

NAYS—129

Amash	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Andrews	Heck (NV)	Negrete McLeod
Bass	Herrera Beutler	Nolan
Benishek	Higgins	Pallone
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Honda	Paulsen
Burgess	Horsford	Pelosi
Capuano	Hoyer	Peters (MI)
Castor (FL)	Hudson	Peterson
Clarke	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)
Cleaver	Huffman	Posey
Coffman	Hunter	Price (GA)
Conaway	Israel	Radel
Costa	Jeffries	Rahall
Cotton	Jenkins	Reed
Courtney	Johnson (OH)	Reichert
Crawford	Johnson, E. B.	Renacci
Crowley	Jordan	Ribble
Cuellar	Joyce	Rigell
Cummings	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Rodney	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Lance	Sánchez, Linda
Delaney	Langevin	T.
Denham	Latham	Sanchez, Loretta
Dent	Latta	Sarbanes
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Dingell	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Duffy	LoBiondo	Sinema
Edwards	Lowe	Sires
Enyart	Lynch	Slaughter
Fincher	Maloney,	Terry
Fitzpatrick	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
Fox	Marchant	Thompson (MS)
Gardner	Markey	Turner
Gibson	Matsui	Valadao
Graves (GA)	McColum	Veasey
Graves (MO)	McDermott	Velázquez
Green, Al	McGovern	Visclosky
Green, Gene	Meehan	Walberg
Griffin (AR)	Meeks	Wittman
Grimm	Miller, George	Woodall
Gutierrez	Moore	Yoder
Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Young (AK)
Hartzler	Napolitano	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert	Owens
---------	-------

NOT VOTING—9

Brooks (AL)	DeLauro	Jones
Cárdenas	Frelinghuysen	Kind
Conyers	Grijalva	Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1107

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NO BUDGET, NO PAY ACT OF 2013

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 39, I call up the bill (H.R. 325) to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until May 19, 2013, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 39, the amendment printed in House Report 113-2 is considered adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 325

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DEBT CEILING.

(a) SUSPENSION.—Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply for the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on May 18, 2013.

(b) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED DURING SUSPENSION PERIOD.—Effective May 19, 2013, the limitation in section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, as increased by section 3101A of such title, is increased to the extent that—

(1) the face amount of obligations issued under chapter 31 of such title and the face amount of obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government (except guaranteed obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on May 19, 2013, exceeds

(2) the face amount of such obligations outstanding on the date of the enactment of this Act.

An obligation shall not be taken into account under paragraph (1) unless the issuance of such obligation was necessary to fund a commitment incurred by the Federal Government that required payment before May 19, 2013.

SEC. 3. HOLDING SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN ESCROW UPON FAILURE TO AGREE TO BUDGET RESOLUTION.

(a) HOLDING SALARIES IN ESCROW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If by April 15, 2013, a House of Congress has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during the period described in paragraph (2) the payroll administrator of that House of Congress shall deposit in an escrow account all payments otherwise required to be made during such period for the compensation of Members of Congress who serve in that House of Congress, and shall release such payments to such Members only upon the expiration of such period.

(2) PERIOD DESCRIBED.—With respect to a House of Congress, the period described in this paragraph is the period which begins on April 16, 2013, and ends on the earlier of—

(A) the day on which the House of Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; or

(B) the last day of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(3) WITHHOLDING AND REMITTANCE OF AMOUNTS FROM PAYMENTS HELD IN ESCROW.—The payroll administrator shall provide for the same withholding and remittance with respect to a payment deposited in an escrow account under paragraph (1) that would apply to the payment if the payment were not subject to paragraph (1).

(4) RELEASE OF AMOUNTS AT END OF THE CONGRESS.—In order to ensure that this section is carried out in a manner that shall not vary the compensation of Senators or Representatives in violation of the twenty-seventh article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the payroll administrator of a House of Congress shall release for payments to Members of that House of Congress any amounts remaining in any escrow account under this section on the last day of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(5) ROLE OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide the payroll administrators of the Houses of Congress with such assistance as may be necessary to enable the payroll administrators to carry out this section.

(b) TREATMENT OF DELEGATES AS MEMBERS.—In this section, the term "Member" includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress.

(c) PAYROLL ADMINISTRATOR DEFINED.—In this section, the "payroll administrator" of a House of Congress means—

(1) in the case of the House of Representatives, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, or an employee of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer who is designated by the Chief Administrative Officer to carry out this section; and

(2) in the case of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate, or an employee of the Office of the Secretary of the Senate who is designated by the Secretary to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate shall not exceed 1 hour with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes. The gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 10 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 325.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 325, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013. This legislation directs Members of the House and Senate to adopt a budget resolution by April 15, 2013. If either body does not adopt a budget resolution by April 15, 2013, Members of that body will have their pay withheld until they pass a budget. It's simple: no budget, no pay. The American people understand that they don't get paid if they don't do their job, and neither should Members of Congress.

In addition, to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the U.S. Government, this legislation allows Treasury to issue debt between the date of enactment and May 18, 2013. However, Treasury may only issue enough debt necessary to pay bills coming due before May 18. I want to be perfectly clear on this point: this bill does not allow Treasury to run up an unlimited amount of debt between now and May 18.

The debt authorized under this bill must be tied to bills coming due during that timeframe. Further, on May 19, a new debt limit is automatically established.

So that's what this bill does. The larger question is, why are we even talking about the debt and debt limit? Our Nation's debt is not just some abstract number. It has a direct impact

on American families. During the President's fiscal commission, the Simpson-Bowles Commission, we heard nonpartisan testimony that when the debt is this large in comparison to the economy, it costs the country the equivalent of about 1 million jobs. Think about that. If Washington got its debt and spending under control, then 1 million more Americans would be working today.

And if that wasn't sobering enough, Fitch Ratings recently warned that the failure to come up with a plan for reducing our debt would likely still result in a downgrade of the U.S. credit rating. A lower credit rating is sure to mean higher interest rates. That means higher credit card payments, higher car payments, higher student loans, and certainly higher mortgage payments.

Despite these nonpartisan warnings, the Democrat-controlled Senate has not produced a budget in more than 1,300 days. That's 4 years without a budget. How can we begin to get our debt under control when Democrats won't even produce a budget? This bill is the first step in forcing Democrats to put forward a budget so we can start holding Washington accountable for its out-of-control spending.

Every day, American families have to make decisions about their household finances. They have to adjust their spending to cover a whole host of things: groceries, student loan payments, braces for children, and a replacement for that aging refrigerator. Of course, they can't buy everything they want. Every day, they have to make tough choices.

It's time for Congress—the House and the Senate—to make some tough choices. To be honest, Mr. Speaker, this isn't a tough choice where I come from. Where I grew up, if you didn't do your job, you didn't get paid. It's time for Congress to start living with the same facts of life everyone else in America has to live with. I support the No Budget, No Pay Act because it brings back a bit of accountability and common sense to Washington. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this bill.

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

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

This Republican bill is not a change in policy. It's a change in tactics. House Republicans continue to play with economic fire. They're playing political games with the debt ceiling, and that undermines certainty.

Yesterday, economist Simon Johnson of MIT testified before our committee saying that a short-term increase would only extend uncertainty. He said:

You will continue to undermine the private sector. You will continue to delay investment and to reduce employment relative to what it would be otherwise.

Let's, for a second, remember history, the last time the House Repub-

licans played political games with the debt ceiling. In August 2011, our economy produced the lowest job growth in 3 years. During that 2-month period, the Dow Jones plummeted 2,000 points, including one of its worst single-day drops in history—635 points on August 8. S&P downgraded the U.S. credit rating for the first time in history.

Leading Republicans in June, 2011, criticized the notion of a short-term debt ceiling increase as providing a lack of certainty. The majority leader said:

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.

Our Ways and Means chairman echoed that feeling only days later saying about the prospect of a short-term debt ceiling increase, It does not give you certainty.

This bill does not give certainty, but uncertainty.

The action we took New Year's Day to avoid the fiscal cliff brought our total deficit reduction over the past 2 years to \$2.5 trillion. What's more, it set the stage for future further balanced agreements that include both spending cuts and new revenue. We should proceed with that effort, not plunge into further uncertainty.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1120

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself 15 seconds just to say that Standard & Poor's downgraded the U.S. credit rating on August 5, after the Budget Control Act was passed. In doing so:

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

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of the House Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, you know what we know with certainty? We know with certainty that a debt crisis is coming to America. This is not a question of if; it's a question of when.

What is a debt crisis? It means we can't keep living beyond our means. It means we can't keep borrowing from our children's future. Our generation of Americans, we're being selfish. We are taking from the next generation their future.

We have a moral obligation to fix that. If we have a debt crisis, those who get hurt the first and the worst are those who need government the most: our seniors, the poor, the people living on the safety net, that's who

gets hurt in a debt crisis. We have an obligation to do something about this.

What does this bill do? This bill simply says: Congress do your job.

When I grew up in Wisconsin, if you had a job and you did the work, then you got paid. If you didn't do the work you didn't get paid. It's that simple. Here's the point. We have a law, and it's called the Budget Control Act. It requires that Congress pass a budget by April 15. All we're saying is: Congress, follow the law. Do your work. Budget.

The reason for this extension is so that we can have the debate we need to have. It's been a one-sided debate. The House of Representatives has passed budgets. The other body, the Senate, hasn't passed a budget for almost 4 years. We owe our constituents more than that. We owe them solutions. When both parties put their solutions on the table, then we can have a good and clear debate about how to solve the problem. The problem is not going away no matter how much we wish it away. The problem of debt, of deficits, of a debt crisis is here.

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We owe it to our children and our grandchildren and we owe it to our constituents to fix this.

This isn't a Republican or Democrat thing. This is a math thing. And the math is vicious, and it's hurting our country, and it's hurting the next generation, and it's hurting our economy. The sooner we can solve this problem, the better off everybody is going to be. That's why this needs to pass.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

This resolution contains some good news, but lots of bad news for the American people. The good news is that our congressional Republican colleagues have finally recognized that America must pay its bills and meet its financial obligations without condition. The bad news is they only want to do that for 3 months. Just read the title: To ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until May 19.

If it's a good idea to maintain the obligations of the U.S. Government between now and May 19, it sure is a good idea to make sure that we meet the obligations of the U.S. Government beyond that. And by setting up what amounts to another fiscal cliff, all our Republican colleagues are doing is prolonging economic uncertainty.

For the last 2 years, we've heard from our Republican colleagues that economic uncertainty is bad for the economy. Guess what? It is. Yet that's exactly what you're doing, another big dose of economic uncertainty. This is a

political effort simply to increase their negotiating strategy leverage 3 months from now at the expense of jobs in the economy and the American people.

How do we know it's at the expense of jobs in the economy? Because we saw what happened in August of 2011. As the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee said, it was the worst month in terms of jobs. We saw our credit rating downgraded, and both GAO and the Bipartisan Policy Center have said it cost the taxpayers over \$1 billion. So that's all we're doing right now, another dose of uncertainty.

To my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee, yes, we need budgets; yes, we need to reduce our long-term deficits. That's never been the issue. The issue is how. We believe we've got to make targeted cuts in reforms, but we also believe we need to eliminate a lot of the tax breaks and loopholes that we heard a lot from our colleagues about in order to reduce the deficit in a balanced way. If you don't do that, you sock it to everybody else in the country.

Let's pass a balanced approach to reducing our deficit, and not one that takes it out at the expense of our kids and our seniors.

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

I would just say that we've already increased the debt limit over \$5 trillion in the Obama administration. That's an almost 50 percent increase in the debt limit.

Let me also just say that we've had several temporary short-term increases in the debt limit before there's been a more permanent longer-term increase—in 1987, in 1990, and 1996. So it is not unprecedented, the action that we're going to be taking today.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Let me just see if I can simplify this just a little bit.

There are three branches of government. Two branches of the government have responsibility for the budget, and there are three pieces to those two branches. The White House is one—the administration needs to produce a budget; the House Republicans need to produce a budget; and the Senate Democrats need to produce a budget for the system to work.

Even though we may not agree with it on this side of the aisle, the President has produced his budget. It's increased our deficit from \$11.4- to \$16.4 trillion or \$16.5 trillion. And some people at home may not really grasp the concept of \$16 trillion. Let's just talk about \$1 trillion. If we spent a dollar a second, Mr. Speaker, how long would it take us to spend that \$1 trillion? It would take 36,000 years. We are 16 of those in debt. It's time for the Senate to do their job.

Even though Admiral Mullen has said our greatest national security threat is

our deficit, and even though the Senate has raised their right hand and took an oath to protect and defend this great Nation of ours and defend the Constitution, they still have not acted. They still have not done their job to protect and defend, to uphold the oath that they took. Again, Admiral Mullen has said—and I repeat—that national security is at great risk because of our \$16 trillion deficit.

Look, you own a home and you have a \$50,000-a-year job and you're making your payments on a car and a house and you're thinking things are going just fine, but I want to add to that. I'm going to buy a new big screen TV, I'm going to put a pool table in, I'm going to buy two more cars, I'm going to put a pool in the back, I'm just going to fix the place up. All the sudden you realize, I can't pay for it.

You have some options available. You have to raise revenue. You go out and get two or three more jobs maybe, or your wife goes to work or your kids have to go to work. And that still doesn't meet your responsibilities. Then you have to stop spending, right? Stop spending.

The only other option now is to get rid of some of the stuff you can't pay for because even though you might have stopped spending and you've taken another job and you've raised some revenue, now you've got to get rid of stuff.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. REICHERT. Let's get rid of the pool table, let's get rid of the big screen TV. We've got to start cutting things. We need to stop spending in this country. The Senate needs to do their job.

No budget, no pay.

□ 1130

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. I don't think anyone challenges the fact that we have to stop overspending. You just can't simplify it and say, "Stop spending."

The problem that we have now is that the debt ceiling has nothing to do with the full faith and credit of money that has already been spent. We'd have plenty of time to talk about taxes and spending if we'd talk about concurrent resolutions, if we'd talk about sequestration; but if what you're saying is that if there is a budget that I have to vote "yes" or "no" on and if one budget says that one way to close and reduce the deficit is to go after the people who are the poorest, the most sick, and the oldest and call that "entitlement cutbacks" and if I don't vote for that then it means that the government is not going to pay me, well, I

can go home very easily and tell them that a bad budget is worse than no budget and that, once again, we are holding hostage the spending cuts that a lot of people want that should be negotiated.

Perhaps we've got a 3-month reprieve, but the fact remains that this is holding up the President and our country from getting on with what we should do when the fiscal impact of this in our country and throughout the world is dangerous.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise today in support of this No Budget, No Pay proposal.

This is why we ran for office. This is why I came to Washington, D.C.—to stand for a vision that's going to attack this debt crisis that is upon us today, the debt crisis that will threaten our children and our grandchildren for generations if we do not get our fiscal house in order in Washington, D.C. It is time to put up the visions of the House Republicans versus those of the Senate Democrats as to what the proposals to move forward to solve this debt crisis are.

We owe it to the American people, to hardworking taxpayers, to be open and honest, and if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to stand for budgets that are all about tax increases, so be it. I believe there is a better way, and that better way will be in a House Republican budget that does the responsible thing and lays out a vision of growth and opportunity for generations to deal with this unsustainable debt crisis that is now upon us.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to another member of our committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, here we are with another Republican straw man out here—a bill set up to fail. The Senate has not yet adopted its rules. We don't know where the filibuster is going to be used or anything, and you're saying they have to do something by a fixed date. Now, we've had fixed dates in here as long as I've been here, and we never make them; but what we are creating is continuous chaos globally in the economic world, and what you're doing by this is simply saying, hey, let's have another big kerfuffle. We'll be out here in May, 4 months from now, making exactly the same speeches. We'll all bring out the same pieces of paper and read from them and give the same speeches, and we will continue to retard the ability of the American economy to move forward.

We cannot send the message worldwide that the United States has lost

the ability to make decisions, to pay its debts. If that's the message you want the world to get, that's what this is about today. I'm voting against this. Bring back one that lifts the debt limit and that gets it out of the way so we can get down to the cost-cutting that needs to happen.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. As a charter member of the Fix Congress Now Caucus and as an early supporter of the No Budget, No Pay, I am very excited that this legislation will be voted on in the House in just a little bit.

We on the House Budget Committee work hard to pass a responsible budget each year, but the Democrat-controlled Senate refuses to do the same. In fact, it has been nearly 4 years since the Senate has passed a budget, and since that time, the government has racked up annual deficits exceeding \$1 trillion a year and, in total, more than \$5 trillion in 4 years. If we stay on this current path of record deficits, big government, and unfunded entitlement programs, Greece's present will be America's future.

A massive debt crisis is surely not the future we want for our children or our grandchildren. Fiscal responsibility and accountability in the Halls of Congress cannot wait. Today, we will take an important step in the House, forcing the Senate to either do its job or to face the consequences. It's simple: no budget, no pay.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. Thank you, Mr. LEVIN.

Our job here is to educate the public, not to entertain them. They ran up deficits on the Republican side of \$6 trillion during an 8-year period of time—\$2.3 trillion worth of tax cuts and two wars. Now they come back today with a glitzy proposal of no work, no pay.

Institutional memory. Do you remember their term limits pledge? They invented that. They're all still here. Do you remember their line-item veto? The constitutional theorists? They got rid of that. How about that they were going to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution? My dad used to say, "At least Jesse James had enough personal respect to wear a mask."

The people who put us into this situation are now quibbling about raising the debt ceiling when they almost broke the country with the proposals that they offered during all of those years, and never once did they deny President Bush on those proposals.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Look, here is an opportunity. There is an opportunity to find common

ground. There is an opportunity to do something that makes common sense, that is not just common ground. It is common sense to require people, if they're getting compensation, to do their jobs. It has been 4 years. Ironically, it has been since the day Rod Blagojevich, the Governor of Illinois, was indicted that the United States Senate has passed a budget, and now we have an opportunity to put pressure on the other body, which is for them to do their work.

We don't do ourselves, we don't do our children, we don't do the taxpayers any favors by creating a climate that says "folks don't have to do their work." We don't get to a solution or a remedy unless we pass budgets. This is an opportunity to get on record and put the other body out into the open field so we can have a discussion and move this country on a pathway that makes sense. We ought to pass this and pass it quickly.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to a member of our committee and chairman of our caucus, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. If you buy a house, you pay your mortgage—well, at least under this bill, for 3 or 4 months. If you want your kids to go to college, you take out student loans, and you'll tell the bank, well, you'll pay for 3 or 4 months, and then we can talk again. If you want to buy a car, you go in and tell the dealer, Love that beautiful new car. You take out a loan. You pay for 3 or 4 months, and then you tell the dealer, Let's talk in about 3 or 4 months about what we do with the rest of the debt.

This simply creates more uncertainty, another fiscal cliff and yet another economic case of sabotage against the American public. The party that voted for tax cuts for the wealthy, two wars, and a massive new prescription drug benefit program and that put all of the costs of that on a credit card doesn't believe it's important now to honor those obligations of paying those bills and maintaining the full faith and credit of the United States of America. Now, with this new Congress, we have a chance for a fresh start—an opportunity to find common ground, not more conflict. Instead, our Republican colleagues are threatening three strikes against the middle class, against small businesses and the U.S. economy—the U.S. default, a government shutdown, and sequestration.

Let's start talking about what really matters to Americans, the biggest deficit we face—a jobs deficit. Let's get to work putting Americans back to work. Let's be problem solvers, not problem makers. It's time to get America moving again.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

□ 1140

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as I travel in my south central Indiana

district, I hear frequently two simple requests from my constituents. First, they want us to get our spending and our debt under control. And, second, they want us to work together, collectively, Republicans and Democrats, to get that important job done. That's why I support this proposed legislation, H.R. 325.

The bill strikes me as eminently reasonable because it not only satisfies those simple requests; it asks us to do our job. We are required under law, as has been said before, to pass a budget. The House is required to do it, and the Senate is required to do it. The Senate has not done it for 4 years.

Now, a budget is essentially spending priorities. It lays out your vision for the future. Whatever solutions you may or may not have are revealed in a budget. It's not easy to put together a budget. Sometimes it's unpopular, but it is our duty.

So I say no budget, no pay. I'm tired of the Senate being dilatory in its responsibilities. They need to pass a budget. That's why I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to another member of our committee, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We continue to talk past one another. The issue isn't passing a budget or not passing a budget. The issue is whether or not we're going to take fundamental steps to reform the way that we spend money around here.

The Republican budget of my good friend, Mr. RYAN, that they've passed on a couple of occasions would have required 9 trillion dollars in additional debt ceiling increase and wouldn't be balanced for two decades.

Let's stop playing games with the form, and let's sit down and work on the things we agree upon. I think the American public would support us if we took out tens of billions of dollars of unnecessary spending for redundant nuclear weapons; to reform the scandal that is the crop insurance program that incents people to plant land that they shouldn't plant and drives up losses. Let's accelerate health care reform like we're doing in Oregon that would save over a trillion dollars if it were applied nationally.

Let's get down and do it. Act, don't debate.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 325. The bill is an important step toward getting our fiscal house in order because it requires the Senate to finally pass a budget, something American families and businesses do each and every day.

The Federal Government is currently in the process of accumulating its fifth consecutive trillion-dollar deficit. We need a serious, forward-looking plan to

address the deficit. However, the Senate has gone nearly 4 years without even passing an annual budget.

Taking a year-by-year approach and addressing only discretionary spending will not solve our long-term spending problem. We must take a comprehensive, long-term approach to the Federal budget. A comprehensive approach to spending must also address the long-term solvency issues of entitlements such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Without reform, spending will remain on an unsustainable path while the Medicare and Social Security trust funds are emptied before the majority of Americans who currently are paying in even qualify to become beneficiaries of those programs.

Today's legislation will allow us to work with the Senate in achieving this long-term deficit solution we know would meet the needs of Americans.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, the 14th Amendment of the Constitution states, if I may paraphrase, the public debt of the United States shall not be questioned. In other words, we don't even have the power, really, in section 4 of that amendment. Take a look at it and read it, what our objectives are, rather than bring to debate year after year whether we should raise the debt limit. We have to do our jobs.

It would be foolish if people around the world began to wonder, once again, whether or not the Congress will give the President the ability to pay the debts that we racked up. Both sides voted for much of this. The fact is that the United States, as the President said, is not a deadbeat Nation. We will pay our obligations, both to our bondholders and to seniors and veterans and the middle class.

So while I'm glad my colleagues on the other side have edged slightly away from the precipice of default, they are still leaving themselves room to backtrack if they don't get what they want. And just the fact that the conference chairperson has said if we have to shut down the government to make sure that President Obama understands that we're serious, that's almost treason, according to the 14th Amendment.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 325, which is based on a very simple principle: if Congress does not pass a budget, Congress does not get paid.

We cannot start the process of controlling spending in this country without a budget. We also cannot ask hard-working taxpayers to manage their own budgets when their elected leaders fail to do so.

The House has done its work and passed a budget each of the past 2 years. The other body of this branch must do theirs if we're going to address our out-of-control spending. For nearly

4 years, the Senate has gotten away with not passing a budget, but they've found time to pass laws that increase spending. Failing to budget for our country for the past 4 years is a terrible way to run a government, and I support this bill which will pay for bills already obligated.

We have to stop the political gamesmanship that is occurring here in this town and work together to find commonsense solutions to cut spending and find savings in our budget. I look forward to passing this bill that will finally hold Congress accountable and begin putting America on a debt repayment plan and save future generations from paying for the mistakes of the past.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 9½ minutes, and the other gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 5¼ minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today solves no problems. In fact, it just maintains the great uncertainty hanging over the U.S. and the global economy—whether or not we're going to jeopardize the full faith and credit of the United States of America and default on our Nation's financial obligations for the first time in our Nation's history. I do not for the life of me understand why anyone would jeopardize that safe haven that's been established in this country.

But we all know what needs to be done to get our fiscal house in order. Both parties are going to have to lock arms and jump into the icy water and make difficult decisions together. Every bipartisan commission that has been formed to address this issue has come up with the same conclusion. There's going to have to be some additional revenue, and there's going to have to be major spending reforms in our budget to make this work.

But my friends on the other side have not been exactly up front with the American people. They've finished two national campaigns promising to restore \$700 billion to the Medicare program and increase defense spending by over \$2 trillion over the next 10 years. That's \$2.7 trillion additional dollars in the two largest spending programs. So we do need an honest conversation about this.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to place in the RECORD a letter from the Executive Office of the President, a Statement of Administration Policy, that says:

The administration would not oppose a short-term solution to the debt limit and looks forward to continuing to work with both the House and the Senate to increase certainty and stability for the American economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 325—TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DEBT
CEILING

(Rep. Camp, R-MI, and Rep. Miller, R-MI,
Jan. 22, 2013)

The Administration supports a long-term increase in the debt limit that would increase certainty and economic stability. Although H.R. 325 is a short-term measure and introduces unnecessary complications, needlessly perpetuating uncertainty in the Nation's fiscal system, the Administration is encouraged that H.R. 325 lifts the immediate threat of default and indicates that congressional Republicans have backed off an insistence on holding the Nation's economy hostage to extract drastic cuts in Medicare, education, and other programs that middle-class families depend on. For these reasons, the Administration would not oppose a short-term solution to the debt limit and looks forward to continuing to work with both the House and the Senate to increase certainty and stability for the economy.

Instead of short-term management of self-inflicted fiscal crises, the President believes there is now an opportunity to strengthen the economy by putting the Nation on a sounder fiscal path. Progress has already been made towards that goal. In 2011, the President signed into law \$1.4 trillion in spending reductions, not counting additional savings from winding down the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The fiscal agreement the President signed at the beginning of January increased revenue from high-income households by over \$600 billion. Together with interest savings, these two steps will cut the deficit by more than \$2.5 trillion over the next decade. The President has made clear that he remains willing to work with both parties in the Congress to budget responsibly and to achieve additional deficit reduction consistent with the principles of balance, shared growth, and shared opportunity.

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

H.R. 325 would temporarily allow the Congress to fund commitments to which it has already agreed. A temporary solution is not enough to remove the threat of default that Republicans in the Congress have held over the economy. The Congress should commit to paying its bills and pass a long-term clean debt limit increase that lifts self-inflicted and unnecessary uncertainty from the Nation's economy.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

The Budget Control Act of 2011 sets the budget for the next 10 years. It actually says it in the name of the bill: the Budget Control Act. Many of my colleagues on either side supported that bill. So we have a budget in place for 10 years. You don't like what you voted for now, I understand that. That's problematic.

But this bill before us today is not a serious proposal by House Republicans, but rather a gimmick. Even the Wall Street Journal called it a gimmick.

□ 1150

This bill does not provide certainty to the business community, the international markets or job creators here in the U.S. that the U.S. Government will pay its bills.

This bill simply sets up another GOP-manufactured crisis in 4 months, putting the economy and the creditworthiness of our Nation at risk. Instead of no cliffs, my Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle are creating a new cliff.

The American people sent us here to work, not to play more games. But my Republican colleagues are failing America again. Only 38 of my Republican colleagues voted for the Hurricane Sandy relief. Only 85 of their Members voted to provide tax cuts to the middle class. Yet, when it comes to pushing our country over the brink, they're all in.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding, and ask my colleagues today to vote for the No Budget, No Pay Act.

You know, the promise here is pretty simple. It says that there should be no long-term increase in the debt limit until there's a long-term plan to deal with the fiscal crisis that faces our country.

Every hardworking taxpayer in America knows that they have to do a budget. Every hardworking taxpayer understands that you can't continue to spend money that you don't have.

We are committed to continue to do a budget every year. And if you think about this, it's not just that we've done a budget the last 2 years that addresses our fiscal crisis. Even when the Democrats had control, in the 2 years before that, you all did a budget. And yet, for 4 years, nearly 4 years, the United States Senate has not done a budget.

And so this bill before us is real simple. It says, Congress, if you don't do a budget, you don't get paid. I have no doubt that we're going to do our work. We're committed to doing a budget and a 10-year plan to solve our budget crisis and to balance our budget.

Frankly, I think it's time for the Senate and the White House to produce a budget that will balance over the next 10 years.

You know, most Americans would look up and go, wait a minute, why do they need 10 years to balance the budget?

But we know with baby boomers retiring, and the fact that it wasn't prepared for, it's going to take a little more time. But my goodness, we ought to be able to balance the budget in the next 10 years.

Balancing the budget over the next 10 years means that we save the future for our kids and our grandkids. It also means that we strengthen programs like Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid that can't continue to exist

in the current form without some kind of controls.

It's time for Congress to get serious about this, and this is the first step in an effort to bring real fiscal responsibility to Washington. It's real simple. No budget, no pay.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to say to the Speaker before he leaves the floor, I believe the Speaker wants to get to a responsible agreement between our parties, between the House and the Senate, and between the Congress and the President on getting to a responsible way to reduce the budget. This bill is not that vehicle.

This bill, in my view, is an irresponsible waste of our time. This bill does not do what Republicans said they wanted to do over and over and over again, and that is give a sense of certainty to our economy, to our people, and to the international community.

This bill kicks the can down the road for 90 days one more time. This bill simply puts a leverage point another 90 days away, so that we can continue to roil this Congress, roil this country, and roil our people and our economy.

This bill is a political gimmick. This bill was cooked up a few miles from here when, frankly, the majority party said, We're in trouble. The people don't like us. Things aren't going well. How do we fix it?

Well, they came up with this gimmick, and the gimmick was, if you don't vote the way we want you to vote, we won't pay you.

Now, very frankly, the problem with that premise is that we are elected by 435 districts who have different perspectives. And my view is the overwhelming majority of us come here, work very hard on behalf of our constituents, but your constituents may not like what my constituents want. But that doesn't mean you have the right to say you're not going to get paid, Mr. HOYER, because we don't like what you're working for. If that's our premise, we are holding hostage policy in an undemocratic, dictatorial fashion.

Not only that, this 90-day kicking the can down the road has got to stop. We need to come to reality that it's not the debt limit that's the problem—and the President's absolutely right. The President has nothing to do with the debt limit. Only this House and the Senate can spend money. The President can't spend a nickel. Only this House and only this Senate.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. The other problem with this, of course, is we're now going to spend till 12:30 today discussing this critically important issue. We treat it like just a throwaway. I can't discuss the substance of this issue in the time

allotted to me, nor can any other Member.

When I had a magic 1 minute, it was a little better when I was majority leader. I miss that very much.

But I urge both of us, both Republicans and Democrats, to come to grips with making the hard decision, not the political demagoguery decisions that this bill projects. Let us sit down together and come to grips with the fact that, yes, my friend, we need more revenues and, yes, we need to restrain spending and, yes, we need to restrain entitlements.

I say that as a leader of my party. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

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

Mr. HOYER. But I say to all of us, you will not get there with gimmicks. You will not get there with pretense. You will not get there with irresponsibility and kick the can down the road.

I understand what you have done. You've taken your most controversial leverage point and put it at the end, rather than at the beginning of the process. But you still have the CR, and you still have the sequester, and we'll have to debate those.

What we ought to be doing is extending this debt limit for 1, 2, 4, or 6 years, or eliminating it all together. When you spend money, it has nothing to do with the debt limit and everything to do with the actions of this Congress.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Member from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a gimmick. For the past, almost going on now 4 years, our colleagues in the Senate have failed in their most basic responsibility of governance, which is to pass a budget.

The people I represent back in Bucks County and Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, the families and the businesses, they wouldn't survive without being able to operate on a budget. The school districts, the municipalities, the boroughs, the townships, the county government, even the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are all required to pass a budget that balances on time.

I'm proud to have, over the course of the past year, been advocating consistently for no budget, no pay in this House. The hardworking men and women that I represent wouldn't be paid if they didn't show up and they didn't do their job, or they didn't get their job done on time. And this place should operate no differently.

So I call on all our Members of the House, all my colleagues, to support no budget, no pay in these very difficult and troubled times.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

No budget, no pay. No budget, no responsibility. No stability, no confidence. No confidence, no ability to borrow, to attract investors.

H.R. 325 is a gimmick. It is a gimmick. And I've always been taught that if you have a debt, pay it. Delaying it drives up interest rates and is not the best approach to convincing investors and lenders that we have the ability to pay.

If you convince people that you don't have the ability to pay, it is more likely that they're not going to let you have what you want. That's what I've always been taught. They do not want gimmicks. They want solutions.

□ 1200

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

Mr. LEVIN. Can I ask how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) also has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to a member of our committee, the Congresswoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for understanding the need to stop dancing with default. Recognizing that we can't disregard our obligations to seniors, veterans, and active military is a first big step. But this legislation doesn't create the long-term certainty that our economy needs. The small business owners that I talk to tell me that they need certainty before they can invest in their businesses and hire more employees.

Instead of providing small businesses the long-term certainty they need, the Republican-led House is just playing games. They're stringing the American public along so they can set up yet another dramatic showdown that only hurts our recovery. The mere mention of default sends markets plummeting, dries up hiring, and pulls the rug out from under consumer confidence.

Businesses in my district and all across the country can't afford more tantrums threatening defaults and government shutdowns. It's our job to find a solution and give businesses, the markets, and American families the long-term certainty they deserve. This legislation isn't a long-term solution. It's yet more irresponsible gamesmanship.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

Mr. DELANEY. There's more cash in U.S. corporations than there's ever been in our country's history. Corporations have three things they can do with their cash: They can raise their

dividends; they can buy back stock; or they can make investments.

To make investments, which require a long-term time horizon, there needs to be certainty. If we care about American families, if we want our corporations to make investments that will create jobs, we will have certainty on the debt ceiling for a reasonable period of time and we will create fiscal certainty in this country in a balanced way. By "balanced," I mean additional revenues. That's what will create certainty in this country. That's what will get U.S. corporations investing.

If U.S. corporations invest, we create jobs, and that helps working families.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining.

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

This isn't: no budget, no pay. This is: 3 months, no certainty. It's been said it kicks the can down the road—a road paved with uncertainty.

What this does, in a few words, is keep default hanging over the heads of this Congress and over the heads of the American economy and the American people. It's unwise to do that. We tried that in the summer of 2011. The Republicans more than flirted with it, and they flirted dangerously. Now they're pulling back.

But instead of meeting this head-on, they essentially bring a bill here that presumes that it moves us ahead, when it moves us into more and more uncertainty. This is unwise. Politically, they think it's smart policy. For the American people, it's very dumb.

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

The gentleman, my friend from Michigan, talked about certainty. And yes, there is certainty, because the Senate majority leader just announced they will take up this bill and pass it. And I think every American understands that we must get our debt and deficit under control. We've had over \$5 trillion in increases in deficits in the Obama administration—almost a 50 percent increase in our national debt.

And let me just say that we have had many short-term increases in the debt limit over time. What was business as usual when the Democrats were in the majority? We had nine short-term debt increases—three of them in 1987 and six of them in 1990—before longer, more permanent debt limit increases were made. So what was business as usual for the Democrats they now call "flirting dangerously" for Republicans.

I think it is very important we move forward on increasing the debt limit for this limited period of time while we can then address the issues that will help affect our long-term debts and deficits, including the sequester and the continuing resolution.

When the long-term debt of the United States was lowered to a AA-plus

rating on August 5, 2011, they said that the downgrade, which was after the Budget Control Act was passed, reflected their opinion that the fiscal consolidation plan that Congress and the administration recently agreed to—meaning the Budget Control Act—falls short of what, in our view, would be necessary to stabilize the government's medium-term debt dynamics, meaning we didn't do enough to address the drivers of our long-term debt. We must do that.

I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 325, to support the No Budget, No Pay Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 325, the No Budget, No Pay Act.

The Budget Act of 1974 requires each House of Congress to pass a budget each year by April 15. This is important, of course, because the budget that we pass is our blueprint, literally, for how we're going to spend the hard-earned tax dollars that the American people send here to Washington to run our Nation.

Today, we are in a situation where the United States Senate has not passed a budget in nearly 4 full years, leaving the American people with no idea of how the Senate intends to deal with the fiscal crisis that is facing our Federal Government. In the time since the Senate last passed a budget, the Federal Government has experienced deficits of over \$1 trillion each and every year, and we have added more than \$5 trillion to our national debt. Obviously, this is a very serious fiscal crisis, and the American people are demanding answers.

This legislation will allow us room to begin working on a solution that will put our Nation on a much more sound financial footing. This bill will extend our Nation's borrowing authority for 90 days to give each House of Congress, the House and the Senate, the needed time to do what they are legally required to do, which is to pass a budget to show the American people how we intend to deal with the many challenges that we face. But while giving Congress time to do its work, it also has a very important caveat associated with it that says, if we don't do what we are required to do by law, that we will not be paid. Simply put: no budget, no pay.

This idea actually came, Madam Speaker, from previous bipartisan efforts to bring fiscal responsibility to Washington. And now the President has indicated that if it reaches his desk, he will sign it, that he does not oppose it.

As well, there have been very promising indications coming out of the United States Senate from many Democratic Members that they will also step up, after 4 long years of inaction, and put forward a budget.

□ 1210

I believe that this can be the impetus today for us to begin working together to make the difficult decisions to finally address our fiscal challenges. Today, we can send that very strong message to the American people with a bipartisan vote to show that we are willing to put our paychecks on the line to meet these challenges.

Now, some are concerned about whether or not this legislation is constitutional because of the 27th Amendment's restriction that the pay of Members of Congress cannot be varied—that is really the operative phrase of that amendment, “varied”—that it can neither be raised nor reduced until another election has taken place. This bill, Madam Speaker, was carefully crafted to comply with the requirements of the 27th Amendment.

So this is how it will work:

If either the House or the Senate does not pass a budget by April 15, the deadline, then beginning on April 16, the pay for Members of that Chamber will be placed into an escrow account and will only be paid when that Chamber—either the House or the Senate—has passed a budget or when we reach the end of the 113th Congress. The amount that Members are paid will not be reduced nor will it be raised, so we stay in strict compliance with the terms of the 27th Amendment.

There is no requirement in the 27th Amendment which states that Members have to be paid weekly, biweekly, monthly, or bimonthly or what have you, only that the pay that they receive will not vary.

Now, some have suggested that the escrow account into which the Member pay would be deposited should bear interest so that that could then, as well, be paid to the Members. This cannot happen because that would actually cause Member pay to increase, of course. It would then vary their pay, which would not be in compliance with the strict terms of the 27th Amendment.

So I am extremely hopeful, Madam Speaker, that we will successfully conclude our work in a timely basis here in the House, and I hope that this additional provision, as well, encourages the Senate to also complete our important work and pass a budget.

What we are suggesting certainly is not unreasonable. I'll tell you, I come from southeast Michigan, and one thing I can tell you that is true about the people that I am honored to serve is that they get up every single day, every morning and work hard all day, every day. They simply do not understand how Congress can fail to do our job for almost 4 years—no budget out of the Senate for almost 4 years—and yet suffer no consequences.

The American people are demanding that their Members of Congress deal effectively with the challenges we face. Our problems are real, and it's time for real solutions or real consequences.

The concept, again, very simple: no budget, no pay. When times are tight,

you balance your checkbook. When you run out of money, you stop spending. When your credit card is maxed out, you cut it up or get a plan together to pay it off. And if you don't do your job, you don't get paid. These are the principles, Madam Speaker, that Americans live by, and we certainly should be no exception.

So I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill is not a serious or viable attempt to address the debt ceiling issue and is merely another way to avoid dealing with the difficult choices we need to make.

We have been here before. We know what happens when we govern with this kick-the-can-down-the-road mentality. The most troubling effect, again, is the constitutionality of this bill is also dangerously unclear.

I was not on the floor last week when my colleagues read the Constitution. Maybe they didn't reach the 27th Amendment. I am not a constitutional attorney. I am not an attorney in any way, and I make no apologies for that. But it's real easy:

No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators or Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of the Representatives shall have intervened.

“Varying” is the, again, as my friend did say, operative word. If you aren't getting a paycheck in a month and you're going to wait for 18 months, that's varying. So it could be—and, in my opinion, it is—a constitutional problem.

But be that as it may, I do commend the majority for recognizing that Congress must pay its bills, that raising the debt ceiling isn't about spending more money, it's about paying for bills we already incurred.

There is widespread, bipartisan acknowledgement of how difficult and serious the fiscal challenges before us have become. However, this proposal is just another attempt to yet again put the discussion off for another day.

Madam Speaker, I came here and I saw the sign, “No Budget, No Pay.” It probably should say, “No Budget, Delayed Pay,” but it sounds better when you say “No Budget, No Pay.” That means we may not be getting paid, but we're going to get paid; it will be delayed, but we're going to get paid.

Every year in this house we do pass a budget; although, it's a budget that I can't vote for. It's a budget that hurts the middle class, the working class, the want-to-be-working class, and it also hurts the American people's safety net. We know again this year we will pass that budget. So our friends on the other side of the aisle are putting up a No Budget, No Pay quite well knowing that they will probably pass their budget and we probably will get paid.

On another thought, as my good friend, Mr. DOYLE, from Pittsburgh has

said to me, why not no gun control, no pay? Why not no immigration reform, no pay? Why not no DISCLOSE Act, no pay?

So, Madam Speaker, in my opinion—and I think in a lot of my colleagues' opinion—it's a gimmick bill. No Budget, No Pay has no teeth.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, before I yield time to my good colleague here, a couple of comments in regards to what my ranking member has said from the committee, why not no gun control, no pay, or using some other examples. I would just point out that none of those are required by law, as passing a budget is required by law.

Also, there was some comment again about the significance of the 27th Amendment. I would just add quickly a statement from David Rivkin, Jr., and Lee Casey. These are two constitutional attorneys that served in former administrations who say the bill passes muster. Their comment:

It does not vary Members' compensation instead holding it in escrow until such time that a budget is passed or, at the latest, this Congress comes to an end. It is attentive to the text and structure of the Constitution.

And just one other quote. This is from another constitutional attorney, a Greg Watson—actually, a gentleman who rallied the support to pass the 27th Amendment. I will proudly point out, in 1992 it was my State of Michigan that put it over the three-fourths threshold. But at any rate, he said:

Nowhere in such a proposal do I see any violation of the terms and provisions of the 27th Amendment. Such a proposal does not vary the dollar amount of compensation to Members of Congress. The proposal merely delays the disbursement of that dollar amount.

STATEMENT OF DAVID B. RIVKIN, JR., AND LEE A. CASEY

Members of Congress are accountable not just to serve their constituents but also to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. The House of Representatives' debt ceiling extension furthers both. The American people expect that their elected representatives in Congress will work together to enact a budget resolution, and the House bill's approach holds them personally accountable for doing so. It honors both Article I and the Twenty-Seventh Amendment to the U.S. Constitution because it does not vary Members' compensation, instead holding it in escrow until such time that a budget is passed or, at the latest, this Congress comes to an end. This mechanism is a model for the way that Congress ought to work: it is creative, it is fiscally responsible, and it is attentive to the text and structure of the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, at this time I am very honored and privileged to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), who is a distinguished member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, the No Budget, No Pay portion of this bill was written specifically to ensure that it complies with the 27th Amendment

to the Constitution. The bill does not vary the amount of compensation and is, therefore, constitutional. It only changes when Representatives and Senators are paid if they fail to adopt a budget resolution, as required by law.

Currently, Representatives are paid monthly and Senators are paid twice a month. This bill simply says, if the House does not adopt a budget resolution, the Members of that House, instead, get paid at the end of that term of Congress.

In 1789, James Madison, when he introduced the 27th Amendment, spoke of preventing changes in compensation from being for the benefit of those determining them. The clear purpose of the amendment—which, as we know, was not ratified until 1992—was to prevent Members from drawing higher salaries from the public treasury without giving voters an opportunity to speak on that decision. This bill does not benefit Members at the expense of taxpayers, and it is consistent with the provisions of the 27th Amendment.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. It is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

We have sharp differences in this body on taxes, on spending, on the best path forward to resolve our fiscal situation. Those are fairly legitimate debates, but there should be absolutely no daylight between us on meeting our obligation to pay our bills. There should be no linkage between the obligation to pay our bills and getting our way on contentious issues in dispute among us.

This is just like a person with a credit card who buys a refrigerator. At the end of the month when the credit card bill arrives, they've used the refrigerator, they see they're above their credit limit, they don't tear up their credit card. What they do is they stiff their credit card company.

□ 1220

We have to pay our bills. That is not negotiable. A year ago August when we went through this spectacle with this linkage, we suffered our first downgrade in the history of the country. That is outrageous. And it's going to cost taxpayers money. If we mess around with the debt ceiling, creating uncertainty as to whether this is a political tool and gimmick, a 1 percent increase in interest rates will cost the taxpayers \$1 trillion.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, the reason that we have such an enormous amount of national debt, such a number that you can't even get your mind around it anymore, \$16 trillion, a big component of that is because we have not been following the law in having the Senate pass a budget as we have done in this House.

I would say, having been very proud to participate and sit on the platform watching the President of the United States in his inaugural getting sworn in just the other day, one of the things

that he said is that we have to address our debt and we have to work together. And today, the White House is saying they will not oppose this bill. So I am asking my colleagues to work together in a bipartisan way. Passing a budget is the foundation for us to begin to get a handle on this out-of-control spending and the deficit and the debt that we have.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York, Hakeem Jeffries.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Over the last 2 years, the debt ceiling has been illegitimately demonized, politicized, and mischaracterized. If it were possible to give voice to the debt ceiling, it might reasonably ask the question: Where do I go to get my reputation back?

The debt ceiling is not a forward-looking vehicle designed to give the President the power to spend more. It is a backward-looking vehicle designed to give the administration the ability to pay bills that have already been incurred by the Congress.

We've all sworn an oath to uphold the Constitution. We, therefore, have a constitutional obligation to protect the full faith and credit of the United States to prevent a default and to stop holding the economy hostage to economic and ideological extremism.

The American people deserve a meaningful, long-term increase in the debt ceiling that will give us the stability to create economic growth. That is the reason why I urge a "no" vote on this legislative gimmick.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, Ms. NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him; our ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. LEVIN; and our ranking member on Budget, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for their leadership and the clarity they have brought to the debate on the floor today.

It's a curiosity what we have on the floor today. It's a subterfuge to distract from the matter at hand. Madam Speaker, once again, as has happened too often in the last 2 years, we have come to the floor at a moment when our Republican colleagues are threatening the full faith and credit of the United States of America and putting the stability of our economy on the line.

Too often, families and small businesses have faced uncertainty about the debt ceiling, funding our national government, our Tax Code, and the rest. Three months. Where is the certainty in 3 months? We should not even be having a debate. There should be no doubt that the full faith and credit of the United States will be honored, and that is what our Constitution says.

Too often, House Republicans have refused to acknowledge the negative

impact of their action, choosing to return to the same tired, failed strategy, one that only serves to, again, weaken our economy and undermine our middle class. That track record must end.

Now, I'm hearing people say that we should go down this path of least resistance. That's what I call it. It's an easy way out, 3 months. But the fact is that that is a path to even more problems and, as Mr. CROWLEY has said, a path to another cliff.

Our country needs a clean, long-term debt ceiling increase and a bipartisan, balanced budget that protects Medicare and Social Security, invests in the future, and responsibly reduces the deficit. We all know that. We know that as we go forward to reduce the deficit we need growth in job creation, we need spending cuts, and we need revenue. Democrats have already agreed to \$1.6 trillion in spending cuts. Democrats have already agreed to more than \$1 trillion in Medicare savings to strengthen Medicare and to protect beneficiaries and not to affect their benefits. Democrats and Republicans came together to avert the fiscal cliff and raise revenues by de-linking the tax cut for the high end from the tax cut for the middle class.

We all agree that more can and must be done to get our fiscal house in order. But we must face the facts. Real, lasting deficit reduction will only be achieved through an approach that is balanced, fair, and focused on jobs and the prosperity of our middle class.

Unfortunately, this bill on the floor today fails to meet those standards. Americans and Members of Congress should remember two words about this legislation—two words: three months. Three months. That's how long Republicans are prepared to raise the debt ceiling. Today they really don't even address the debt ceiling issue—three months.

But Republican leaders are doing more. They have made promises to their fellow Republicans, to get their vote, to even go beyond the Ryan budget. This is like the Ryan budget on steroids. They have called this bill No Budget, No Pay. But who pays under the Republican budget? Seniors pay, ending the Medicare guarantee. Seniors, children, and people with disabilities pay, cutting Medicaid. Children pay because it will cut investments in their education, in their future, in their self-fulfillment, in the competitiveness of our country in the global economy. Veterans pay because of the gutting of our domestic spending priorities.

I don't think that we should ever link what we do here as to whether people get paid. We have a lot of work to do here. This linkage is a gimmick, it's a joke, and it's not right. It's designed to put people on the spot and say, you don't get paid, and in order to get paid, in order for Members of Congress to get paid, you must cut benefits for seniors and their Medicare guarantee, Medicaid and the rest. It's a

false link. It shouldn't even be there in the first place, and it is wrong.

Again, this proposal is a missed opportunity. It does not relieve the uncertainty faced by small businesses, the markets, and the middle class. It is a gimmick unworthy of the fiscal and economic challenges that we face. This proposal does not have certainty. It does not have growth, and it does not have my support. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. How much time do I have remaining, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I would like to yield 1 minute to my dear friend from right across the river from me, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

□ 1230

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, an owner of a software company is deciding whether to hire more people today, a manufacturer is deciding whether to buy a new piece of equipment, a restaurant owner is deciding whether to add more tables and jobs to her restaurant. In order for them to decide to grow, they need to know there's going to be a stable financial environment.

What we're doing today is saying to those decisionmakers, don't worry, the government is going to pay all of its bills until May 19. After that, we're not sure.

The way to reduce the deficit is, yes, fiscal restraint and adding revenue, but the way to reduce the deficit is to grow jobs in this country. The people who decide to grow jobs in this country will not make that decision in an atmosphere of financial chaos.

This bill creates another fiscal cliff. Fiscal cliffs are the problem, not the solution. The solution is economic growth.

Let's oppose this bill and oppose yet another unnecessary and contrived fiscal cliff.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York, Mr. JERRY NADLER.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, the gimmick nature of this whole thing I won't elaborate on. It's been done before. The fact that this provision of withholding pay from Members of Congress is unconstitutional as it varies Members' pay is obvious. The argument that withholding pay for a year and a half or a year and three-quarters is not varying compensation. It is constitutionally laughable and beneath respect.

Secondly, this is institutionalized bribery and extortion. It should never

be considered. What this provision says is if you vote the way we think you ought to vote, you'll get paid. If you vote the way we think you should not vote, you will not get paid. That's why we have this provision in the Constitution. We should not be bribing Members. We should not say to a Member that if you think the budget before you is not good for the country, vote against it and you won't get paid; if you think it's not good for the country, you better vote for it because you have a mortgage payment coming due.

How dare we.

Finally, the last thing we want to do is say to people thinking of running for the Congress, if you're not a millionaire, don't run because there's no guarantee you'll be paid.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, it's my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the assistant Democratic leader, Mr. CLYBURN.

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

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

In 2011, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, said:

We don't need to be governing in 2 month increments.

I agree.

We don't need any more uncertainty.

I agree.

He later said:

Uncertainty prevents entrepreneurs from taking a risk, from starting a business and creating jobs.

I agree. Governing in 3-month increments is no better. It maintains a continuous cloud of uncertainty.

We all saw the damage caused in 2011 when our Republican colleagues risked the full faith and credit of the United States. Businesses slowed and Standard & Poor's downgraded America's credit. Going down this road again will threaten our ongoing economic recovery and reverse job growth.

My Republican colleagues continue to use the American economy as leverage for their ideological agenda and creating another cliff is not an adequate solution. This is hostage-taking, and this is unacceptable.

This bill merely kicks the can down the road and does nothing to end the uncertainty facing businesses. I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. As I have no more speakers, I'm prepared to close and yield myself the balance of my time.

I heard the previous speakers on the other side talk about no budget, no pay. It's no budget, delayed pay. They are trying to fool the American people by saying we're not getting paid, which is not true. We are going to be getting paid—which I doubt also—at the end of 18 months. So we're going to get paid.

The reason why I doubt that is because every year my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do pass a budget. Do we pass a budget that we can agree with? No. Do they hurt the middle class? Yes. Do they hurt the working class? Yes. Do they take away safety nets? Yes. Do they hurt our veterans? Yes.

Without question, I will make a bet with anybody who would like to that there will be a budget passed in this session. When that happens, they will try to put some pressure on the Senate, which can easily pass anything they want to pass, and then that makes this no budget, no pay, no teeth.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just say this, Madam Speaker: what we're hearing from our Democratic colleagues here in the House is really a complete disconnect from what we're hearing from their Senate colleagues about this particular bill.

You have House Democrats saying that this bill is nothing but a gimmick. I've heard it said that this bill is a joke. In other words, it is a gimmick or a joke to suggest that Congress should follow the law.

I think that's different than what Senate Democrats have been saying very vocally, that this bill actually would give them an opportunity to pass a budget and the White House saying that they won't oppose it. Again, it's a complete disconnect from my colleagues here on the floor, some that I'm hearing on the other side there. I would say more pointedly that it's a complete disconnect from what the American people have as an expectation for their government, which is to follow the law, to pass a budget, to get a handle on our debt and our spending, and to prioritize our spending.

Again, a budget is a blueprint for a path forward. It speaks to the American people of the priorities of their Congress, of their government. We will have lots of other opportunities to address this terrible national debt.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support No Budget, No Pay. The idea behind No Budget, No Pay came from a Nashvillian who approached me two years ago and said, "I don't get paid if I don't do my job, and do it on time. Why should Congress be any different?" I agreed, and I introduced No Budget, No Pay in 2011 during the last Congress with the help of the important non-partisan reform group No Labels. I reintroduced the bill, H.R. 310, last Friday, with 48 original cosponsors, 19 Democrats and 29 Republicans.

The purpose of No Budget, No Pay is to get Congress to do its essential budgeting work on time. This means pay-for-performance, a new concept here on Capitol Hill. Getting the job done on time is a fundamental American principle yet one that has been forgotten in

our nation's Capitol. Our No Budget, No Pay proposal aligns incentives of elected officials with those of our citizens back home so that we will start completing our work on time in order to get paid. The purpose of this bill is not punishment, but performance.

We are in an interesting parliamentary situation today because, after stonewalling by both political parties, the Republican Party has now, suddenly and without hearings, adopted a diluted version of No Budget, No Pay for immediate floor consideration. Thankfully, the Democratic Party has decided not to make this a partisan issue, freeing members to vote as their conscience tells them.

I am not defending Republican floor procedures, or the modifications they made to my bill. But the important point is that reform of Congress is long overdue, and this is the way to start, with a new type of reform that brings Congress back in line with the values and the work ethic of the American people. No work, no pay. No budget, no pay.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 325, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013.

It frustrates me to no end that my Republican colleagues still have not learned their lesson from their earlier failures on matters of similar character. The American people want results, not political gimmicks, which is precisely what this bill is. H.R. 325 does nothing to ensure the long-term stability of markets, promote sustainable economic growth, and protect the credit rating of the United States. Very much the opposite, it is a "gotcha bill" that allows House Republicans to thumb their noses at the Senate and blame it for faults in which House Republicans share. I have never been a great lover of the other body, but now is not the time for petulant antics. Now is the time for action in the public interest.

I urge my colleagues to vote down H.R. 325. We have time enough—though not much—to negotiate a bipartisan increase to the debt ceiling that is not just another stop-gap measure creating new problems and risks in the immediate future. That will require good faith and hard work by all who choose to be involved. I choose so, and I hope my colleagues do as well.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this measure will continue to ensure funding for all federal government obligations and allow the government to continue its day to day operations through May of 2013.

The U.S. Constitution is clear on the subject of the debt limit. Section 4 of the 14th Amendment states in clear language that: "the validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be questioned."

The American people and our economy are being held hostage to gimmicks driven by polls, and unfettered brinkmanship. On the cusp of the inauguration of our 44th President—a glorious occasion—the people deserve better.

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

The President has stated:

"The Administration supports a long-term increase in the debt limit that would increase

certainty and economic stability. . . Instead of short-term management of self-inflicted fiscal crises, the President believes there is now an opportunity to strengthen the economy by putting the Nation on a sounder fiscal path. Progress has already been made towards that goal."

I would hope that my colleagues on the other side realize that these are trying times for the American people and brinkmanship is not the answer. This body must come up with a sensible solution to the pressing financial problems which plague our economy.

It is truly shameful that during the beautiful transcendent inaugural weekend, in which many of my Houston constituents were able to come and enjoy Washington, DC, hospitality; capped off by the celebration of Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday, Congress is back to the same bad sportsmanship which has crippled this body to the point of gridlock.

The measure provides funding authority for the first five months of 2013, through May 2013, to allow the government to service debts and obligations which we have previously incurred.

This legislation is filled with gimmickry because it would require House Members' salaries to be held in escrow if we House do not adopt a budget resolution and Senators' salaries to be held in escrow if the Senate doesn't do the same. It appears that my colleagues on the right have opted for form over substance.

We cannot continue to hold our Nation hostage, keeping the benefits of recipients of Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare who have must have sleepless nights because they are worried about the disappearance of their monthly checks.

I support a long-term increase in the debt limit that would increase certainty and economic stability. The bill before us this morning, H.R. 325, is a short-term measure with unnecessary complications, needlessly perpetuating uncertainty in the Nation's fiscal system, though I would note that the Obama administration has given somewhat tepid support, and only because H.R. 325 lifts the immediate threat of default and indicates that my Congressional Republican colleagues have backed off an insistence on holding the Nation's economy hostage to extract drastic cuts in Medicare, education, and other programs that middle-class families depend on.

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

That is why Madam Speaker, I submitted an Amendment to the Rules Committee yesterday which:

"Establishes that it is the sense of Congress that the safety net for the most vulnerable among us, the 15.1 percent of Americans living below the poverty line which includes 21 percent of our nation's children, must be protected in any budget negotiations."

Madam Speaker, Social Security is currently the only source of income for nearly two-thirds of older American households receiving benefits, and roughly one-third of those households depend on Social Security for nearly all of their income.

Half of those 65 and older have annual incomes below \$18,500, and many older Americans have experienced recent and significant losses in retirement savings, pensions, and home values. Today, every dollar of the average Social Security retirement benefit of about \$14,800 is absolutely critical to the typical beneficiary.

Contrary to some claims, Social Security is not the cause of our nation's deficit problem. Not only does the program operate independently, but it is prohibited from borrowing. Social Security must pay all benefits from its own trust fund.

If there are insufficient funds to pay out full benefits, benefits are automatically reduced to the level supported by the program's own revenues.

For reasons like these, I may not oppose a short-term solution to the debt limit and look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues here in the House and the Senate to provide certainty and foment stability for the economy.

I would add that instead of short-term management of self-inflicted fiscal crises, I truly believe we have an opportunity to strengthen the economy by putting the Nation on a sounder fiscal path.

Progress has already been made towards that goal. In 2011, the President signed into law \$1.4 trillion in spending reductions, not counting additional savings from winding down the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. We need to seize this template and move forward—not backwards.

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

The President has made clear that he remains willing to work with both parties in the Congress to budget responsibly and to achieve additional deficit reduction consistent with the principles of balance, shared growth, and shared opportunity.

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

According to the Bipartisan Policy Center, spending for Medicare and Medicaid is projected to increase from 21 percent of non-interest federal spending in 2010 to 31 percent by 2020. The numbers are wonkish sounding but in terms of real dollars, the increase is mammoth. That is why we must address the spending issue in earnest but not using the paltry monthly income of seniors to pay for yachts for millionaires.

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

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

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

I want to give some pertinent facts about my district and why the certainty provided by H.R. 325 is so important.

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

The Houston metro area:

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

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

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

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

Moreover, given the uncertainty of final funding decisions and the possibility that across-the-board spending cuts will occur in March unless Congress and the President can reach agreement to prevent the currently scheduled "sequester," it is critical that we work towards bipartisan solutions to our nation's financial woes.

Given the U.S. economy is showing signs of progress, it is crucial that we continue to fund government programs without interruption.

Lastly, as a Senior Member of the Homeland Security and Judiciary Committees I understand the importance of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection mission to enforce drug, trade and travel laws in efforts to keep our borders safe; and the importance of ensuring that our nation remains safe from terrorists and others who would do harm to our nation.

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

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

And I close with the sacred words from our Constitution. Section 4 of the 14th Amendment

states in clear language that: "the validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be question."

And the President himself was transparent and sincere when he stated:

"H.R. 325 would temporarily allow the Congress to fund commitments to which it has already agreed. A temporary solution is not enough to remove the threat of default that Republicans in the Congress have held over the economy. The Congress should commit to paying its bills and pass a long-term clean debt limit increase that lifts self-inflicted and unnecessary uncertainty from the Nation's economy."

I echo President Obama's words and wish that this House gets its house in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 39, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Murphy of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 325 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING VETERANS, TROOPS, AND SENIORS FROM BENEFIT CUTS AND COST INCREASES.

A concurrent resolution on the budget shall not be taken into account under section 3 if the concurrent resolution provides for—

(1) any cut in benefits for veterans, members of the Armed Forces, or their families; or

(2) any cut in benefits for seniors, including—

(A) the elimination of guaranteed health insurance benefits for seniors or people with disabilities;

(B) the conversion of Medicare into a voucher plan that provides limited payments to seniors or people with disabilities to purchase health care in the private health insurance market;

(C) cuts in Medicaid health insurance benefits;

(D) cuts in nursing home care; or

(E) privatization of Social Security benefits.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

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

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

□ 1240

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment

to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will be amended and immediately proceed to final passage.

I appreciate that the Republican leadership has put forward legislation that would raise the Nation's debt ceiling, agreeing that it is not an option for the United States to default on its obligations. I also support that Members of Congress should not be paid if they do not do their jobs, part of which is to pass a responsible budget, but I do not agree with the political gamesmanship of, once again, playing politics with our serious fiscal issues and using short-term gimmicks rather than working to find long-term solutions. We need to stop playing games with the debt ceiling and spend our time and energy on job creation.

I supported a clean debt limit bill. However, because in this version congressional pay has been tied directly to passing a budget, it is important to ensure that the budget that is passed is responsible and protects our most vulnerable citizens.

My amendment would not kill the underlying legislation. It would merely add commonsense protections to the bill for members of our Armed Forces, our veterans, and our seniors from the budget-cutting process. Anyone who supports the underlying legislation has no reason to not also support this amendment. If adopted, the debt limit would still be raised to allow the government to pay its obligations through May 19, and Members of Congress would still have their pay withheld if they fail to agree to a budget resolution by April 15. The amendment simply clarifies that the budget resolution protects our troops, veterans, and seniors.

I recently visited the West Palm Beach VA Medical Center and spoke with both veterans and staff. I heard their very real fears that their benefits, which they fought for, would be threatened by the political gamesmanship in Washington. I saw that same anxiety in the eyes of seniors I recently spoke to from Nettles Island on the Treasure Coast, who worry that cuts to Medicare and the privatization of Social Security could lead to a choice between a meal or medicine. After hearing these concerns, I expressed time and time again throughout my district that I could not understand why anyone would oppose amending the underlying legislation to ensure veterans, troops, and seniors are protected from devastating cuts.

Madam Speaker, this amendment language should have the full support of the House. It simply states that we cannot cut benefits for veterans or members of the Armed Forces or cut benefits for seniors and that we will not gamble our grandparents' futures on Wall Street or turn Medicaid into a for-profit voucher system designed more to help out the big corporations than those who are struggling or disabled.

I also want to express my disappointment that the underlying legislation is another short-term fix when our country needs long-term solutions. I spoke to several business groups last week, and they want stability from our government. If they had certainty, they would begin investing capital back into our economy rather than sitting on it. Our dysfunctional Congress is to blame for slowing our recovery.

Now is the time to work together with courage and purpose and come to a grand bargain that will protect America's greatness for generations to come. Our Nation cannot afford to continue down the path of such fiscal irresponsibility. Such piecemeal approaches will not address our country's long-term fiscal health. Rather, we must look at reducing spending, generating revenue, lowering unemployment, addressing the long-term sustainability of Social Security and Medicare, and creating additional economic growth through job creation.

A real fix to America's long-term fiscal issues and deficit reduction can only come by truly coming to the table without personal agendas and with the recognition that America needs less political gamesmanship and more leadership. Unfortunately, the underlying legislation in its current form falls short of what our country desperately needs.

That is why I hope my amendment will be adopted here today as a first step towards putting aside partisanship and, instead, protecting our veterans, troops, and seniors. While the underlying legislation is not perfect and while it is not the grand bargain we were hoping for, it would show that there is willingness in the 113th Congress for compromise. As we move forward from the debate over the debt limit and on to other pressing fiscal issues, we can no longer settle for short-term approaches to our public policy but, instead, work together to come to the grand bargains that will ensure America continues to be the greatest country for generations to come.

Madam Speaker, my amendment is an opportunity to show the American people that this Congress is willing to work together and compromise to address our fiscal issues and to protect our troops, veterans, and seniors. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of my commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, as I read this motion to recommit, it says that the concurrent resolution on the budget shall not do this, shall not do that, shall do this,

shall do that. This debate belongs when we do the budget. We're not at the budget yet.

Look, I'm glad people are excited about actually debating a budget. That's wonderful. Let's hold that enthusiasm until we actually are debating a budget. The purpose of this bill is to actually get us to have that debate, to have a budget.

What's frustrating for Democrats and Republicans in the House, I would like to say, is that the other body hasn't been doing a budget for 4 years. The minority, to their credit, brought a budget to the floor. The majority has brought a budget to the floor and passed it both of the last 2 years. The Senate, no budget. So what we decided to do was to take a piece of legislation from the minority, from a member of the minority—the No Budget, No Pay legislation—and add it to this so that we can get to debating this Nation's fiscal house, which is not in order, Madam Speaker.

So all I would say is we should defeat this motion to recommit. It is premature, and it is prejudging a budget that does not yet exist. So let's get rid of this motion to recommit and be serious about this short-term extension so that we can make sure that we have the debate we deserve.

How are we going to prevent a debt crisis? How are we going to balance the budget? How are we going to have growth and opportunity in this society? How are we going to save Medicare? How are we going to make sure that we can pay our bills and stop our government from living beyond its means? How are we going to secure a future for our children and our grandchildren?

That's the debate surrounding the budget. This is premature. It applies to a budget that hasn't even been written yet and which will be written on a baseline that doesn't even exist yet. So let's defeat this motion to recommit—it's silly, it's partisan, it's process—and move on to the underlying bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 151, nays 277, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—151

Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Negrete McLeod
Barber	Higgins	Nolan
Barrow (GA)	Hinojosa	O'Rourke
Beatty	Holt	Owens
Becerra	Honda	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Horsford	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Huffman	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Israel	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Jackson Lee	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Jeffries	Peterson
Braley (IA)	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Jones	Pocan
Bustos	Kaptur	Polis
Butterfield	Keating	Price (NC)
Capps	Kennedy	Quigley
Carney	Kildee	Rahall
Cartwright	Kilmer	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Kind	Royal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Chu	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Ciциlline	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	T.
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Crowley	Levin	Schneider
Cuellar	Lewis	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Schwartz
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Scott (VA)
Delaney	Lofgren	Scott, David
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
DelBene	Lowey	Shea-Porter
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
Doggett	(NM)	Sires
Doyle	Lujan, Ben Ray	Slaughter
Duckworth	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Engel	Lynch	Speier
Enyart	Maffei	Swaiwell (CA)
Eshoo	Maloney,	Takano
Esty	Carolyn	Tierney
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Fattah	Markey	Tonko
Foster	Matheson	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Van Hollen
Gabbard	McIntyre	Vargas
Gallego	McNerney	Vela
Garamendi	Meng	Velázquez
Garcia	Michaud	Vislosky
Grayson	Miller, George	Walz
Green, Gene	Moore	Watt
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Gutierrez	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Hahn	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Hanabusa	Neal	

NAYS—277

Aderholt	Clyburn	Foxx
Alexander	Coble	Franks (AZ)
Amash	Coffman	Frelinghuysen
Amodei	Cohen	Fudge
Bachmann	Cole	Gardner
Bachus	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Gerlach
Barr	Conaway	Gibbs
Barton	Connolly	Gibson
Bass	Conyers	Gingrey (GA)
Benishek	Cook	Gohmert
Bentivolio	Costa	Goodlatte
Bilirakis	Cotton	Gosar
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Gowdy
Black	Crawford	Granger
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Blumenauer	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Bonner	Cummings	Green, Al
Boustany	Daines	Griffin (AR)
Brady (TX)	Davis, Danny	Griffith (VA)
Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Grimm
Brooks (AL)	DeGette	Guthrie
Brooks (IN)	Denham	Hall
Broun (GA)	Dent	Hanna
Brown (FL)	DeSantis	Harper
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Harris
Buchon	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Burgess	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Calvert	Duffy	Heck (NV)
Camp	Duncan (SC)	Heck (WA)
Campbell	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Cantor	Edwards	Herrera Beutler
Capito	Ellison	Himes
Capuano	Ellmers	Holding
Carson (IN)	Farenthold	Hoyer
Carter	Fincher	Hudson
Cassidy	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Chabot	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
Chaffetz	Fleming	Hultgren
Clarke	Flores	Hunter
Clay	Forbes	Hurt
Cleaver	Fortenberry	Issa

Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney

Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schock

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Cárdenas Rush Waters

□ 1310

Messrs. LATTA, OLSON, PERRY, Ms. BASS, Messrs. SERRANO, ADERHOLT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. PAYNE, McDERMOTT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, CUMMINGS, MCGOVERN, CARSON of Indiana, CLAY, RICHMOND, AL GREEN of Texas, PERLMUTTER, THOMPSON of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Messrs. MORAN, SCHIFF, RUPPERSBERGER, and BLUMENAUER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. HUFFMAN, POLIS of Colorado, McNERNEY, GUTIERREZ, and BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. COHEN changed his vote from “present” to “nay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE
Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 285, noes 144, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

AYES—285

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Huitzenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly
Kilmer
Kind
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul

Stutzman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton

Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—144

Amash
Andrews
Bachmann
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garcia
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Grayson
Grijalva

Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi

Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOT VOTING—3

Cárdenas Green, Gene Rush

□ 1320

Messrs. BROOKS of Alabama, DUNCAN of Tennessee and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 30, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Madam 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: