year added \$6 trillion to the national debt.

I rest my case. Live up to your responsibilities. That's what the American people want us to do.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill. As a proud member of the freshman class that came to Washington, D.C., in November 2010, I can tell you the culture of this city is changing.

□ 1640

I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle put forth the argument that because we've raised the debt ceiling 102 times and seven times under President Bush that somehow it makes it right for us to raise the debt ceiling without dealing with the problem that's causing it to exist in the first place, and that is the uncontrolled spending that has gotten us to this point of \$14.4 trillion of national debt.

As a member of the freshmen class, we have changed the culture of this place because now the debate is happening on the floor of this House, and we're going to take it to the Senate so that they take it to the floor of the Senate and for once openly and honestly debate the issues of the day. Yet they still in the Senate have not heard

that call, but through this process, they will.

We wanted more, but we realize that this is just a step in the process. The battle will go on. We will act responsibly today by passing this out of the House and cure the risk that comes from the risk of default.

But don't make any mistake about it: The battle will go on, and this is just the beginning.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from the great State of California, XAVIER BECERRA.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are way ahead of the politicians. They have been telling us over and over again: We want a balanced approach to reducing our deficits.

One in five Americans has said very clearly: We support the Republicans' slash-and-burn default plan that we see before us that only cuts services to Americans to try to help us balance our budget. But nearly three times as many Americans have been saying over and over again: We want to see a balanced approach between those cuts to very important services, a little bit of pain, but also tax increases on all those folks who have been taking advantage of those tax loopholes and making a ton of money.

The American people don't think it's a good idea to cut Medicare and Social Security and to cut Medicaid to protect tax loopholes for special interests. They've been saying that over and over.

But here's the biggest clue that our Republican colleagues aren't listening to: The American people have said over and over that the biggest deficit our country faces today is a jobs deficit. After 204 days as the majority, Republicans have only given us slash-and-burn politics that have created not one single job for hardworking middle class families. In fact, instead of creating jobs, their major pieces of legislation could potentially cost 2 million more Americans to lose their jobs.

The worst thing about this whole charade is that every single person here in this room today knows that this bill that we're discussing today won't go anywhere. We face the very real possibility of an historic default in under a week, and here we are spinning our wheels.

We all agree that our Nation must not default on its past obligations. The Republican Members here must abandon their "my way or the highway" approach and work across the aisle on a balanced, bipartisan agreement to reduce our deficit, create jobs, and protect our seniors and our middle class.

I say to my Republican friends: America is not short on work ethic; we're short on jobs. It's time for us to get to the business of America and create those jobs.

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

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), who is a member of our committee and the chair of our caucus.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, the whole world is watching in on the United States Congress.

It is a sad day for the United States Congress. We in America, the pre-eminent military, economic, and cultural leaders in the world, are governing like we're a Third World country. It is a sad time for this body that we cannot come together. Sad is the American public who looks in at this and recognizes that it's theater, except that it's become the theater of the absurd.

In a frail recovery where Americans are already overburdened, what we have in front of us is a manufactured ideological crisis. Eighteen times the debt ceiling was raised for Ronald Reagan, eight times for George Bush, because they would never stand in this body to see a default on the full faith and credit of the United States. As the world looks in and we default on a global economy and we march towards defaulting on a national economy, the most ruinous thing is that we are defaulting on household economies.

What this body should be focusing on is dealing with this deficit and focusing, as Mr. BECERRA said, on the real default that's taking place in Congress: the lack of job creation, the need to put people back to work so that we can restore the dignity that only comes when people are able to sit across their dining table and look at one another and know that they have the dignity that comes from a job.

We need not go through this ideological hostage situation. Why are we holding the American people hostage? Let's put America back to work. We're a better Nation. We're a better body than that.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL. As a freshman Member of this distinguished body, I am completely disappointed in our failure to work together.

Our constituents sent us here to solve America's problems, not create more problems for them. The constituents of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama sent me here to make sure that I better their lives, not create fear and instability.

The entire world is watching us, and what are we showing them? We're showing them that we're completely detached from reality. We're showing them that we don't care about what their families, local governments, States, and businesses are facing.

America's debts are serious. We all know that. We have to put our fiscal house in order. No one is disputing that. It's how we go about it. No matter how we got here, we have bills to pay and we must pay our bills. That's what we, as Americans, do. We pay our bills.

The Republican bill that's before us does not do that. What it does is it holds hostage America's promise, the promise that we made to students and to seniors for Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid. It's unfair.

I ask my colleagues in this House to vote against the bill on the floor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. In a few words, what is endeavored here is an abdication of responsibility.

This bill is going nowhere. It tries to bind the wounds of a divided Republican caucus. We should do better. We'll have to do better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I have been listening to my friends on the other side over the course of this afternoon, and I would just say to them: Where is your plan? Where is your legislation to address the debt problems of the United States? Where are your ideas in legislation that is scored by the Congressional Budget Office so that you could bring your alternative to the floor? This isn't the direction that you want to go; where is your plan?

I notice in the other body, the majority has not passed a budget in more than 800 days. Frankly, if they passed a budget on the other side, we might not be in this situation because we would have the avenue of reconciliation potentially available to us. This is the second Congress the other body hasn't passed a budget. We've got no ideas from my friends on the other side on how to address this issue.

So this is the second proposal that we have put forward that has been in legislative form, that has been scored, where you can address the problems that are facing this country.

□ 1650

We've had lots of rhetoric from the other side, but no concrete plans. We've had lots of press releases from the other side, but no proposals. Even the President has not articulated one spending cut after giving us 3 years of trillion-dollar deficits, after putting us on a path to more than double the debt of this country in less than half the time of the previous administration.

So I would say this is the proposal that will get our country onto a fiscal path that will prevent default, that will address the long-term debt obligations that this Nation has run up, frankly, under both parties. But we need to address them now because the

trajectory has become so much worse in recent years. This is the plan.

I urge a "yes" vote.

I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be yielded to the Budget Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan's remaining 2 minutes will be yielded to the chairman of the Budget Committee.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. LANKFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to speak in support of this bill.

I came on as a freshman, and in January of this year we were already talking about this moment. For months, the conversation has been: How do we reach a point of agreement? There have been lots of different ideas floated around. Very few of those have been put down in writing. But the ideas that have been floated around seem to circle around a central theme: How can we find a middle ground to be able to resolve this issue? I propose this bill is that middle ground.

The debt reduction that's in it was a framework that was formed in the Biden talks. The Select Committee that's in it is something very important to the Senate, that HARRY REID raised that idea. The proposal to have a balanced budget amendment is very important to Republicans to say, Let's have a moment to be able to discuss that. And the statutory caps that are coming are very important to Republicans.

This is a bill that has been discussed in its essence and in its core in a bipartisan fashion. And while we search for a compromise, I would suggest we have found it. And we are about to vote on it. This is a moment to be able to look at it and say it is not the draconian monster that it has been described as. It allows a simple way to be able to handle one of the most difficult issues that we have dealt with in a very long time.

Ultimately, we bump up against an issue that is significant because of this one key truth: Why has this not been a problem before? Why haven't we passed it? Why haven't we just added to the debt ceiling year after year after year? We've done that. But now we have reached \$14.3 trillion. We've now reached 100 percent of GDP. We have to start dealing seriously with how do we start paying down our debt. And not just paying our interest payments, but how do we start paying down our debt. At this moment in time it becomes a key moment to say, Let's resolve the problem, let's start dealing with difficult issues and work on these together, both parties both Houses, to be able to settle the issues. But let's do it

in a way that forms long-term solutions.

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

It's high time that we stopped playing Russian roulette with the American economy and American jobs. And yet that is exactly what this measure does, for the following reason. It says, Okay, America, we're going to pay America's bills, but only for 5 more months—and only if we put in motion a plan that will end the Medicare guarantee and slash education. The proposal before us today will put the American economy and American jobs at even greater jeopardy over the next 5 months than they are today. It deliberately, by choice, keeps the economy under a cloud of instability and uncertainty. It chooses to risk higher interest rates and shrinking retirement funds that hit on every American family.

So why would we choose to intentionally keep this cloud hanging over the country and the American people? We're told that we have to do it in order to force this Congress to reduce the deficit. That's what we're told. But the actions tell a very different story. The actions suggest this is not about reducing the deficit. It's about reducing the deficit in a particular way—the way the Republican plan wants to reduce the deficit. That's why our Republican colleagues walked out of talks three times. That's why they've rejected the balanced approach and framework put forward by the President that says, Let's do \$4 trillion in deficit reduction, and we'll do \$3 trillion in spending cuts and \$1 trillion in revenue. Three dollars of spending cuts to every dollar in revenue from cutting special interest tax breaks and asking the folks at the very top to go back to the rates they were paying during the Clinton administration.

Our Republican colleagues rejected that approach to reducing the deficit because they don't want to end these tax breaks for the purpose of reducing the deficit. In fact, we passed a piece of legislation just a week ago that says we're going to keep America from paying our bills unless we enact a constitutional amendment that makes it easier to cut Medicare and Social Security than it does to cut special interest subsidies. It would say a majority vote, let's just cut Medicare and education, but you need two-thirds, a supermajority, if you want to cut corporate tax breaks for the purpose of reducing the deficit.

So that's what it's all about. This particular issue on the debt ceiling is a manufactured crisis. We've all heard when President Reagan was President, he raised it 17 times. So this is a manufactured crisis in order to try and force and squeeze through a particular deficit reduction plan—a deficit reduction plan that would end the Medicare guarantee, cut education, and yet protect those special interest tax breaks and breaks for the very top.

If we want to be serious about the deficit, we need to do a balanced approach, but let's not hold the entire American economy hostage. Let's not put us on 5-month to 5-month interest rate and creditworthiness watches in order to jam through a particular idea on deficit reduction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I enjoyed listening to the talking points from my friend. I just don't think they apply to this bill.

Russian roulette. This is the second piece of legislation we've brought to the floor to responsibly raise the debt limit while cutting spending. Manufactured crisis. Who went on television to scare senior citizens that their Social Security checks might be in doubt? The President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the cuts in this bill were agreed to in a bipartisan group. The level of cuts in this bill that go into effect immediately are \$2 billion off the Senate majority leader's cuts in his bill. These were agreed to on a bipartisan basis. We're cutting spending not as much as we want, but at least we're cutting spending. Russian roulette is raising the debt limit without getting borrowing under control. A manufactured crisis is trying to scare seniors and the country into giving this government another blank check to keep spending money we don't have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. GUINTA.

Mr. GUINTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the bill before us, the Budget Control Act of 2011. Mr. Speaker, this is about leadership. This is about an ability and a willingness of this body to do something right, not for partisan purposes, but for spending reductions and for the country. I hear from the other side that they are concerned about this component or that component. But what I don't see is a plan and a solution. We have not put one, but two different proposals. The one that I co-sponsored, Cut, Cap, and Balance, I think is the best and most appropriate way to move forward. But the Senate has decided that they don't want to take up that piece of legislation. So we're here to compromise. We're here to work with the other side of the aisle to get something accomplished on behalf of real structural change in how we spend taxpayer dollars—other people's money.

□ 1700

I took an oath to make sure I uphold the Constitution. I will also make sure that I represent New Hampshire in the manner in which they would like me to represent them. I contend that they would like us to reduce expenditures, to reduce our debt, to reduce our deficit. This bill does that. They also want to see us cap spending. We all have to

live within the means we have. We take in \$2.2 trillion a year, and we're spending about \$3.7 trillion. Nobody in America has that type of balance sheet.

The time to act is now. No more partisan politics. No more baseless charges from Members of this body. Let's do the right thing. Let's make sure that we can send a message to the country that we can work in a bipartisan fashion to do what everybody in the country understands we need to do, which is to spend no more than we take in. That is the goal. That is the objective.

In exchange for that, we allow this President to raise the debt ceiling, to pay for the 41 cents of every dollar that we continue to borrow. That policy has to stop. Those days are over.

I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues here in the House and the Senate to do the same.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We keep hearing from our colleagues that there wasn't a proposal put forward by the President. The framework is pretty clear, and we can sort of solve this particular piece of it today, if possible. He said he will do \$3 in spending cuts for \$1 of revenue for deficit reduction. If someone wants to take us up on that offer while we're talking about it on the floor, that would be just terrific.

Because our Republican colleagues walked out of that discussion, Senator REID did put on the table a proposal that has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office. I have their score in my hand, dated July 27, 2011. It would reduce the deficit by \$2.2 trillion, more than the \$917 billion score in the Republican proposal. This is a non-partisan, independent CBO score. The difference is he would raise the debt ceiling for 2 years so we don't keep the economy under a cloud, so we don't keep the threat of higher interest rates going into effect, which would be a hit on every American family.

Why we would choose to deliberately keep the economy under a cloud and put jobs at risk is a mystery. The only answer is our Republican colleagues want to use that as a forcing mechanism to ultimately put in place their budget plan, which does end the Medicare guarantee, which does slash education and does protect corporate tax loopholes.

With that, I yield 1 minute to a terrific member of the Budget Committee, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. We are faced with an important moment for our Nation: a moment of enormous economic uncertainty, a moment to significantly reduce our deficit and make the right choices for our future.

The Boehner bill does neither. As a result, it has little support from either side of the aisle because it does not seriously reduce the deficit. It will ensure uncertainty in the markets for many, many months ahead, and it cuts \$1 trillion over 10 years.

Speaker BOEHNER had the opportunity, in working with the President, to reduce the deficit, not by \$1 trillion but by \$4 trillion, and he walked away from that plan. The Gang of Six made a bipartisan effort to reduce the deficit by \$3 trillion, and he rejected that plan as well. This moment is about choices. Speaker BOEHNER made a choice to walk away from the plans that offered trillions of dollars in deficit reduction, and he substituted, instead, a political document with significantly less deficit reduction.

This is not a serious proposal, and we have little time to avoid default. Let's stop wasting time. Members from both sides of the aisle should reject this bill because it is an inadequate response to both deficit reduction and because of the harm it will do to our Nation's economy.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Every now and then, Mr. Speaker, you need to just step back and look at the record and put the rhetoric aside.

When this majority showed up in January of this last year, we found a situation where our friends on the other side had failed to write a budget for this year, had failed to pass any appropriations bills and had just sort of gone home.

We had a President who had appointed a debt reduction commission but yet failed to embrace any of their actions at all—not one. Then we heard the President come and address us in this Chamber in a state of the Union message, but for 35 minutes, he didn't bother to mention the looming debt crisis—35 minutes.

The first serious proposal we got from that President, our President, was for a \$400 billion reduction over 10 years that was so laughable that, when it was brought up in the United States Senate, which is controlled by his party, it failed 97-0.

Then the President wanted to have a free vote on raising the debt ceiling. Let's just raise it. Go ahead and see what happens. We obviously don't support that as we think there ought to be some spending reductions, but we said, sure, you've got the vote. Fewer than 100 of my friends on the other side supported their own President when he asked for that vote. They clearly weren't sufficiently motivated to do that.

Now we've reached a point where, last week, we actually did raise the debt ceiling by \$2.7 trillion. We did institute cuts that, frankly, are going to happen anyway—they coincide with my friend Mr. RYAN's budget—and we put caps on long-term spending. We said just give the American people a chance—just a chance—to vote on a balanced budget amendment. We're not asking that it pass, but don't you think they ought to have the right through

their State legislatures to make that decision? We were denied that.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE. Now we're at a point where we are about to, once again, raise the debt ceiling and to do it in a responsible way, in a way that I predict, frankly, will probably become the pattern in the future. This body should never raise the debt ceiling again automatically. We've certainly done it on our side, and our friends on the other side have done it. We should always couple it with spending restraint and reform, and that's exactly what we're doing in this measure.

This majority has enacted a budget. My friend has taken a lot of arrows for that budget, but I'm proud to be associated with him. This majority will have twice raised the debt ceiling and coupled it with historic spending cuts.

As for the President's plan that we hear about, I'd just like to see it, just once. I haven't seen anything or heard anything like this since Richard Nixon had a secret plan to end the war. The President must have a secret plan, because it's not on paper; it has not been scored, and it has not been publicly presented to anybody.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE. If the majority leader's plan scores at \$2.2 trillion—and I take my friend's word on that—I guess we really have a \$4 trillion deficit, because we have \$3 trillion, and we don't even count the extra \$1 trillion, which is automatic because the wars are ending. So I think we ought to up ours. We have a \$4 trillion plan. We ought to give the majority leader the credit for finding that additional \$1 trillion.

If you'll just vote for this, you'll have your magic \$4 trillion plan done—our 3, Senator REID's 1. That adds up to what the President wanted. So let's pass this, give the Senate an opportunity to pass it, and give the President of the United States an opportunity to sign it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As I was listening to my friend, I really don't think the American people want us to be doing this every 5 months so that it becomes business as usual that we put the country through this crisis situation and with the threat of rising interest rates and all the other negative economic consequences that would happen.

Because the grand bargain is now off the table, Senator REID has put forward a proposal. Again, I have the CBO scoring of it right here: \$2.2 trillion, with more cuts than in the proposal that's on the table here from our Republican colleagues, the big difference being he doesn't want to say every 5 months "let's put the country into economic crisis" and deal with all the uncertainty between now and 5 months from now that that will create.

With that, I yield 1 minute to a terrific member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the issues we want on the table here is revenue. The top 400 wealthiest people in the United States of America pay a 17 percent tax rate. My constituents in Youngstown and Akron, Ohio, pay a heck of a lot more than 17 percent.

□ 1710

We hear our friends on the other side say how all of these changes need to occur, how all of these problems need to be solved. But heaven forbid, Mr. Speaker, we ask the 400 wealthiest families in the United States of America to maybe be a little bit patriotic and help us out. And you'll say, Well, these are the job creators. These taxes aren't going into place for another year or two. We've got to get through this downturn.

But we need to send the message to the bond market that we are serious. And for us to be this irresponsible and not ask the wealthiest—what are they being asked to sacrifice here? The top 1 percent, what are we asking them to sacrifice?

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One final point.

The debt that we now are debating was run up by our friends on the other side—two wars, the Bush tax cuts, and a prescription drug plan all on the credit card. And now the same people who've worked their way up in the leadership positions are saying, We're not going to pay the bill. This is irresponsible.

Let's solve this in a balanced way, and let's ask for some shared sacrifice.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The gentleman, my friend over from Maryland, keeps talking about the Reid plan, the Senate majority leader over in the Senate. His plan. I've got the CBO score, too. It says it's a \$2.7 trillion increase. That means it doesn't raise the debt limit less than we cut spending, so it cuts less. But more importantly, \$1.3 trillion of that money is accounting tricks and budget gimmicks.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of all of the accounting tricks and the budget gimmicks that go on in Washington. Let me explain what \$1.3 trillion of this does. It says that imagine that we're at war for 10 years in Afghanistan and Iraq at surge levels. We assume we're going to be fighting this war for 10 more years with over 100,000 troops in Afghanistan and, oh gosh, wait. We're going to withdraw our troops in 2014. Trillion dollars in savings.

I've got a better idea. Let's pass a bill to cover the Moon with yogurt that will cost \$5 trillion today. And then

let's pass a bill the next day to cancel that bill. We could save \$5 trillion. Wait. I got a better idea. Our debt is \$14 trillion. Let's come up with a new plan to spend \$14 trillion, then rescind it the next day and let's save \$14 trillion.

This stuff is fiscal fantasy. You can't make this stuff up, Mr. Speaker. Suggesting that we're going to be in a war at these levels for 10 more years when everybody knows we've already decided not to do that, that does not get us \$1.3 trillion in spending cuts. Only in Washington can you add up math like that. We need real spending cuts.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional minute to say this is getting serious, Mr. Speaker, very serious. We can't keep spending money we just don't have. Now 42 cents of every dollar coming out of this place is borrowed money. It doesn't just threaten our children and grandchildren any more. It is hurting our economy today.

Half of that money is coming from other countries like China. Why on Earth do we want to give the President a blank check to keep doing that, giving our sovereignty and our self-determination to other countries to lend us money to fund our government. Those days have got to end.

This bill doesn't cut as much as we want. We passed a budget cut \$6.2 trillion in real spending cuts. This cuts about a trillion.

Let's cut this trillion, bank that money, and then go cut some more. That's what we're trying to do to be responsible.

The problem in this town is not that we don't tax Americans enough. The problem is we're spending way too much money.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, of course we should be reducing the deficit. Of course we should make sure that we don't rely on the Chinese as our bankers any more, which is why it's so ironic that our Republican colleagues refuse to cut subsidies for oil companies by one penny for the purpose of reducing the deficit so we don't have to rely on borrowing from China anymore.

In fact, if you look at Exxon's quarterly profits today, they're through the roof. Now, I'm all for having Exxon make money. But why should they have taxpayer money on top of it? And yet our Republican colleagues get up here and they talk about how we're dependent on China. But they don't want to break that dependency if it means actually asking the top oil companies to get rid of their subsidies for the purpose of deficit reduction. So let's get serious.

Now, with respect to the plan that has been put forward by Senator REID. I listened to my colleague. I would point out to the body that if you look at the Republican budget and the documents that accompanied it when they

pointed out what their savings were relative to the CBO baseline, they also show a trillion dollars in savings from the global war on terror. As my friend the chairman knows, that is a function of the way the Congressional Budget Office scores.

But it is also a fact that when the Republican budget was presented, they presented it both relative to the President's baseline and the congressional budget baseline. I would further make the point that even if you took that off the table, the proposal by Senator REID cuts immediately more on spending than the Republican proposal before us today, the difference being he doesn't keep the economy hanging under a cloud for 5 months and make this country go through this exercise just by the end of December.

With that, I would yield 1 minute to the distinguished Member of Congress from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Soon my colleagues will be quoting Dr. King's "I Have a Dream" speech, and here's a quote they will not read and they will ignore: "In a sense, we've come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the 'unalienable rights' of 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'"

"It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note in so far as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the people a bad check, a check which has come back marked 'insufficient funds.'"

But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. The problem, Mr. Chairman, is not that we spend. It's that we don't honor our obligations. We are a Nation that spends billions of dollars to put a man on the Moon, fund the war in Afghanistan, fund the war in Iraq, but we can't find the money in this Congress to put a man on his own two feet right here in America.

And there is something more fundamental, Mr. Speaker, that is going on here. This President is being treated differently than other Presidents. No other President has been "stook up," shook down, or held hostage as this President of the United States over this debt vote. This is fundamentally unfair, Mr. Speaker, to change the rules in the middle of the game.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would respectfully ask that Members heed the gavel and only consume the amount of time yielded to them by the floor managers.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of

the House Republican Conference, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has a debt crisis not because we are undertaxed but because Washington spends too much. And here we are days before the President's August 2 deadline, and the President of the United States has yet to submit a plan to deal with the debt crisis. Here we are days away from the President's August 2 deadline, and the United States Senate has yet to pass a single plan.

Days before the President's August 2 deadline, not only have House Republicans passed their first plan, in a manner of hours we will vote yet again on another plan to deal with the debt crisis that we must remember is spending driven. It's the President's spending that brought us here.

Now, the bill that we're bringing to the House floor, Mr. Speaker, is not the ultimate solution. But, Mr. Speaker, it ensures that this Nation pays its current bills, like families, like small businesses have to. It gives us the opportunity to actually cut spending.

□ 1720

The amounts are not what they should be, but for the second year in a row, we will have the opportunity to actually reduce spending to save our country and save our children's futures. But most importantly, within this legislation is the opportunity that brings us the ultimate solution, and that, Mr. Speaker, is a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. Every family, every small business, almost every State has a provision that says, we have to balance our budget. Should we expect less of a great Nation? Maybe that's why we have the \$14 trillion debt. We must act today, approve this bill, balance the budget for our Nation and future generations.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes at this time, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation before us today is a down payment. Does this cut the amount of spending we need to save the country from a debt crisis? No. Our budget does do that. This is two-thirds of the spending cuts we called for in this category of spending, discretionary spending. Is it 100 percent of the cuts we asked for? No, it's two-thirds of the cuts we asked for.

What does the President's budget do? It actually spends \$130 billion more. I will take two-thirds of the step in the right direction instead of going in the wrong direction, the President's plan.

The Congressional Budget Office, we asked them to take a look at the President's framework. The CBO director told me under oath that they can't score speeches. This plan rejects the President's fiscal demands for tax increases, and it rejects his political de-

mands for a blank check to get him through the election.

What we are doing here today is getting serious about getting spending under control. The spending cuts that are in this bill were already agreed to by bipartisan talks. Why are people hiding from that? This is the second bill we will have passed to avoid a default. That's responsible. It has been 820 days since the Senate even tried passing a budget.

The President, as we know, has yet to offer a plan to fix this problem. We passed a budget to fix this problem. We passed a plan to deal with the debt limit. And now we are passing another plan, based upon mutually agreed to spending cuts that get two-thirds of the cuts we already called for in this category of government. That's reasonable. That's responsible. And that is what we should be doing. Instead, we hear all this empty rhetoric and all this call for a blank check and all these accounting gimmicks and budget gimmicks from the other side who are trying to do everything they can to do anything but cut spending.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, just to be very clear, the Democratic Senate leader Mr. REID has put on the table a plan that would cut more immediately than the Republican plan before us today, even if you don't include the overseas contingency account funding. The difference is, he would not put our economy in jeopardy again just 5 months from now, as the Republican plan did.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we're talking about being serious. And here we're considering a \$2 trillion bill, \$200 billion a year, slapped together behind closed doors and sprung on the House less than 24 hours after it was printed, an up-or-down vote, no amendments, and is legislation that 53 Senators already say they are going to oppose.

We have a situation where last December, we passed \$400 billion a year in tax cuts, and now everybody says we need \$400 billion a year in deficit reduction. This bill does not cut anything. It has caps, promises for cuts in the future. And we don't know what those cuts are going to be. But we know in the continuing resolution, food inspection was cut, FBI agents, air traffic controllers, flu shots, clean water grants, schools, scientific research, community health centers, transportation—we can expect all of those to be cut in the future, all to preserve tax cuts, many for millionaires and oil companies. That's not right. Let's go through the regular process so we know what we're doing.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, you know what we've seen play out here is, a few years back, we provided the tax breaks that went disproportionately to the very wealthy in this country. Now all of a sudden—oh, well, we can't pay

our bills anymore, a good part of that reason being the tax cuts. But how are we going to deal with those bills? We're going to sock it to middle class America, whether it's through cuts in education or cuts to Medicare, and all because we don't want to cut subsidies for the oil companies.

Again, as I said, just today, Exxon reported huge profits. God bless them for making all that money. But why do they need any of ours, our taxpayer money? And that is the rub of the issue. It's not whether we reduce the deficit; it's how.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. May I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 1 minute, and the gentleman from Maryland has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself 45 seconds just to say that we, as a body, need to do two things: Number one, we need to make sure the United States pays its bills. We need to make sure it pays its bills, and we shouldn't do it in a way that puts the American economy in jeopardy every 5 months. Just listen to the folks, the experts who have been monitoring this. They have said that if you do this on a 5-month period, you will risk interest rates going up. Second, we need to reduce the deficit. Of course we do. Let's do it in a balanced way. The President has proposed \$3 in spending cuts to \$1 in revenue, but we can't get our colleagues on the Republican side to get one penny—not one penny—of revenue from closing a corporate tax loophole if the purpose is deficit reduction. And there is the rub.

So let's reject this wrong approach. Senator REID has a proposal on the table. It cuts more than the one that the Republicans have, but it doesn't put the economy in jeopardy every 5 months.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the last minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI), the terrific Democratic leader in the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend him for his tremendous leadership. We couldn't be prouder of the way he has represented the values of the American people, both as the ranking member of the Budget Committee and also at the table in the bipartisan talks with Mr. CLYBURN under the leadership of Vice President BIDEN. It's too bad that the progress that was made in those meetings, to have a balanced, bipartisan initiative to bring to the floor, to give confidence to the markets, and to give confidence to the American people, did not succeed because the Republicans walked away from those talks.

Mr. Speaker, last week, our Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER, said he couldn't reach an agreement with President

Obama because they have different visions of our country. President Obama shares the vision of the American people. When we look to find our common ground and take it to a higher ground, I think all Americans agree that we want to educate our children for their own self-fulfillment but also to keep America number one by having innovation, which springs from education and from the classroom. I think all Americans share the higher ground, the common ground when it comes to the creation of jobs, good-paying jobs here in America for the economic stability of America's families and of our economy.

□ 1730

I think all Americans agree that we must have a dignified retirement for our seniors, where they have health and economic security. That's why Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security are so important to the American people.

I think all Americans agree that we must keep the American people safe, both in our national security and our economic security, and we must do so in a fiscally sound way without adding to the deficit. That is President Obama's vision of our country, and I'm sure that Speaker BOEHNER must share those views. So if that is the reason, the different vision of our country, maybe it is, hopefully it is not. Hopefully they share that vision.

Why are we where we are today? I believe it is because it wasn't about not sharing a vision for our country. I believe it is because the purpose of these talks was to reduce the deficit. My belief is that the Republicans came to the table not to reduce the deficit, but to go way beyond that and to dismantle decades of progress made in a bipartisan way for America's great middle class.

If, in fact, the purpose was deficit reduction in a very strong way, we were on that path. In the Biden talks and in the talks subsequent to it, we all agreed that there had to be substantial cuts, that we had to subject Federal dollars spent to make sure that we got our money's worth for U.S. taxpayers.

Democrats wanted revenue. We wanted sharing of the sacrifice in all of this. Republicans did not.

But we still could come to a place, as Senator REID did and as our distinguished ranking member referenced, to a place that used the proposals that Republicans had in the Ryan budget and in proposals that they had agreed to in the talks to reach a strong deficit reduction number that would enable us to come to agreement and to put this matter to rest until February of 2013, so we would remove all doubt in the markets that we were going to honor our debts, we were not going to default on previous spending. The purpose was not to lift the ceiling so we could spend more. The purpose was to lift the ceiling so we could pay for previous obligations, and that there would be that 18 months of certainty.

Instead, the Republicans have come forth with a proposal that, as I said, dismantled. This isn't about deficit reduction. This is about dismantling the public sector. And in doing so, they want to do it for 6 months, which means the minute this thing would be accomplished, and God forbid that it would be accomplished, we would have to start all over again.

I believe the American people are disappointed that this has taken so long, then angry that it is happening because of the uncertainty it brings to their lives, and, next, disgusted with the whole process. And they are so rightly so, because if our purpose is to reduce the deficit, we certainly can do that. If our purpose is to dismantle progress to the middle class, we won't be a party to it.

I think that the 6-month plan, not only in terms of uncertainty, is also a job killer. It has front-loaded cuts that will deter, impede the growth of our economy, our comeback, and, again, kill jobs. Every day that we are debating this is another day that we are not talking about job creation. Every day.

Republican bills that they have brought to the floor in the first 200 days of their majority, now it's 205, would amount to nearly 2 million jobs lost, just under 10,000 jobs a day lost by the proposals they have brought to the floor.

The American people's top priority is the creation of jobs. Jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs. Instead of this prolonged dismantling of the public sector attempt, we should instead have reached agreement—we still can—on a balanced bipartisan approach.

I want to say something as a mom about this dismantling of the public sector. I view my role in politics as an extension of my role as a mother and now a grandmother. As parents, all of us know that we want to do everything we can for our children to help them grow, be healthy, to learn, to reach their fulfillment, but there are things we can't do for them. We have to look to the public sector in order for them, and moms can identify with this, I'm sure, to make sure that they have clean drinking water, that the air they breathe is clean, that there is food safety. We can't do that ourselves. We can't do that ourselves. That is a public role.

The list goes on about the education of our children, the health security of our grandparents. Now, being a grandparent myself, but in terms of Medicare, Medicaid, all the things that are important to children, their health, their education, the economic security of their families, the pension security and health security of their grandparents, the safety of their neighborhood, some of these are private roles, some of these are public roles, some are public/private roles.

But, as a mom, I call upon all mothers across the country to understand what this bill does to the health and well-being of America's children. And

really, it's quite ironic, because any speech that you hear on the floor, in meetings and all the rest, they say we must reduce the deficit because it's immoral to pass along deficits to our children. Well, I think it's wrong to pass along private or public debt to our children.

But what we are doing here is to pass along to our children a future less bright because of, again, I'll say it again, this dismantling of the public sector, which is an ideological goal long held by our friends. They would rather see seniors pay more for Medicare. They'd rather cut Medicaid and jeopardize Social Security while they give tax subsidies to Big Oil making record profits, tax breaks to corporations sending jobs overseas, and tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country at the expense of the education of our children and the health and well-being of our country.

I hope that the House will reject this measure. I know that people of good intention to reduce the deficit can find a path to do that. It can't be too late because we have a deadline on August 2.

But I want to pay my respects to President Obama, who has been respectful of every suggestion proposed by the Republicans, giving it the time and attention that they thought it deserved. He tried to accommodate all of those to have a balanced bipartisan approach. And what did the Republicans do? Walk away from the table.

Well, the American people know about this. That's why 50-some percent of the American people support the balanced bipartisan approach that the President says we should strive to achieve, and only about 19 percent of the American people support the proposal that is put forth by the Republicans.

□ 1740

This House should reject that. We should come together and use the work that has been done already to do something that will remove all doubt that we pay our bills, to remove all doubt that we are a strong economy that recognizes the role we play in the global economy, but also recognizes that all of this has an impact in the lives of everyday Americans as they sit around their kitchen table thinking about what they will do if the cost of credit goes up.

And that means their credit card bills, their car payment, their house payment, student loans and the rest are more expensive to them. This is very costly in terms of confidence and in terms of making ends meet.

Let's be responsible. Reject this bill and get back to work so that on Tuesday we will have met our obligations. That's the least that we can do for our children.

Mr. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to Speaker BOEHNER'S flawed plan to address our urgent need to raise the debt limit and our longer term challenge of reducing our nation's debt.

First, the Speaker's plan is a short-term band-aid, when our economy and markets need certainty. Under the Speaker's plan, we would be back where we are now in a few months, facing yet another possibility of defaulting on our debt. We should pass a debt limit extension that will take us through 2012. Playing with the creditworthiness of the United States is a game that never should have been started.

Second, this bill virtually guarantees cuts to Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security while protecting oil companies and the wealthiest in our country from any pain or paying their fair share. Billionaires are not being asked to pay more in taxes; loopholes that benefit the few are sacrosanct. But the programs seniors and children rely upon receive no such consideration.

Finally, this bill ignores the central problem facing our nation today: we need to put more people to work so they can afford to buy the products and services that will get our economy growing at a healthier pace. We need to make investments that will pay long-term dividends. Cutting funding for infrastructure, education, and child nutrition are short-sighted decisions that will hurt us in decades to come.

The people of Hawaii want Washington to change its ways. They want a compromise. They'd like a plan that is fair and balanced. They want us to reduce the deficit by cutting wasteful spending. They also want the wealthy to pay their fair share. Most of all, they want us to create jobs.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the "Budget Control Act of 2011," which, like the previous debt-ceiling bills introduced by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, attempts to resolve our budget ceiling crisis by demanding sharp cuts to domestic programs that ask average Americans to make life-changing sacrifices while not asking America's wealthiest individuals and most profitable corporations to contribute their fair share.

In my lifetime, I have never seen such a concerted effort to ransom the American economy in order to extort the American public. While I support bipartisan efforts to increase the debt limit and to resolve our differences over budgetary revenue and spending issues, I cannot support a bill that unduly robs average Americans of their economic security and ability to provide for their families while constraining the ability of Congress to deal effectively with America's economic, fiscal, and job creation troubles.

The Budget Control Act of 2011 cuts \$22 billion dollars from the Federal Budget for FY2012. Robert McIntyre, of Citizens for Tax Justice testified before the Senate Budget Committee that tax loopholes for corporations, big business owners and business investors cost the Treasury Department \$365 billion dollars in FY2011.

We need to change the tone here in Congress. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said it best when he stated in a recently before the House Committee on Financial Services. "We really don't want to just cut, cut, cut," Chairman Bernanke further stated "You need to be a little bit cautious about sharp cuts in the very near term because of the potential impact on the recovery. That doesn't at all preclude—in fact, I believe it's entirely consistent with—a longer-term program that will bring our budget into a sustainable position."

The Boehner plan does just that it will cut, cut, cut without taking into full consideration the serious cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. This bill is essentially a re-hashed version of the same bill that President Obama promised to veto and the Senate vowed to reject. It asks for \$917 billion in cuts from domestic spending for a \$900 billion dollar increase in the debt ceiling while demanding nothing in revenue from the nation's wealthiest. This is nothing more than a ransom note, irresponsibly raising the debt ceiling for only a few months so that in just a short period of time, the American public will be hit again for \$1.6 trillion in cuts from Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Veterans benefits. Anyone who believe that this plan will not result in a serious cut to Social Security should consider this . . . Social Security represents 20 percent of all federal spending, making it unrealistic to think such large cuts in mandatory spending will not affect Social Security benefits.

I state here today that the Boehner proposal is ill-conceived and fails to offer a balanced approach to decreasing the deficit. Instead of requiring shared sacrifice, the Boehner plan places the entire burden on the backs of seniors, the middle class and our nation's most vulnerable citizens, while doing nothing to close corporate tax giveaways and increase taxes on those most able to afford them.

The Boehner plan calls for large cuts in discretionary programs of \$1.2 trillion over the next 10 years through strict new spending caps. Most experts predict that the first round of cuts would target discretionary programs, including education, infrastructure, job training and law enforcement. The Boehner plan would then require an additional \$1.8 trillion in savings to be identified by the end of the year as a condition for raising the debt ceiling again at that time. Given the magnitude of these additional required savings, it would result in deep draconian cuts in federal entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. A repeal of health reform's coverage expansions. And a dramatic reduction in safety net programs for vulnerable Americans, such as food stamps and unemployment and disability insurance. This is unacceptable, and each is avoidable if corporations and the wealthy are required to shoulder a fair share of this burden.

The Speaker's plan requires a vote on an ill-advised constitutional balanced budget amendment in both chambers of Congress by the end of this year. The details surrounding exactly which proposed constitutional balanced budget amendment will be voted on are unclear. However, earlier proposals that have appeared in the House of Representatives, including H.J. Res. 1, would have a devastating impact on discretionary spending and on our modest economic recovery.

Passing an amendment to the Constitution is one of the most serious processes the United States Congress can undertake, requiring a two thirds supermajority of support in both the House and Senate and ratification by three-fourths (¾) of the States. The Founders purposely made the amendment process a long and arduous one. Do my Republican colleagues really expect Congress to capriciously pass an amendment altering our Nation's founding document on such short notice; an amendment that will fundamentally change our country without reasonable time for debate;

without the opportunity for a hearing or questioning of witnesses; without any reports as to what impact it may have?

By tying the fate of whether the United States pays its debt obligations to the historically prolonged Constitutional amendment process, the Republicans who support this bill have demonstrated, at this critical juncture in American history, that they are profoundly irresponsible when it comes to the integrity of our economy and utterly bereft of sensible solutions for fixing it.

The Speaker's plan will result in for \$2.7 trillion in deficit reduction and a \$2.5 trillion increase in the debt limit in two stages, with the two debt ceiling increases being conditioned upon enactment of an initial set of spending cuts and a later, second deficit reduction measure.

I do not believe that Congress should yield its authority to what amounts to a Commission. BOEHNER's plan creates a 12-member joint congressional committee to develop a plan for an additional \$1.8 trillion in deficit reduction that Congress would vote on in December. In addition the Speaker's plan authorizes the president to submit a \$900 billion increase in the, \$14.3 trillion debt ceiling immediately after enactment of this bill, and a \$1.6 trillion increase if the \$1.8 trillion deficit reduction measure is enacted. Both debt limit increases would take effect automatically unless Congress enacted resolutions of disapproval. The Speaker's plan also requires the House and Senate to vote by the end of the year on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. As I have stated before this will tie the hands of congress.

Finally, as noted above, the Boehner proposal provides only a short-term extension of the federal debt ceiling. This means that the gridlock that now prevails in our government will continue for the remainder of the 112th Congress. According to the Center on Budget and Policy, recent reports have suggested that rating agencies will downgrade the U.S. credit rating if the Boehner proposal is enacted. This would result not only in higher interest costs to the federal government but also would raise the, interest rate paid by individuals and families on car loans, credit cards and mortgages throughout the United States. Taken together, all of these factors would undermine the nation's fragile recovery.

There has been a theme this Congress of focusing on cutting programs that benefit the public good and for the most at need, while ignoring the need to focus on job creation and economic recovery. This bill is wasting a tremendous amount of time when we should be focused on paying our nation's bills and resolving our differences.

In my district, the Texas 18th, more than 190,000 people live below the poverty line. We must not, we cannot, at a time when the Census Bureau places the number of American living in poverty at the highest rate in over 50 years, cut vital social services. Not in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and persistent unemployment, when so many rely on federal benefits to survive, like the Supplemental Nutrition Access Program (SNAP) that fed 3.9 million residents of Texas in April 2011, or the Women, Infant, and Children (WIC) Program that provides nutritious food to more than 990,000 mothers and children in my home state.

In 2009, there were 43.6 million Americans living in poverty nationwide. According to the

2010 Federal poverty threshold, determined by the US Census, a family of four is considered impoverished if they are living on less than \$22,314 per year.

Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States poor population. In 2008, there were 15.45 million impoverished children in the nation, 20.7% of America's youth. The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that there are currently 5.6 million Texans living in poverty, 2.2 million of them children, and that 17.4% of households in the state struggle with food insecurity.

There is no doubt that we must reduce the national debt, but my Republican colleague's desire for instant gratification through deep spending cuts to benefits, Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security is reckless and threatens the financial security of millions of Americans.

Instead of closing corporate tax loopholes to reduce the deficit, the Budget Control Act cuts discretionary spending, and requires Congress to draft proposals to cut at least \$1.8 trillion from Medicare and Social Security. This is an outrage, and an insult to the American dream.

Forcing Congress to draft plans to cut 1.8 trillion from Medicare and Social Security forces Members to disregard the best interests of their constituents. Medicare guarantees a healthy and secure retirement for Americans who have paid into it for their entire working lives. Protecting Medicare represents the basic values of fairness and respect for our seniors, including the 2.9 million Texans who received Medicare in 2010.

Any cuts to Medicaid would be just as damaging. Harris County has one of the highest Medicaid enrollment records in Texas. Limits and cuts to Medicaid funds would significantly hurt the citizens of Texas's 18th District. Harris County averages between 500,4300 and 600,000 Medicaid recipients monthly, thousands of people who may not have access to healthcare should Congress sacrifice Medicaid to cut spending.

Yes, we must take steps to balance the budget and reduce the national debt, but not at the expense of vital social programs. It is unconscionable that in our nation of vast resources, my Republican colleagues would pass a budget that cuts funding for essential social programs. Poverty impacts far too many Americans and social safety nets provide these individuals with vital assistance.

Perhaps my friends on the other side of the aisle are content to conclude that life simply is not fair, equality is not accessible to everyone, and the less advantaged among us are condemned to remain as they are, but I do not accept that. That kind of complacency is not fitting for America.

As we continue to discuss the necessity of increasing out debt ceiling, I have heard the concerns of many of my constituents and the American people regarding the size of our national debt and the care with which taxpayer money is spent. I, too, am concerned about these issues; for to burden future generations of Americans with tremendous amounts of debt should not be a way to avoid our fiscal responsibilities to the American people. However, the task of resolving our debt ceiling crisis must take precedence over other concerns, including political ideology. The game is up, and the American people understand that increasing the debt ceiling has nothing to do with any new spending and everything to do with paying off the obligations that we have already agreed to and promised to pay.

Prior to the existence of the debt ceiling, Congress had to approve borrowing each time the federal government wished to borrow money in order to carry out its functions. With the onset of World War I, more flexibility was needed to expand the government's capability to borrow money expeditiously in order to meet the rapidly changing requirements of funding a major war in the modern era.

To address this need, the first debt ceiling was established in 1917, allowing the federal government to borrow money to meet its obligations without prior Congressional approval, so long as in the aggregate, the amount borrowed did not eclipse a specified limit.

Since the debt limit was first put in place, Congress has increased it over 100 times; in fact, it was raised 10 times within the past decade. Congress last came together and raised the debt ceiling in February 2010. Today, the debt ceiling currently stands at \$14.3 trillion dollars. In reality, that limit has already been eclipsed, but due to accounting procedures by Treasury Secretary Geithner, the debt limit can be artificially avoided until August 2nd.

Congress must act now in order to avert a crisis. Never in the history of America has the United States defaulted on its debt obligations.

We must be clear on what this issue means for our country. America has earned a reputation as the world's most trusted borrower. United States Treasury bonds have traditionally been one of the safest investments another country or investor could make. For investors around the world, purchasing a U.S. Treasury bond meant that they held something virtually as safe as cash, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States government.

In turn, with the proceeds from the bonds, the federal government of the world's largest economy is able to finance its operations. If the United States defaults on its debt obligations, the financial crisis that began in 2008 would pale in comparison, according to economic experts. The ensuing economic catastrophe would not only place the U.S. economy in a tailspin, but the world economy as well.

The fact that Congress, a body that typically has its fair share of political battles, has never played political chicken when it came to raising the debt ceiling should give us all pause, and is a testament to the seriousness with which we must approach this issue. However, this time around, my Republican colleagues have created an impasse based upon an ideological commitment to spending cuts. While I understand and share the concern of my Republican colleagues with respect to deficit spending, and will continue to work with them in order to find reductions, now is not the time to put ideology over pragmatism. The reality is that, on August 3rd, the United States will begin to default on its debt obligations if the debt ceiling is not raised.

This unnecessarily places the American public and the economy between a rock and a hard place. Either Congress sides completely with the radical agenda of the Tea Party, which irresponsibly pulls the chair out from under the average American while polishing the throne of the wealthiest.

This detour into a spending debate is as unnecessary as it is perilous, as increasing the debt ceiling does not obligate the undertaking of any new spending by the federal government. Rather, raising the debt limit simply al-

lows the government to pay existing legal obligations promised to debt holders that were already agreed to by Presidents and Congresses, both past and present.

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

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

Once America defaults, investors who purchase U.S. bonds and finance our government will be less likely to lend to America in the future. Just as a person who defaults on a loan will find it harder to convince banks to lend them money in the future, a country that defaults on its debt obligations will find it harder to convince investors to lend money to a government that did not pay.

Showing the world that the United States does not pay its debts makes the purchasing of that debt less desirable because it requires the assumption of more risk on the part of the investors. The proponents of this bill are putting the country at serious risk of losing its status as the world's economic superpower. Our allies will lose faith in our ability to manage global economic affairs. Our status in the world will be diminished, which will undermine our leverage on the world stage that allows us to command the respect and compliance of other nations when it comes to decision-making. This bill will reduce America's ability to compete with a surging China.

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

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

The Speaker's plan is a short term fix for a long term issue. It is a patch rather than a proper repair. BOEHNER's plan requires that Congress address debt-ceiling once again in a short span of time, which will once again lead to market uncertainty in a time when we are trying to rebuild our nation. This plan is not good for Wall Street and it is not good for the American People. The Speaker's bill is a short-term debt limit increase that will only ensure that Congress will go through this exact

same standoff again in the next few months. Short-term proposals risk further uncertainty and the potentially damaging downgrade of the U.S. credit rating. The markets have made it clear that a short-term extension is not sufficient and could result in very serious consequences. While Democrats support deficit reduction, we support doing it in a balanced way that provides certainty to the economy.

As if another stock market crisis were not enough, the housing market would take another hit if America defaulted. Higher mortgage rates in a housing market already weakened by default and foreclosures would cause a further depression of home values, destroying whatever equity families might have left in their homes after the housing crisis. Moreover, the long-term effects would reduce spending and investment in the housing market.

Increasing the debt ceiling is the responsible thing to do. Congress has already debated and approved the debt that an increased ceiling makes room for. However, my Republican colleagues have chosen to use this as an opportunity to hold the American people hostage to their extreme agenda.

Even prominent Republicans like Senator JOHN MCCAIN and Christine Todd Whitman have criticized the radical elements of their party who insist upon holding up the entire political process in order to flaunt their extreme, irrational, and unrealistic ideology. Senator MCCAIN has called the Tea Party's stance and the way they have conducted themselves during this manufactured crisis "bizarre", and I am inclined to agree. Their agenda for this country is even too radical for Speaker BOEHNER, with the Tea Party vowing to reject their leader's own bill.

They live in a world that is not the world that the American people live in. In their world, they believe that taxes are always too high, even on people making over a billion a year in a struggling economy; that any increase in revenue is fundamentally wrong, even if it comes from large corporations who use tax loopholes at the expense of our job-creating small businesses; that investing anything in our economic future above tax revenues is impermissible, even in the midst of an economic downturn; and that tax cuts for the wealthy are always the nation's top priority, even at the expense of people that depend on Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Veterans benefits to survive.

These beliefs place them on the fringe of American society, and yet due to the nature of our political process, they have held up the entire government and placed our economy on the precipice of a turbulent second recession.

If Congress cannot find a resolution then Congress will open the possibility that the President may invoke the Fourteenth Amendment to United States Constitution, Section four, which states "the validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be questioned." The argument can be made that if Congress will not resolve our nation's pending default then the President to protect the interest of our nation must act. The President would then have to consider his powers under the Fourteenth Amendment which may grant him the authority to raise the debt ceiling, on his own through executive order and if Congress fails to raise the debt limit by the August 2, 2011 deadline. As a body we should not

place the President or our country in this position.

For those reasons I urge my colleagues to consider the constituents in their home districts who would be hurt by this bill. I urge my colleagues to return to the world in which the vast majority of Americans live; in a world in which our shared destiny is determined by reasonable minds and good faith efforts to compromise. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned that defaulting could "throw the financial system into chaos," and "destroy the trust and confidence that global investors have in Treasury securities as being the safest liquid assets in the world."

Instead of injecting ideological spending cuts and Constitutional amendments into the traditionally non-political business of raising the debt ceiling, we must work quickly to pass a bill that makes good on our debt obligations and restores confidence in American credit.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, with six days left until we default on our national debt, there is simply no excuse for the partisan gridlock that has blocked all progress toward a fair and balanced agreement. This week, Congressional switchboards lit up and websites crashed under the sheer volume of outreach from citizens who wanted their voices heard in this debate. I hope my colleagues were listening. The resounding message I received from Rhode Islanders was that they are tired of political games. They want their leaders to work together to solve this problem in the best interests of the country. We have an opportunity to do that, and we literally can't afford to squander it with the usual Washington politics.

Our surest path to success includes a balanced approach of spending cuts and revenue increases that will reduce our budget deficit, stabilize our rising debt, reassure global markets and create greater economic certainty to bolster our fragile recovery. I will not support a plan that forces benefit cuts in Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid or places the entire burden of deficit reduction on middle-class families, seniors, the disabled and others already struggling through the effects of a deep recession. We must all be willing to share in the sacrifice, and that includes multinational corporations and the richest 2 percent of income earners who received the lion's share of tax breaks under the Bush tax cuts. This approach has bipartisan support in the Senate, as well as from officials in previous Democratic and Republican Administrations.

However, my Republican colleagues in the House have opted to turn a deaf ear to reason, choosing instead to put forward "The Budget Control Act," a politically motivated proposal that makes clear their willingness to drive our nation into default rather than compromise in the best interests of Americans. This short-term extension contains arbitrary spending caps and a Balanced Budget Amendment so conservative in nature that it would deem unconstitutional the fiscal policies of Presidents Reagan and Bush, as well as the budget passed by the Republican House earlier this year.

The most egregious part of this legislation is that it only offers a short-term fix that will force Congress to revisit this same debate in a few months, setting the stage for another partisan fight as lawmakers gear up for the next election. It's hard to imagine how things could get

much worse in Washington, but I can promise you we will find out if we have to replay this battle again next year. Moreover, it is exactly the wrong message to be sending the American people and the world. A short-term extension would fail to establish economic certainty, reassure businesses or provide market confidence. In fact, ratings agencies have warned that under the Republican proposal, the U.S. credit rating could still be downgraded, leading to higher interest rates and a tax on all American families.

The Senate is considering legislation that, while imperfect, protects our most vulnerable citizens, cuts more than \$2 trillion, and ensures we avoid a repeat of this dangerous game in a few months. While it may not represent my preferred approach of including both spending cuts and revenue increases, it at least offers a compromise that a majority of members should be able to accept. It is time for both parties to put their differences aside, if not for good, then for long enough to agree on a balanced approach to pay our nation's bills, reduce the deficit and give businesses and markets renewed confidence in the full faith and credit of the United States. They should never have had to doubt it in the first place.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Budget Control Act and urge its adoption.

America pays its bills. Default on those obligations, by not raising the debt limit, would be dangerously irresponsible.

However, the \$14.3 trillion national debt is utterly unsustainable. Consider the fact that total government spending at all levels has risen to 37% of gross domestic product today from 27% in 1960—and is set to reach 50% by 2038. Today, our national debt has reached 100% of the size of our economy, up from 42% in 1980.

These are trends that, left unchecked, will saddle future generations with burdensome debt and a lack of jobs and opportunities. In this regard, our efforts this week to raise the debt ceiling while firmly addressing the debt crisis is as much a moral as an economic decision.

Over the past several months, we have told the President that we will not support his request to increase the debt limit without serious spending cuts, binding budget reforms and we will not support higher taxes on families and small businesses we are counting on to create jobs.

Last week, I supported the "Cut, Cap and Balance Act," legislation designed to immediately cut federal spending to 2008 levels, before all the "bailouts" and the failed "stimulus" bills. That measure also sought to put the federal budget on a glide path to spending no more than 20 percent of our economy and requires that Congress pass a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution.

Unfortunately, the same Senate Leadership that has not proposed a budget in over two years, will now not even allow a debate on this common-sense bill.

Today, the House considers the Budget Control Act. While far from perfect, this measure finally begins to turn back the tide of federal red ink in several important ways:

It cuts spending by \$917 billion and does not raise taxes that would fuel additional spending. That is a vast improvement over current law.

It keeps the pressure on the President and Congress to cut spending further by providing another opportunity later this year to debate and keeping the pressure on to cut spending.

It creates a process that keeps our underlying fiscal policy problems front-and-center for the foreseeable future rather than ignoring them until 2013.

Contrary to some published reports, the bill contains serious reductions. This legislation cuts \$22 billion in FY 2012 and \$42 billion in FY 2013. Yes, these are still small numbers when placed in the context of overall federal spending. One reason is that the 2012 and 2013 budgets are the only ones that will actually be under the control of this 112th Congress. But even more important is the greater reduction in the budget glide path that will be used in future years. In the years beyond the 112th Congress, the budget savings multiply.

I would add that the Budget Control Act also keeps the focus on cutting spending, requiring a plan by December that cuts at least \$1.8 trillion more.

It is important to note that the debt fight we're engaged in today has set an important precedent. From now on, increases in the debt ceiling will need to be accompanied by equivalent or greater cuts in spending.

On this point, I would remind everyone of the words the President uttered just days ago in the White House briefing room. When asked about the current debt negotiations, he said, 'I don't want to be here doing this. I'd rather be here talking about new programs . . .'

'New programs'? Translated: 'new spending.' Clearly, the President has not listened to the American people.

That is why it is so important to prevent him and his Congressional allies from finding new ways to spend the taxpayers' money. This bill locks in spending cuts for the future.

Of course, the next logical step is to enact permanent budget reforms like a Balanced Budget Amendment to our Constitution. I voted for a balanced budget amendment over ten years ago and I voted for the "Cut, Cap and Balance" bill last week. I look forward to voting for another balanced budget amendment in coming days and would urge my colleagues to give the American people the opportunity to weigh in on this common-sense reform.

Some well-meaning Americans have opposed the bill because they think it does not cut enough. While \$900 billion+ of spending cuts is a genuine deficit reduction, I completely agree that it is far from sufficient to solve our underlying budget problems. In that respect, this House bill is a step in the right direction, nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, I want deeper spending cuts and greater deficit and debt reduction. However, given the stubborn insistence of the President and his Congressional allies on a debt limit increase coupled with new taxes and still more spending, I cannot see how we achieve greater savings at this time.

I, for one, will not give the President a blank check and urge approval of the Budget Control Act.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S. 627, Speaker BOEHNER's refusal-to-compromise, short-term bill that moves us closer to an unprecedented default.

This bill is not designed to become law. The Senate has made clear the votes aren't there for passage. If it did somehow reach the President's desk, he's publicly declared his intent to veto it.

Yet, here we are in the House of Representatives, wasting what little time we have left before the August 2nd deadline for default, considering this pointless piece of ideology just to appease the Tea Party.

If this doesn't make clear to the American public that the House Republican Majority is incapable of governing, I don't know what does.

The Boehner bill fails to address the number one crisis facing our nation: the instability of our financial standing. By providing only a short term debit limit increase—and guaranteeing we are in this same battle in a few short months—this bill would still lead to a downgrading of U.S. credit which would lead to higher interest rates and a tax on all American families.

The Boehner bill forces our country into this dangerous predicament solely to drive the extreme Republican agenda that demands protection of special interest tax breaks at the expense of vital public programs which people's lives depend on: namely, Medicare, Social Security and Medicaid.

By making clear their refusal to consider any tax increases—even proposals to end corporate welfare for Big Oil and tax breaks for corporate jet owners—BOEHNER's "solution" puts a target on Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. Because the immediate savings in the bill would decimate discretionary spending for the next decade, the only other place to turn will be these social insurance programs that people have paid into their whole lives. Medicare, Social Security and Medicaid would be mined for savings at levels never before seen. The ability of these programs to continue to guarantee financial and health security to senior citizens, people with disabilities, and—in the case of Medicaid, families with low incomes—would be in serious jeopardy.

Avoiding default is critical. It's something Presidents and Congresses from both sides of the aisle have always worked together to do. Unfortunately, Speaker BOEHNER's bill is strictly partisan. It fails to meet the goal of long-term stability and, at the same time, endangers fundamentally important programs that Americans depend upon.

A yes vote on this bill means you don't think the threats of default are real and that you don't believe in guaranteeing Medicare and Social Security for our nation's seniors. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in vigorous opposition to this ill-conceived legislation. Speaker BOEHNER's plan is not the answer to the urgent issue of raising the debt ceiling. If it becomes law, it will eviscerate the well-being of the American people.

It is, in fact, a disgrace that we are considering this measure at this late hour when we are days away from defaulting on the full faith and credit of the United States. The Republican leadership should have reached a compromise with President Obama and Senator REID weeks ago.

When President George W. Bush was elected, he inherited from President Clinton a sur-

plus of tens of billions of dollars. But during his Presidency, two wars, a series of tax cuts, and a pharmaceutical benefit plan that no one paid for increased our national debt by over \$5 trillion.

After years of irresponsibility, the Republican leadership now wants working families, seniors, pregnant women, children, and the poor to pay for their spending binge.

And they are using the debt limit to try to enforce their extreme Tea Party agenda.

Most of this terrible burden will fall on the programs that provide health and economic security to American families: Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security and the Affordable Care Act.

These are programs I have fought for and supported throughout my service in Congress.

But they face a terrible toll, inflicted in two cruel steps.

First, the Republican plan imposes immediate cuts approaching \$1 trillion. Then, Congress is required to legislate, later this year, another series of massive spending cuts of at least \$1.6 trillion.

These Republican budget cuts would have severe consequences.

They would end Medicare as we know it, ending its guarantees of coverage for hospital care, chemotherapy, doctor's visits, and prescription drugs. In its place, the Republicans want to substitute a voucher system where seniors would be forced into the private market to buy health insurance with only limited financial support from the government.

The Republican budget plan already approved by the House will increase premiums and cost sharing by at least \$6,000 per person. The cuts required by this legislation would be even deeper.

The Republican budget cuts will destroy Medicaid too. Their budget, approved by the House, would cut Medicaid in half by 2022, leaving tens of millions of people without access to care. People in nursing homes would be cut off. The Republican budget would also slash support for the Children's Health Insurance Program which, together with Medicaid, cover over one third of America's kids.

Medicaid is the primary payer for long-term care and the home and community-based services that help people stay out of nursing homes. Who will now bear the \$72,000 per year cost of a nursing home for an 85-year-old grandmother who collects \$10,000 a year in Social Security benefits? Her children will try, but only the rich will be able to afford the costs in today's economy.

Social Security is next in line. The Republicans claim this legislation doesn't affect Social Security. But with budget cuts of this size—and no new revenues—Social Security will be on the chopping block. This bill gives a new 12-member committee a blank check to raise the retirement age, cut benefits, and squeeze the poorest retirees even harder.

The Republican cuts also go to the heart of other public health programs that are so essential to all of us. Budget cuts of the magnitude sought by the Republicans mean severe funding reductions in biomedical research to fund the cures we need for diseases like cancer, heart disease and Alzheimer's. Food safety enforcement will be curtailed. Programs to discourage tobacco use and prevent the marketing of tobacco to children will be threatened.

It is almost unthinkable that we find ourselves in this position today. We are on the

brink of a fiscal emergency. If we do not pass a debt limit extension, the United States Government will default next week. Yet there still is no compromise.

The President, the Treasury Secretary, and others have outlined in explicit detail that default risks another catastrophic financial crisis and severe harm to American families, including the stoppage of Social Security checks, paychecks to our armed forces, and government contracts with the private sector. Food stamps, disability and veterans payments, paychecks to federal workers, IRS tax refunds, and black lung disease benefit payments are all vulnerable to interruption. In all, 70 million people and companies will be affected beginning next week.

In addition, we will lose, for the first time in our history, our AAA credit rating that establishes the United States as the world's safest investment. As a result, it will cost more to borrow money across the board, and this will have the effect of a huge tax increase on American households across the country. Municipalities and counties in every state will face this same stark reality—as will small businesses, millions of American homeowners, and countless others.

Speaker BOEHNER's legislation is fatally flawed because it provides for a two-step process to raise the debt limit. This is exactly the wrong approach. We need legislation that is long-term and balanced. That is the only thing that will provide the certainty and stability and confidence our economy needs and that the markets require. Keeping the debt limit on such a short leash only ensures that it will persist as the overriding, unresolved domestic policy issue for the next several months—perpetuating uncertainty and anxiety and discouraging investment and job creation.

By distracting this House from coherent action on what we urgently need to do today—raise the debt ceiling—the Republicans are courting disaster for every American who makes a house payment, or a car payment, or is paying off a credit card balance, or who has a business loan or a personal line of credit.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a very serious point. This is not the moment to engage in fantasy. This House must take its responsibilities seriously and do its proper duty for the nation. And that duty is not to wrap the budget and the American economy in a straightjacket. That proper duty is to authorize the payment of the debts we have incurred, restore certainty, and end the fear and anxiety their brinkmanship has instigated.

The bill before us is a vicious assault on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, along with public health, scientific research and environmental protection. It is a prescription for default, a recipe for financial chaos, and a checklist of hardship and woe for the American people.

I urge its defeat.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican Default Act.

I oppose this bill because it does nothing but guarantee another default crisis in six months. It's nothing more than another partisan gimmick that will quickly be voted down in the Senate.

The majority says it wants a plan to address our nation's deficit, and the President has worked with them to achieve this goal. He has negotiated in good faith and put everything on the table, demanding only that the plan be bal-

anced and responsible. And how did the majority respond? They refused to compromise and walked out of negotiations . . . twice.

Clearly, the majority is more focused on pushing their ideological agenda to end Medicare and preserve tax breaks for Big Oil and Wall Street than forging a good faith compromise to avoid default.

Mr. Speaker, compromising is what the American people send us here to do. As the President said, they voted for a divided government, not a dysfunctional one. It's time to stop the gimmicks and ensure our country does not default on its obligations.

Default would destroy close to 700,000 jobs, spike interest rates on credit cards and mortgages, and cause untold damage to our struggling economy.

Ronald Reagan took the necessary steps to avoid default 17 times. George W. Bush did it 7 times. No games. No gimmicks. Just a clean vote to avoid default and maintain the full faith and credit of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to come back to the table and forge the balanced and responsible compromise the American people deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of S. 627 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CHARLES "CHIP" LAWRENCE CHAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2548) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, as the "Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2548

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

SECTION 1. CHARLES "CHIP" LAWRENCE CHAN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2548, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK), would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, as the "Charles 'Chip' Lawrence Chan Post Office Building."

This bill was reported from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on June 22.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. I thank the gentleman and my good friend from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this legislation to designate the Federal post office located at 6310 North University Street in Peoria, Illinois, as the Charles "Chip" Lawrence Chan Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, we are quickly approaching the 10th anniversary of the horrific attacks of September 11, 2001. And while as Americans we can recall the events of that tragic day like they were yesterday, I offer this legislation in remembrance of all those Americans who died on that day. Specifically, this legislation would honor the life and sacrifice of Peoria, Illinois, resident Charles "Chip" Chan.

On September 11, 2001, Chip was a 23-year-old bond trader working for the brokerage firm of Cantor Fitzgerald on the 105th floor of 1 World Trade Center when terrorists flew an airplane into his building, killing thousands of individuals like Chip.

Chip graduated from my alma mater, Richwoods High School, in Peoria in 1995 and went on to attend the University of Illinois College of Commerce and Business where he graduated with a degree in economics. Soon after graduating, Chip received his first official job in, of all places, New York City. When trying to describe to family members or friends which tower he worked in, Chip would often say, The one with the antenna on top.

Chip was a member of the St. Thomas Catholic Church in Peoria Heights and was the son of John and Julie Chan. He was the oldest of six boys, brother to Christopher, Craig, Matthew, Mark, and Michael Chan.

When describing his son only days after September 11, his father John described Chip as a good athlete, a good learner, someone who was outgoing in