

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I recently surveyed my constituents and asked them what they thought I should spend my time on in 2011. No surprise, they said jobs; create jobs.

Fifteen million Americans without work today, and what does the Republican continuing resolution do? It is going to add another 700,000 jobs lost in America, by Mark Zandi, the fine economist who was the adviser to JOHN MCCAIN when he was running for President, 700,000 jobs.

So why would they do this? You've got to scratch your head. The reason why they want to do this is because they only win if the economy is down, if there are more jobs lost. So their whole approach is not to be Americans but to be Republicans.

I say: Republicans, join us in being Americans first. Let's create a job-seeking engine. Let's create jobs in this country, not take them away.

#### HONORING PAT KELLY

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, a democracy is not beautiful edifices or beautiful buildings or even words written on paper. A democracy's foundation is the people. Today we pay tribute to the retirement of Pat Kelly, someone who has really helped our democracy thrive.

For 54 years, she has been one of the people that, anonymously and without much fanfare, has made sure that this democracy, whose very foundation is the longest continually maintained journal in the world, kept running. She did it as a proud daughter of Brooklyn, and she comes from a truly patriotic family.

Her mother was a Member of Congress, as the Speaker and minority leader have pointed out. Her grandfather, William Kelly, was the Postmaster General of Brooklyn. I was proud to kind of make quasi-association with Pat when I was in the city council and I got some funds to fix up Kelly Playground, where so many of us enjoyed Brooklyn.

You know, it really is true that many of us as Members of Congress blithely come through here. We cast our votes. We give our speeches. And it's easy for us to forget that this democracy is not about us. It's about the participation of citizenry and, of course, the hard work of so many people that make this institution so grand.

Pat Kelly is such a person. She is an institution unto herself. She will be missed around here, but I can tell you she will not be forgotten. We will remember her for her charm, her smile, her grace, and the way with which she did her job.

So to her family, the entire Kelly family, from all of the people from her home borough of Brooklyn, I want to say to her, congratulations on her retirement. She will be missed.

#### WILL WE CONTINUE TO GROW OUR ECONOMY?

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, a 2-week extension to fund the government may prevent a shutdown, but it will not change the fact that a serious choice lies before this Congress.

Will 2011 be a year in which we continue to grow our economy, a year that builds on the over 1 million private sector jobs created in 2010, or will it be remembered as the year extremists ignored the warnings of world-class economists at Moody's Analytics and Goldman Sachs and allowed our economy to shrink by over 700,000 jobs?

Will 2011 be a year in which we prepare America's children to compete in a global economy, or will it be the year that right-wing extremists and Congress defied common sense, cutting Pell Grants, blaming teachers for the deficit, and punishing struggling school districts across America for a financial crisis they did not cause?

In 2 weeks, these choices will once again come before this Congress. I implore the Republican leadership to seize this opportunity, not for partisan gain but for America's gain. Let's reduce the deficit in a way that does not jeopardize our recovery and make 2011 a year we move forward instead of backwards.

□ 1230

#### DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, when I returned to Illinois last week, I talked to my constituents, and the refrain I heard over and over was their frustration and concern about the pain they're feeling at the gas pump. And it's not just hurting them. It is threatening to damage our economy. It's already a weak economy, and it is damaging it even worse.

At this moment, the average cost of a gallon of gas in my home State of Illinois is over \$3.50—more than 10 cents higher than the national average. These prices are unseasonably high, hitting Illinoisans and Americans hard in their already-thinned pocketbooks and threatening our economy's tenuous recovery.

It's clear that Congress must act to protect our constituents from even higher gas prices by expanding our Nation's domestic energy production. More energy production here at home would not only reduce the cost of gas, putting money back in the wallets of every American; it would also create the kind of good-paying jobs that so many people need and will help get our economy running again.

Creating jobs, saving our constituents money, and helping the economy should be bipartisan goals, and we can

achieve them by expanding American energy production. I hope we come together to accomplish these goals in the weeks and months ahead.

#### FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENTS, 2011

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 115 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 115

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 115 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.J. Res. 44. This bill would fund the government through March 18 and reduce federal spending by \$4 billion over the remainder of the fiscal year. The measure cuts \$2.7 billion in earmarks from Energy and Water, Labor-HHS, Transportation-HUD, Homeland Security, and Legislative Branch appropriations, but most importantly, this measure averts a government shutdown and allows the Senate time to continue to consider H.R. 1, the bill that we successfully passed in this Chamber just 1 week ago.

Mr. Speaker, on that bill, we had roughly 50 hours of debate from both sides of the aisle, debate that ran late into the night that allowed the House to work its will for the first time in a long time. And the end result was that continuing resolution, H.R. 1, that now sits idly in the Senate.

This resolution today, this rule today, which I urge Members to strongly support, will allow for the 2-week extension of Federal funding to allow the

Senate time to seriously consider this bill, again, H.R. 1, the first bill in a long time on which the House has had a chance to work its will.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in 4 days, the Federal Government will run out of money. We must ask ourselves, how did we get into this dire situation where we are 4 days away from critical Federal services being closed and our Federal Government being unable to meet its obligations.

Today we are racing the clock to avoid this shutdown in large part because we have squandered the past 2 weeks debating H.R. 1, a ridiculous spending bill that contained some cuts so extreme it had no realistic chance of ever being passed into law and left other areas of the budget that both sides have generally agreed need to be cut untouched. H.R. 1 also had every bit of social legislation from the Republican majority, including gutting the ability of EPA to protect our air and our water and defunding Planned Parenthood and family planning, so that it had a threat of a Presidential veto and faces no realistic prospects of passage in the Senate.

So rather than working with Democrats in the House and Senate to craft a real long-term CR that would preserve the gains of our economy and invest in our future, Republicans have squandered the past few weeks to pass their out-of-touch and unrealistic spending bill that would prove devastating to our economy, our safety, our health, and, yes, our values.

Their draconian spending bill would destroy 700,000 jobs, according to Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's and former adviser to Senator JOHN MCCAIN. And as Goldman Sachs said, their long-term CR would "stall the economic recovery and reduce U.S. economic growth." In fact, just this morning more than 300 economists from across the country warned against the massive GOP spending bill, stating that, "as economists, we believe it is shortsighted to make budget cuts that eliminate necessary investments in our human capital, our infrastructure, and the next generation of scientific and technological advances. These cuts threaten our economy's long-term economic competitiveness."

Mr. Speaker, today's continuing resolution meets our shared goal of preventing a Federal Government shutdown, but at what cost? And for how long? We are committed to reducing the deficit beginning with an aggressive attack on waste, fraud, and abuse. Every Member in this body owes it to our constituents to responsibly cut spending and balance the budget without sacrificing jobs or weakening our economy.

Time and time again, the Republican leadership has told us that they want to proceed in an open and transparent fashion, and yet here we are again, fac-

ing another closed rule, shutting down amendments from both sides and stifling the legislative process and good cost-cutting ideas from both sides of the aisle. In fact, yesterday in the Rules Committee, my colleagues took a party-line vote to block an amendment from the top ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, Mr. DICKS. Mr. DICKS' amendment would have cut more funds than the Republican bill and, at the same time, restored funds for education programs.

In the spirit of the urgent need for cost-cutting and balancing the deficit, I think this body should consider ideas from both sides of the table and allow a rule that allows for discussion of the Dicks amendment and other ideas to cut costs even further than this CR allows.

This CR may succeed in keeping the government open from March 5 through March 18, which I think we all agree is necessary. But we also all know that 2 weeks is not nearly enough time to negotiate a long-term solution to the enormous spending challenges we face, especially when the Constitution guarantees the President 10 of those days to decide whether to sign or veto the bill.

The other side had discussed, at the end of last session, the need to have stability with regard to what kind of taxes people and businesses can expect over time. And at the end of last session, we passed a bill that set predictability for 2 years so people and businesses know what their taxes will be. Well, the other side of that coin is we need predictability and stability around appropriations and the general activities of government. It is stifling to the economy and stifling to job creation for people to be uncertain as to whether the largest enterprise in our country, the Federal Government, will or won't be solvent in 4 days' time.

This is my third year in Congress and already the fourth time I've managed a rule on a short-term CR. The shortened timeline set out by this CR sets the stage for a devastating shutdown crisis every 2 weeks that will bring legislating to a standstill, impede hopes of long-term economic growth, and create enormous overhang on the markets because of this great uncertainty that is of our own creation.

□ 1240

We are also undermining, through this CR, Mr. Speaker, investments in our own future. Take the cuts to literacy programs, for example.

Building an excellent public education system that ensures that each and every child has an opportunity to succeed is the most important investment we can make in our Nation's future and developing our human capital which helps keep America competitive. This is an investment that I have spent much of my life to support and achieve—on the State Board of Education, as a founder of a charter school, and now here in Congress.

What we see now, however, from the proposed short-term CR is the elimination of the Striving Readers Fund, which supports literacy for students from preschool through 12th grade. With American students' reading scores stagnating for the past 30 years, this proposal makes no sense.

Striving Readers is the only targeted Federal literacy funding for preschool through 12th grade. And particularly at a time of State and local budgets cuts, these resources are more important than ever.

Now, we can agree that Striving Readers should be improved. In fact, I am working, along with Congressman YARMUTH, to provide the LEARN Act, which would ensure that teachers and students have innovative strategies and data-backed tools to improve reading and writing. The administration's proposal would build on the progress of the Striving Readers program.

President Obama said in his State of the Union address: It's not just about how we cut, but what we cut. Republicans have mistakenly claimed that the administration also wants to eliminate Striving Readers, but they neglect to mention that the administration's 2012 budget proposes instead to revise, improve Striving Readers. The goal is not to reduce and eliminate Federal support for literacy; it is to consolidate and make more efficient Federal support for literacy, to strengthen literacy performance expectations, scale up innovative methods of teaching reading, writing, and language arts.

In fact, nearly all States, 44, have applied for the first \$10 million in the Striving Readers allocation that was available and have developed State literacy plans as a result. My home State of Colorado has been awarded \$150,000 for these important projects.

Literacy is the foundation of learning. It is the gateway to other content areas that are increasingly important in the global society, like science and math. Destroying the foundation of literacy is cutting off our Nation's own legs. Education is an investment in our future. By pulling the rug out from under our schools and children, Republicans seem willing to sacrifice our future prospects as a Nation. Education is how America can reclaim our edge in job creation, bring jobs back to our shores, become better business leaders, and provide a livable wage for working families.

We all agree that cuts must be made. But as the Romans said, caveat emptor, may the buyer beware. By agreeing to cuts in repeated short-term CRs, we run the risk of opening the door to a spending agenda that arbitrarily kills jobs, hurts our communities, completely undermines education reform, and we do nothing to promote the stability of the Federal Government that markets require to allow businesses to thrive and grow.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

say to my friend, I could not agree with him more. We must ask ourselves: How did we get here? How did we get here? I have been on the job for 60 days, but the fiscal year began back on October 1 of 2010. How did we get here?

We got here because the work of the people's House didn't get done last year, and I regret that. Candidly, I'm not sure how. I hear so many folks talk about the partisanship in the Congress and the partisanship in Washington, DC, and people can't get things done because of the partisanship. But, of course, last year Democrats controlled the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. And yet we still sit here today without a budget, without the appropriations that the speaker knows we need for the government to continue its operations.

How did we get here? I don't know. But I know this: Nobody elected me in November to come up here and point the finger of blame. They elected me to work with my friend to clean up this mess. Irrespective of how we got here, we have to move forward.

I have to say, because I was at home for the past week with my constituents working through these very same issues we are talking about today, the question I got over and over and over again is: Rob, that is a great start, but let's do more. That's a great start, but let's do more.

You know, getting started is what is hard. It is hard to get started. Over and over again we have heard our friends on both sides of the aisle say: You know, this program, it can be fixed. It can be fixed.

I wonder if we will have a day here where we can start from a blank sheet, just a blank sheet, and say: What is it that is worth borrowing from our children for? What is it that is worth increasing our children's credit card balance for? What is it that is worth mortgaging our children's future for?

Let me just say to my friend, because I know he has a great passion for education, and it is a passion I very much respect, I have the great fortune of coming from the part of the world called Gwinnett County, Georgia. And Gwinnett County was the recipient of the Broad Prize for the single best urban education school district in America. We made it as a finalist 2 years ago, but last year we won. And we won in spite of Federal Government intervention—not because of it, in spite of it. We won because, as a community, we got together back in 1996 and said there is a better way. What can we do to enable our children to succeed better?

We were doing standardized testing in Gwinnett County before standardized testing was in vogue because we knew we had to have a way to measure. We knew we had to have a way to sort out what works and what doesn't. Well, folks, we need some of that standardized testing here on Capitol Hill: What works and what doesn't?

And there are a lot of things that aren't working. Not only do we need to

get the bad out of the budget, we've got to decide that we're going to choose between good and good, between good and good because every school group I spoke to over our district workweek is a school group from whose future we are borrowing, whose future we are mortgaging over and over and over again.

It has to be said that the House worked its will in an unprecedented fashion, an unprecedented fashion. Mr. Speaker, I don't say that lightly. I mean never, never before in modern times has the House worked its will on a continuing appropriations bill the way it did last week. Again, I don't care whose fault it is. I don't care why we couldn't get it done last October. I don't care why we couldn't get it done in November. I don't care why we couldn't get it done in December. What I care about is we have an opportunity to get it done, and we did that last week.

The House worked its will, and we had some winners and we had some losers. I voted for a number of amendments that failed. I didn't get everything that I wanted in that bill. I know my friend from Colorado didn't get everything he wanted in that bill, but the House worked its will, Mr. Speaker, with unprecedented openness, and H.R. 1 was the result.

Well, I asked my staff to call over to the Senate before I came down here. I wanted to find out exactly how much debate the Senate had been putting in on H.R. 1. Of course, we debated it for almost 50 hours. We went through the night on a couple of nights. We wanted to make sure that the entire House had an opportunity to be involved. My staff tells me, Mr. Speaker, not a moment. Not a moment.

I hear the sense of urgency from my friend from Colorado that we have to take action; this is no way to run a government. I think he is right. I think cleaning up this mess means passing a single continuing resolution that gets us through to the end of the fiscal year. For Pete's sake, the Appropriations Committee is already taking testimony to try to get us into the 2012 budget cycle. This is leftover work that simply didn't get done last Congress. Not one second has been spent on the Senate side, Mr. Speaker, from what my staff tells me. Not one second has been spent considering a bill on which the entire United States House of Representatives worked its will; a bill that was the only open process that this House has seen on a continuing resolution; a bill that allowed Members from both sides of the aisle to come down here to the House floor and represent their constituents back home by doing exactly what my friend from Colorado is suggesting—trying to make good cuts, trying to make those things, present those things on the House floor that make the most sense to folks back home.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are where we are. No one wants the Senate to act ex-

peditiously on the work of the people's House more than I do. But given that not one moment has been dedicated to that, we have to come down here and fund the government one more time. It is the responsible thing to do. It is the responsible thing to do.

The better thing to do would be to act on H.R. 1, which the House passed last week with the support of Members in this body. But now, we have to come down here and extend for 2 weeks to give us time to finish those negotiations with the Senate side. And if that is not enough time, I suspect we will be back down here again. My friend from Colorado and I will be back down here in this well doing this same thing.

But it is no way to run the government, Mr. Speaker. It is no way to run the government. This is just what we have to do while we wait on the Senate to take up that bill on which the House worked its will last week.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman from Georgia said let us do more to save money, and yet this rule shuts down the process and doesn't allow amendments from the minority, including one by Mr. DICKS that saved over \$1 billion and would have reduced the deficit by over \$500 million. And yet again, through this closed rule, we are unable to do more, thanks to this restrictive rule by the Republican majority.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, House Joint Resolution 44.

This bill is just another part of the reckless Republican no-jobs agenda. Instead of focusing on creating jobs, Republicans are trying to cut nearly 1 million jobs across the country. Republicans have been in control of the House for now more than 2 months. They have been in control of the House for now more than 2 months, and they have failed to bring up a single bill to create a single job.

□ 1250

I mean, they haven't done just a poor job. They haven't done anything. This bill is just a mini-version of a larger Republican drive that America soundly rejected a week ago. I am absolutely against starting down a series of short-term cuts, of short-term CRs, that result in a bleed of the American middle class. This is death by 1,000 cuts—a slow bleed.

As Speaker BOEHNER stated earlier this week before the National Religious Broadcasters convention, "If they won't eat the whole loaf at one time," he said of the Democrats, "we'll make them eat it one slice at a time."

This is what this short-term CR is all about, one slice at a time, with the goal of shoving a whole loaf down the throats of the American people. The American people don't want the Republican layoffs. They want jobs.

Let's be clear. The bill before us today is just one more fight in this battle to keep American jobs. It's the

same job cuts that Republicans passed a week ago. This is just a 2-week version of it. The Republicans' reckless "so be it" attitude on spending destroys jobs that threaten America's economy. You don't have to take my word for it. All you have to do is read the report released by the chief economist at Moody's, Mark Zandi, if you want to know about the Republicans' "no jobs agenda" CR, which would cut 700,000 jobs by year's end if they make us eat one slice at a time and which would reduce economic growth.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. Let me quote economist Mark Zandi directly: "While long-term government spending restraint is vital and laying out a credible path toward that restraint very desirable, too much cutting too soon would be counterproductive."

The economy is adding about 100,000 to 150,000 jobs a month; but until that number reaches about 200,000 on a monthly basis, "imposing additional government spending cuts before this has happened would be taking an unnecessary chance with the recovery."

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

Mr. Speaker, to put these cuts in perspective, because, again, we have to get started somewhere, there is not going to be a speaker who stands up here today who doesn't speak out in favor of fiscal restraint. The questions are: When do we start? How much do we do?

Compare the bill that's before us today, which is the continuing resolution to fund the government for 2 weeks and is adding about \$4 billion in cuts, to the bill we passed last week, which had \$100 billion of cuts in it. Now put that \$100 billion of cuts in perspective.

Let's take the average American family who has to go out and buy groceries. That family has a 31-day grocery bill. Knowing that you've got to go out and buy 31 days' worth of groceries, what we're asking of the American people is to cut 1 day out. We're going to tell you now that we're going to cut 1 day out, and we need you to stretch your 30-days' worth of groceries into 31.

Mr. Speaker, that doesn't seem that draconian. In fact, it doesn't seem draconian at all. It seems like what American families are doing over and over and over again in the recession that we've been battling.

When we talk about these jobs numbers, these are the same jobs numbers about which folks said, If only you'll put your children in debt to the tune of another \$1.5 trillion, we'll get unemployment down under 8 percent. It's the same economist who said, Well, it didn't work the first year, but what if we do it the second year? If we put you in debt to the tune of \$1.6 trillion, in addition to the 1.5, in addition to the 1.3 the year before, then we're going to

get unemployment back down under 8 percent.

Those jobs didn't materialize because the Federal Government can't create jobs. We can destroy jobs—we can and we do—but we can't create jobs. Our young entrepreneurs create those jobs. The business owners in our communities create those jobs. We destroy jobs, but we cannot create jobs. That is what this continuing resolution is a recognition of, Mr. Speaker: that the government can absolutely get out of the way. We're not going to hear today about the numbers of jobs that will be lost if the EPA continues to classify carbon dioxide as a pollutant and hamstring the American economy in a way that no other economy on this planet is hamstrung. We're not going to hear those jobs numbers. H.R. 1 would solve that, and we have to get started somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I take no pride of authorship. I'm just a participant in H.R. 1 as it passed the House, as the House worked its will, as Democratic amendments passed and as Republican amendments passed. I wish we'd been governing the right way and that this had been done back on October 1. We passed that continuing resolution, and it's unclear to me why there was no open process there. We passed the second one in December and then the third one in December.

Again, the openness that this House has seen in this 112th Congress is absolutely unprecedented.

Now, I know my friend from Colorado is a strong supporter of CBO and of the work that CBO does. I couldn't agree with him more. Then when Mr. DICKS came before the committee last night with an amendment that would cut even more, as someone who believes we need to cut more, I was incredibly enthusiastic about that. My understanding was that CBO hadn't had a chance to score that amendment, that there was no scoring to be had, and so we couldn't tell whether or not this was going to cut or whether or not this was going to add or how the spend rates were going to sort themselves out, because it came at the very last minute.

Yet what didn't come at the last minute was the opportunity for the minority to offer a substitute. The Speaker reached out to the minority to say if you were interested in offering the same continuing resolution that you had offered before, which was going to freeze funding—and we've heard that a lot. Let's just freeze things. We don't want to cut anything, and we don't want to be draconian—the majority would have absolutely made that in order.

Again, the House could work its will, but my understanding is that that offer was turned down and that folks were not interested in offering that substitute. I would have been a proud "no" vote on that substitute, but I still believe, as the gentleman from Colorado said, openness in the process yields a better result.

This brings me full circle, Mr. Speaker, to H.R. 1, which is the single continuing resolution that has had more openness in the process than any other continuing resolution this House has ever considered. It led to the best process, and it led to the best outcome. This is the bill that sits in the United States Senate today, that could be acted on today, that would fund the government and provide the certainty that we need today through the end of the fiscal year, which is on September 30.

So when we're talking about certainty, and I absolutely believe that our economy needs certainty, it is the government that's creating the uncertainty. We are creating the uncertainty. We have historically created the uncertainty. We have an opportunity with H.R. 1 to eliminate that uncertainty for the rest of the fiscal year and to get back to doing what this House always should have been doing, which is considering appropriations bills under regular order.

Candidly, I hope my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle are throwing down that gauntlet today. I hope they're saying, You know, ROB, it's not easy to lead. It's not easy to move bills through regular order.

I want that opportunity to try. I want an opportunity to do it the right way. If we can move H.R. 1 through the Senate and onto the President's desk, we can then come together with the same kind of open process that we began 2 weeks ago to consider all of the appropriations bills and to make the priorities that this House chooses to make priorities, not the last Congress, not two Congresses ago, not President Obama in his first year, not President Bush in his last term—but this House today, together. What are our priorities?

As soon as we move this continuing resolution behind us, Mr. Speaker, we can begin to focus on those priorities, which is where the true work of the House is intended to be.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. I like the gentleman from Georgia. He's a nice guy. But I have to say that his story about what actually happened here is not exactly accurate.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is when the Democrats were in charge in the last Congress, we did have an omnibus appropriations bill, but it was the Senate Republicans who refused to provide the votes, because, as you know, you need a supermajority in the Senate.

Then he talked about how he was glad to be home last week. I was glad to be home last week too, and I got a lot of input, but we should have been working here and not moving up so perilously close to these deadlines where the government could actually

shut down. My fear is that we're just going to be kicking the can down the road every 2 weeks, every 2 weeks, facing another possible government shut-down. As the gentleman from Colorado said, that creates economic uncertainty and is not good for the economy.

□ 1300

Now, I just wanted to comment on the gentleman from Georgia. I was glad that I finally heard him use the word "jobs" and talk about jobs because that's the problem here. This H.R. 1 that he talks about we know is going to destroy jobs—various accounts, 700,000, 800,000 jobs that will be destroyed or will be eliminated, not just because the government isn't paying for the jobs, but because it doesn't invest in the future.

If you listened to what President Obama said in his State of the Union address, he said that the government has a role. The gentleman from Georgia says the government should get out of the way. Well, I don't agree with that. We need to make wise investments in our future, in our education programs—which this cuts—in our research and development for the future, in infrastructure so that we can have roads and highways and mass transit so that commerce can continue and we can grow the economy.

That is what's wrong with H.R. 1 and this larger bill that the Republicans have put forward. And, of course, the Senate can't take up the bill the way it is because they know it will destroy jobs and cripple the economy.

So what I ask of my Republican colleagues is go out there, sit down with the Senate Democrats, sit down with the House Democrats. Don't just say take it or leave this bill that we know has such draconian cuts and doesn't do anything to invest in America's future. We can't continue down this road. We've got to work together.

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

I associate myself with the gentleman from New Jersey's comments. We absolutely have to work together. It's a great source of pride for me that I've only been on the job 60 days and we've already seen more working together than this House has allowed in the past 4 years combined. Understand that. Understand that as we're working on this appropriations bill, as we're working through this appropriations process, that 2 weeks ago you saw more openness and working together in this Chamber—right here, right here in the people's House—more working together than you had seen in the previous 4 years combined.

Can we do more? I say to the gentleman from New Jersey, I think we can, and I look forward to being a partner and making that happen. But to say that what is sitting on the desk in the Senate is the product of take-it-or-leave-it legislating could not be further from the truth. It's the furthest from take-it-or-leave-it legislating that the

House has seen in 4 years. Arguably, it's the furthest thing from take-it-or-leave-it legislating that the House has seen on continuing appropriations bills in modern time.

So when we talk about where we are and where we're going, we have to ask that question of, why are we characterizing this as a process that's broken? Why are we characterizing H.R. 1 as something that doesn't work? Why isn't H.R. 1 the very best, the very best, given the makeup of this House, given our collective intellect and wisdom? Why isn't H.R. 1 the very best that we can do? Because when the process is open and everyone gets to participate, it ought to bring out our very best.

And I'll say to the gentleman from New Jersey, he has some of the lowest gas prices in the country. I enjoy traveling through his great State. Every time I go through, not only do I get full-service gasoline, I get it for the best prices in the country.

Gas prices are up 25 cents a gallon in Gwinnett County, where I come from; 25 cents a gallon in the past 10 days. We have economic crises in this country; we have economic challenges in this country; but spending more government resources is not the answer. We have about a \$15 trillion economy. Even with a \$3.5 trillion Federal budget, the Federal player is small, small—8.5 cents of every dollar in education in Georgia comes from the Federal Government. The rest comes from exactly where you expect it to come from, local communities and State governments. We have to get the government out of the way.

And if you're worried about uncertainty, as I am, if you share our concern about uncertainty, then let's pass H.R. 1. Let's be done. Let's be done with this 2 weeks, 4 weeks, 6 weeks, 12 weeks. Let's get us through the end of the year. Let's finish the job that we should have gotten done last year. Let's put it behind us, and let's start that new open process again. And it's one that I look forward to joining my colleagues in.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

H.R. 1 cannot be looked at as a serious budget document. Now, it's not about the cuts—\$61 billion, \$70 billion, we can come to a number that we can agree. And by the way, you can't come to a serious number without making sure that defense is also on the table. But what we have with H.R. 1 is a bill that loads up every piece of the far-right social agenda in one bill, from restricting a woman's right to choose, to preventing government from protecting the air we breathe and the water we drink. So if we want to have a discussion about a serious budget document and serious cuts, that's one thing. If we want to have a far-right dream list, that's another.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

DICKS), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, the CR disproportionately cuts education, especially literacy efforts. David Brooks, not known as a left-wing journalist, writes in the New York Times column today: "If you look across the country, you see education financing getting sliced often in the most thoughtless and destructive ways. In Washington, the Republicans who designed the cuts for this fiscal year seem to have done no serious policy evaluation."

Last night, I asked the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment restoring education cuts. The amendment cut \$1 billion from the Census in money that wasn't needed, applying most of that to offset education spending, and the remainder went to further reducing the deficit below the levels in the CR before us. The Rules Committee chose not to make that amendment in order, and therefore I oppose the rule.

But to talk to the gentleman, I spent 8 years on the staff of the other body, and this is my 35th year in the House of Representatives. Nobody ever gets everything they want: This is a process where the House passes a bill, it goes to the Senate, and then we have a conference committee or the Senate sends the bill back to us. Both sides meet and work out their differences. There is give and take, there is compromise, and that is the way this process works.

And I also want to say to the gentleman, and to your side, remember it was the Democratic Congress and the House Senate and Mr. Obama signing the \$41 billion cut from the Obama FY11 budget. It was the Democrats that did it. We had one Republican vote. And I just want to remind you, that was done in December in a lame duck session, which turned out to be a very effective lame duck session; and in that bill we made cuts across the board in all these areas.

So I want to make it clear we are also for deficit reduction, but what I am concerned about—and I know the gentleman is very sincere, I can tell that, I know you believe in every word that you are saying—but the biggest problem with that is what the effect will be on our economy. Mark Zandi of Moody's says, it will cost us 400,000 jobs in 2011, 700,000 jobs in 2012. Goldman Sachs, who I don't normally quote, they say that this could cut 1.5 to 2 percent of gross domestic product. That could mean the loss of 2.4 million jobs over the next 2 years. That's not what you want to do.

You're trying to reduce the deficit, and the way you reduce the deficit is put people back to work. You get them back to work, and they pay their taxes in and the deficit comes down, the unemployment rate comes down. If you do the wrong thing and make draconian cuts at the same time that the States are cutting \$125 billion from their budgets, the impact of those two things—\$61 billion and the \$125 billion—could have a very devastating effect on the economy and hurt a lot of

programs needlessly because it's going to be counterproductive. I just hope that you think about that.

There isn't any economic theory that I've ever heard of called "cut and grow."

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

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

Mr. DICKS. So, again, it was the Democratic Congress that cut the \$41 billion. And every reputable economist says what you did in H.R. 1 is going to have a negative effect on the economy. And so I hope you all think carefully about what you're about to do.

Again, it takes compromise. You've got to work with the other body to come up with a reasonable solution here, or we're going to have problems with a government shutdown. And you can say whatever you want, but we don't need the government shutting down when we're in two wars, a war in Afghanistan and a war in Iraq, and a global war on terror. We don't need to shut the government down.

□ 1310

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds only to say that's why we're here today, as the gentleman knows, so that there is no government shutdown. And I could not be more proud that we're here taking that responsibility exactly as seriously as it is.

It's very difficult to have a conversation about jobs when we have carbon regs coming down the pipe that will destroy jobs and we have financial regulations coming down the pipe that will destroy jobs and we have health care regs coming down the pipe that will destroy jobs over and over again. My folks are saying "enough."

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman that I give credit to for giving us the most open process on a continuing resolution that we've seen in modern times.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. That was a good process. I appreciate what you all did in having an open rule. I applaud Chairman ROGERS and Chairman DREIER. That is the right thing to do. It was appreciated on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. WOODALL. And we could not have done it without your support.

Mr. DICKS. I did my best to help.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, I was going to begin by saying that both my colleagues, Mr. ROGERS and Mr. DICKS, did an absolutely phenomenal job at taking on the responsibility that is thrust on them when we have an open amendment process.

The people who go through the greatest challenge are those who have to defend the bill and be here for hours and hours and hours. And as we all know, we had 162 amendments considered on the House floor during those days that led up to before adjournment week before last. And we worked into the morning on every occasion. That means after midnight. I mean, I guess we adjourned at 2 or 3 on some of those days. I was sound asleep then, I have to admit. But you guys were working very, very hard, Mr. Speaker. And I want to thank them.

And I was pleased that those in the minority did recognize that doing what we did was unprecedented. Never before has a continuing resolution been considered under the process that we've had. At best, it's been a structured rule, which is what we had two decades ago, and both political parties had had usually a closed rule for the consideration of continuing resolutions up to that point. So I do believe that we have come together with, as Mr. WOODALL has said, a package that included amendments from both sides of the aisle as we proceed with this.

Now, I was tickled also to hear my friend talk about the fact that \$41 billion in cuts were made under Democratic leadership. The fact that both sides of the aisle are now talking about and bragging about ways to cut spending is, I think, a very encouraging sign, because that is the message. That's the message that Mr. WOODALL was just offering. The constant expansion of government is, in fact, counterproductive in our quest to create jobs and get the economy moving.

Now, we had this exchange last night in the Rules Committee—yesterday afternoon in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, in which we were talking about Mark Zandi and the Goldman Sachs projections as far as bringing about spending reductions.

And I brought to the fore one of the most brilliant economists I know, John Taylor, who is at the Hoover Institution of Stanford University, former undersecretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, a very good personal friend of mine. His son used to work in our office. He's serving in the United States Marine Corps. And I've got to say, Mr. Speaker, that John Taylor, in responding to the Zandi quote, made it very clear that the notion of not bringing about spending reductions would in fact exacerbate the economic challenges that we have. And the bottom line is: The best way for us to get our economy growing is to ensure that people can keep more of their hard-earned money and to restrict the kind of control that the Federal Government has continued to thrust on individuals.

I'd be happy to yield to my friend if he would like to share one of those quotes.

Mr. DICKS. Let me just make a brief comment.

And I do applaud the gentleman from California as chairman of the Rules

Committee for giving, for working out that modified open rule.

Just let me, on the point about Mr. Taylor at Stanford, Stanford's a very good school. My son graduated from it, and I'm quite proud of that.

A letter signed by 300 of America's leading economists makes the argument that cutting investments this quickly will undermine growth. Among the original signers from Stanford alone: Kenneth Arrow, Martin Carnoy, Paul David, Mordecai Kurz, Roger Noll, and Gavin Wright.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, I would say to my friend I think what we've just shown is that the proverbial economists say on one hand, on the other hand.

The fact is not every economist agrees on this notion, but a statement has been made. And, in fact, my friend made it upstairs, and that is, he said when he was quoting Mark Zandi, that everyone, basically every economist—and that is what I inferred from the statement—came to this conclusion. And my point in actually referencing Professor Taylor is that there is disagreement on it.

I happen to come down on the side, personally, of Mr. Taylor. I think it's important for us, just because we want to all encourage individual initiative and responsibility, to do everything that we can to reduce the size and scope and reach of government—and that's what the goal of H.R. 1 is—so that we can get the economy growing. And I believe that more incentives by reducing that tax and regulatory burden will create jobs, because we do share that goal. I mean, I'm convinced that everyone wants to do that.

But this notion, I mean I've heard commentators saying that somehow that Republicans in saying that we might see a reduction in the number of Federal Government jobs, that we're not for job creation. We want people to have good, long-term jobs in the private sector, and that's our goal here.

This rule is a standard rule. I should say at the outset that we wanted to have this not a closed rule but a modified closed rule. And I know my friend was concerned that his amendment that he testified on behalf of in the Rules Committee wasn't made in order. But I will tell you that we did, from the very beginning, say to the minority leader, Ms. PELOSI, that she, when having introduced on February 18 her substitute proposal that basically kept spending at 2010 levels, that we would have made that in order and it would have made it a modified closed rule that we had offered, so we did do that.

We are where we are. Ensuring that we don't go through a government shutdown is something that Chairman ROGERS and I know Mr. DICKS and all of us in leadership positions, rank-and-file Members alike, want to avoid, and that's why we've got this 2-week package that's before us. I hope the Senate will act so that we can do that, and then do what we all want to make sure

happens, and that is have a negotiated agreement that will get to where we need to be.

So I thank my friend for his management of this rule just as he managed the last open rule.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. And before I yield back, I guess I should yield to the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS. I just want to say one brief word.

I applaud these modified open rules. And on the regular bills on appropriations, we hope—Mr. ROGERS and I have been in contact, we're going to get these bills done in a timely way. And we want open rules, and we want to be able to have these unanimous consent agreements after the bills have been on the floor for a while in order to narrow the amendments and then to get these things done in a timely fashion. And I think that it's going to take the cooperation of all of the Members to be able to do that.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I will say the gentleman is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker. We want to have something that we haven't had in the last couple of years, and that is an open amendment process when it comes to the regular appropriations bills. And Mr. ROGERS and I have been discussing that at length and will continue to.

And I believe that the best way to deal with this is for not leadership but for the floor managers to come together and work out an agreement on that.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

I join the gentleman from Washington in praising the gentleman from California, the chair of the Rules Committee, with regard to the modified open process that this body was able to undertake.

But again, with regard to this particular bill before us, what the gentleman from California said is that the Democrats would be allowed to offer an amendment that would spend more but not allowed to offer a substitute amendment that would spend less. The Democrats, in fact, don't have a desire to offer forward a substitute amendment that spends more. We do have a desire to offer a substitute amendment that Mr. DICKS came forward that does spend less. The rule doesn't allow for that.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, let's take the next 2 weeks to try to work together to do the right thing for the American people.

□ 1320

I believe that the right thing for the American people is to come up with a

budget plan that sensibly reduces spending but does not put American jobs at risk. What do I mean by this? What do we mean by this? Let me give you an example.

I think that a policy that says that oil companies, which made \$77 billion in profit last year alone, can drill on federally owned property that's offshore and not pay anything in royalties to the American taxpayer is wasteful, and we should stop it. I think provisions that say that there are tax loopholes for companies that outsource jobs out of our country are wasteful, and we should stop them. Let's get rid of those things from our budget.

But let's not follow the reckless plan of the majority that says in education, let's cut funding for 10,000 reading tutors and math coaches. In education, let's cut funding for 7,000 teachers of autistic children, children with a learning disability. In border security, let's cut funding that's used to pay the people who board ships and inspect containers that come into this country to make sure they don't have dirty bombs in them. In public safety, let's not cut funding that will lay off police officers and firefighters in towns around our country. In health care, let's not cancel hundreds, if not thousands of research grants, where our best researchers are working on cures for cancer, or dementia, or diabetes. These are reckless cuts.

The problem with the Republican plan is not just that it disrupts the United States Government; the problem with the Republican plan is it disrupts the United States economy. And this is why the leading economist for JOHN MCCAIN's Presidential campaign of 2 years ago says this plan the Republicans are offering will cost 700,000 jobs. That's why the largest investment bank in the country, in a nonpolitical way, says that this Republican plan will cut in half the economic growth the country is counting on for this year.

Let's not disrupt jobs in this country. Let's cut wasteful spending. Let's go after corporate welfare, not special education. Let's go after oil company giveaways, not Head Start. Let's get back to the business of debating job creation in the private sector in our country, not defunding Planned Parenthood.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. There are 15 million unemployed Americans as we meet here this afternoon. Let us resolve in the next 2 weeks to put their interests first, to sensibly reduce spending where we can, to invest in education and health care where we must, and get on with the people's business.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds just to invite my friend from New Jersey to join me on H.R. 25, the Fair Tax Act. Not only will it create jobs in this country, it's the

only bill in Congress that will eliminate every single corporate piece of welfare, loophole, tax exception, credit, so on and so on, because none of them need a nickel of it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I would ask the gentleman what the sales tax rate would be on his fair tax proposal on American families for buying something?

Mr. WOODALL. Given that it eliminates the payroll tax, which is the largest tax 80 percent of American families pay—

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the sales tax rate?

Mr. WOODALL. Twenty-three percent.

Mr. ANDREWS. Twenty-three percent on every purchase.

Mr. WOODALL. Less than what you're paying now.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

(Ms. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule on this continuing resolution that the Republicans have brought forward. Why? Number one, it's for 14 days. Can you imagine one of the most powerful economies in this country and we are talking about doing kind of in a pause mode for 14 days? That's not very responsible.

But let's get to the specifics of why I am opposed to this. This CR would slash \$340 million for construction jobs for projects of the Army Corps. Now, I just heard the previous speaker talk about private jobs. Are we prepared to say that this government, we don't think there should be any Federal Government jobs? So are you to tell me that in my district, where I have two ports, the largest ports in the Nation, that we don't need to do dredging, that we can just have ships run afoul? I mean, how are we going to continue our economy?

I support cuts. If you check my record, you will see that I have supported many of the initiatives that have been brought forward. But they need to be thoughtful, and they need to make sense. A few others that concern me greatly: A slash of \$20 million to the Department of Homeland Security. What are we thinking here? Haven't we learned anything from Hurricane Katrina or 9/11? That we would suggest a cut, \$103 million of FEMA State and local programs that would provide grants to avoid disasters and how we prepare for them. Cut \$129 million from higher education.

I would ask, what is this 14 days about? We have talked about that we are prepared, everyone's going to come here and make these cuts. Well, let's have a real civil discussion, and let's build upon last week, but let's not do it

on the backs of the American people. There is waste that can be addressed. And I look forward to supporting those initiatives. But this 14-day pause button is the wrong way, and I am opposed to it.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to this bill. This CR is further proof that the majority does not care about the unemployment crisis. This really is a question of our morality as a Nation.

Are we going to eat a loaf of bread that is spotted with the mold of conservatism and so-called fiscal responsibility, or are we going to bring to our children a loaf of bread that is healthy, whole wheat, and good for America? This bill represents a loaf of bread. And I might point out the Speaker yesterday or a few days ago said something about, well, if they don't want to eat the whole loaf of bread at one time, then I am going to make them eat it one slice at a time. Well, every slice is speckled with mold of this old-fashioned, old way of thinking that got us into this problem that we are in now.

What we have done is given the keys to the car that they drove into the ditch back to them, and now we are forced to eat bread in that car, moldy bread in that car that is going nowhere but down.

Mark Zandi said 700,000 jobs would be lost if we do it the way that these Republicans who cannot drive, if we allow them to do that. And I am simply looking ahead for my children and for my grandchildren and my great-grandchildren. I cannot in good faith go along with this.

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

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire if the other side has any remaining speakers.

Mr. WOODALL. I am the final speaker.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself as much time as remains.

Mr. Speaker, we all share the goal of reducing the deficit. But if we are serious about deficit reduction, we need to look at defense as one of the line items. I am a member of the Spending Cuts and Deficit Reduction Working Group, and I have worked with my colleagues to identify more than \$70 billion in savings that could be used for deficit reduction.

If Republicans truly claim to be committed to deficit reduction, then why, as they cut millions from programs like Even Start and LEAP, do they spare defense spending? The short term CR carries forward the 2010 defense budget, but the policies, priorities, and levels proposed for 2010 no longer apply. Our current military expenditures support bloated troop levels and bases across Europe that quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, are relics of a bygone era.

Rather than fighting the demons of the past, we need to focus on the very real threats of the present and future.

□ 1330

Who are we fighting? The Nazis, the Soviets, the French? It's time for us to rethink our defense spending. It's clear that the current strategy is one that we cannot afford.

The expenditures in Afghanistan are \$100 billion. It's been estimated that there is only, at most, 100 al Qaeda operatives in Afghanistan. That's a spending level of \$1 billion per al Qaeda operative in Afghanistan. Most of al Qaeda's operations have moved across the border to Pakistan, and they have also gained a foothold in Yemen. Meanwhile, we are bogged down in a costly war with no clear end game.

Let's get serious about balancing the budget. Let's find savings in every agency, including the Department of Defense. Until we get serious about controlling defense spending, the largest component of the discretionary budget, we will never achieve our goals of reducing the deficit.

This CR claims to only cut earmarks, but in reality we are playing a shell game. This continuing resolution states that earmarks have no legal effect, which means that agencies have not been funding these programs. It means the Department of Homeland Security, for example, will have \$264 million less to prepare and respond to threats and disasters and protect our ports.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, Members from both sides of the aisle proposed amendments to enact even more cuts. My friend from New York (Mr. NADLER) proposed cutting funding to Afghanistan so that we could have a responsible withdrawal, saving \$90 billion. My friend from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) proposed a very reasonable cut to the Department of Defense's operation and maintenance budget so that we could get rid of funding for unneeded boards and commissions.

I have also heard from many of my Republican friends that we want to go back to 2008 levels. Well, my colleagues from California, Mr. STARK and Ms. LEE, proposed to do just that with the defense budget. Let's get real on deficit reduction and lead the way with real cuts that actually balance the budget.

The President is proposing real change for public education through funding for the Investing in Innovation and Early Learning Challenge funds. We see none of these solutions in the proposed CR. As we look to agree on a budget for the rest of the fiscal year, it's critical that we have meaningful resources for our public schools, particularly at a time when they are under increasing budget pressure from districts and State cutbacks. Education of our children in their youngest years is a research-proven return on investment.

We have no second or third chance with kids. They are only young once.

By ending literacy support for our children and restricting proven school improvements in repeated short-term CRs, we run the risk of opening the door to a spending agenda that eliminates jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we give the markets and businesses the predictability that they need with regard to the ongoing operations of government. A 2-week continuing resolution simply fails to do that. We will be back before this body, again, to do it again regardless of the outcome today. But I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can work across the aisle to put together a real long-term solution to keep the Federal Government open.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we are here today for one reason and one reason only, and that's to provide ample time for the Senate to consider H.R. 1, to keep the doors of the Federal Government open, to keep important services being dispensed, to keep the government of America on track for 2 more weeks while the Senate takes time.

I will associate myself with the gentleman from Colorado when he says we can't always get what we want. I sadly haven't gotten what I wanted so far, and I am prepared to get even less of what I want going forward. But I don't mind telling you I don't know how we are going to get to what any of us want if folks don't even start considering the bill.

This was our very best shot. It was our very best work product. Whether you love it or whether you hate it, it was the most openly produced work product in continuing resolution history. And there it sits, and there it sits, almost 10 days now with no advancement whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I hope these 2 weeks are enough. I recognize the caution that my friend from Colorado suggests that we may be back here one more time doing this again. I hope this is the last time that we will be here.

But I know this: I know we can't continue to mortgage our children's future while we wait. I know we can't fiddle while Rome burns. So we have passed, we have presented this continuing resolution with cuts there to prevent our children's future from continuing to be mortgaged.

As I spoke with school groups across the district last week—and I share my friend from Colorado's passion for education—I asked them to turn on C-SPAN this week, because I said it doesn't matter who stands up, whether they stand up on the left or the right, or whether they speak from the well or from the leadership table, they will tell you that the reason they are there

today is for you, is for you, the children. It's for your future that they are there on the floor of that House.

I believe that. I believe that in everyone's heart they are here to make sure that tomorrow's generation does better than today's generation. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that if there are schoolchildren out there watching today, perhaps they will pick up the phone and they will give us a call and let us know exactly which one of us is on the right track, because I know it's all about them that we do what we do.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

YEAS—241

Adams	Davis (KY)	Herrera Beutler
Aderholt	Denham	Huizenga (MI)
Akin	Dent	Hultgren
Alexander	DesJarlais	Hunter
Altmire	Doid	Hurt
Amash	Dreier	Issa
Austria	Duffy	Jenkins
Bachmann	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (IL)
Bachus	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Barletta	Ellmers	Johnson, Sam
Bartlett	Emerson	Jones
Barton (TX)	Farenthold	Jordan
Bass (NH)	Fincher	Kelly
Benishke	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)
Berg	Flake	King (NY)
Biggert	Fleischmann	Kingston
Bilbray	Fleming	Kinzinger (IL)
Bilirakis	Flores	Kissell
Bishop (UT)	Forbes	Kline
Black	Fortenberry	Labrador
Blackburn	Fox	Lamborn
Bono Mack	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Landry
Boustany	Gallegly	Lankford
Brady (TX)	Gardner	Latham
Brooks	Garrett	LaTourette
Broun (GA)	Gerlach	Latta
Buchanan	Gibbs	Lewis (CA)
Buehson	Gibson	LoBiondo
Buerkle	Gingrey (GA)	Long
Burgess	Gohmert	Lucas
Burton (IN)	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Calvert	Gosar	Lummis
Camp	Gowdy	Lungren, Daniel
Campbell	Granger	E.
Canseco	Graves (GA)	Mack
Cantor	Graves (MO)	Manzullo
Capito	Griffin (AR)	Marino
Cardoza	Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (CA)
Carter	Grimm	McCaul
Cassidy	Guinta	McClintock
Chabot	Guthrie	McCotter
Chaffetz	Hall	McHenry
Coble	Harper	McKeon
Coffman (CO)	Harris	McKinley
Cole	Hartzler	McMorris
Conaway	Hastings (WA)	Rodgers
Costa	Hayworth	Meehan
Cravaack	Heck	Mica
Crawford	Heller	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Culberson	Herger	Miller, Gary

Mulvaney	Rivera
Murphy (PA)	Roby
Myrick	Roe (TN)
Neugebauer	Rogers (AL)
Noem	Rogers (KY)
Nugent	Rogers (MI)
Nunes	Rohrabacher
Nunnelee	Rokita
Olson	Rooney
Palazzo	Ros-Lehtinen
Paul	Roskam
Paulsen	Ross (FL)
Pearce	Royce
Pence	Runyan
Peterson	Ryan (WI)
Petri	Scalise
Pitts	Schilling
Platts	Schmidt
Poe (TX)	Schock
Pompeo	Schweikert
Posey	Scott (SC)
Price (GA)	Scott, Austin
Quayle	Sensenbrenner
Reed	Sessions
Rehberg	Shimkus
Reichert	Shuler
Renacci	Shuster
Ribble	Simpson
Rigell	Smith (NE)

NAYS—179

Ackerman	Green, Gene
Andrews	Grijalva
Baca	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Hanabusa
Barrow	Hastings (FL)
Bass (CA)	Heinrich
Becerra	Higgins
Berkley	Himes
Berman	Hinchev
Bishop (GA)	Hirono
Bishop (NY)	Holden
Blumenauer	Holt
Boswell	Honda
Brady (PA)	Hoyer
Bralley (IA)	Inslee
Brown (FL)	Israel
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Jackson Lee
Capuano	(TX)
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)
Carney	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Kaptur
Chandler	Keating
Chu	Kildee
Cicilline	Kind
Clarke (MI)	Kucinich
Clarke (NY)	Langevin
Clay	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Lee (CA)
Cohen	Levin
Connolly (VA)	Lipinski
Conyers	Loeb
Cooper	Loeb
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe
Courtney	Lowe
Critz	Lujan
Crowley	Lynch
Cuellar	Maloney
Cummings	Markey
Davis (CA)	Cummings
Davis (IL)	Matsui
DeFazio	McCarthy (NY)
DeLauro	McCollum
Deutch	McDermott
Dicks	McGovern
Dingell	McIntyre
Doggett	McNerney
Donnelly (IN)	Meeks
Doyle	Michaud
Edwards	Miller (NC)
Ellison	Miller, George
Engel	Moore
Eshoo	Moran
Farr	Murphy (CT)
Filner	Nadler
Frank (MA)	Napolitano
Fudge	Neal
Garamendi	Oliver
Gonzalez	Owens
Green, Al	Pallone
	Pascrell

NOT VOTING—12

Bonner	Fattah
Castor (FL)	Giffords
DeGette	Hanna
Diaz-Balart	Hinojosa

Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)
Southerland	Stearns
Stivers	Stutzman
Sullivan	Terry
Thompson (PA)	Thornberry
Tiberi	Tipton
Turner	Upton
Walberg	Walden
Walsh (IL)	Walsh (IL)
Webster	West
Westmoreland	Whitfield
Wilson (SC)	Wittman
Wolf	Womack
Woodall	Yoder
Young (AK)	Young (AK)
Young (IN)	Young (IN)

□ 1359

Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, THOMPSON of Mississippi, RAHALL, DAVIS of Illinois, and PASCRELL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 251, nays 170, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—251

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

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

NAYS—170

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

NOT VOTING—11

Bonner	Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Castor (FL)	Giffords	Marchant
Connolly (VA)	Hanna	Young (FL)
DeGette	Hinojosa	

□ 1405

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up

the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 44

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 111-242) is further amended—*

(1) by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting “March 18, 2011”; and

(2) by adding after section 166, as added by the Continuing Appropriations Amendments, 2011 (section 1 of Public Law 111-322), the following new sections:

“SEC. 167. The amounts described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 114 of this Act are designated as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 3(c)(2) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

“SEC. 168. Any language specifying an earmark in an appropriations Act for fiscal year 2010, or in a committee report or joint explanatory statement accompanying such an Act, shall have no legal effect with respect to funds appropriated by this Act. For purposes of this section, the term ‘earmark’ means a congressional earmark or congressionally directed spending item, as defined in clause 9(e) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and paragraph 5(a) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

“SEC. 169. The first and third paragraphs under the heading ‘Rural Development Programs—Rural Utilities Service—Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program’ in Public Law 111-80 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 170. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Corps of Engineers-Civil—Investigations’ at a rate for operations of \$104,000,000.

“SEC. 171. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Corps of Engineers-Civil—Construction’ at a rate for operations of \$1,690,000,000: *Provided*, That all of the provisos under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 172. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Corps of Engineers-Civil—Mississippi River and Tributaries’ at a rate for operations of \$260,000,000: *Provided*, That the proviso under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 173. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Corps of Engineers-Civil—Operation and Maintenance’ at a rate for operations of \$2,361,000,000.

“SEC. 174. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of the Interior—Bureau of Reclamation—Water and Related Resources’ at a rate for operations of \$913,580,000: *Provided*, That the fifth proviso (regarding the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund) and seventh proviso (regarding the Milk River Project) under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 175. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy’ at a rate for operations of \$1,950,370,000: *Provided*, That all of

the provisos under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 176. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability’ at a rate for operations of \$158,910,000: *Provided*, That all of the provisos under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 177. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Nuclear Energy’ at a rate for operations of \$784,140,000: *Provided*, That the proviso under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 178. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development’ at a rate for operations of \$635,530,000: *Provided*, That the second proviso under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 179. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science’ at a rate for operations of \$4,826,820,000: *Provided*, That all of the provisos under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 180. The last proviso under the heading ‘Department of Energy—Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities’ in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 181. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Energy—Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation’ at a rate for operations of \$2,136,460,000: *Provided*, That the proviso under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 182. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Energy—Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Office of the Administrator’ at a rate for operations of \$407,750,000: *Provided*, That the last proviso under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 183. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Energy—Environmental and Other Defense Activities—Defense Environmental Cleanup’ at a rate for operations of \$5,209,031,000, of which \$33,700,000 shall be transferred to the ‘Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund’: *Provided*, That the proviso under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 184. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Energy—Environmental and Other Defense Activities—Other Defense Activities’ at a rate for operations of \$844,470,000: *Provided*, That the proviso under such heading in Public Law 111-85 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 185. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Independent Agencies—Election Assistance Commission—Election Reform Programs’ at a rate for operations of \$0.

“SEC. 186. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Homeland Security—Office of the Under Secretary for Management’ at a rate for operations of \$253,190,000.

“SEC. 187. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of

Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$8,063,913,000.

"SEC. 188. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Construction and Facilities Management' at a rate for operations of \$276,370,000.

"SEC. 189. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Homeland Security—Transportation Security Administration—Aviation Security' at a rate for operations of \$5,212,790,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in Public Law 111-83 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act as follows: by substituting '\$5,212,790,000' for '\$5,214,040,000'; by substituting '\$4,356,826,000' for '\$4,358,076,000'; by substituting '\$1,115,156,000' for '\$1,116,406,000'; by substituting '\$777,050,000' for '\$778,300,000'; and by substituting '\$3,112,790,000' for '\$3,114,040,000'.

"SEC. 190. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Homeland Security—Coast Guard—Operating Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$6,801,791,000: *Provided*, That section 157 of this Act shall be applied by substituting '\$17,880,000' for '\$21,880,000', and without regard to 'and "Coast Guard, Alteration of Bridges"'.  
 "SEC. 191. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Homeland Security—Coast Guard—Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements' at a rate for operations of \$1,519,980,000.

"SEC. 192. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Homeland Security—Coast Guard—Alteration of Bridges' at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 193. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Homeland Security—National Protection and Programs Directorate—Infrastructure Protection and Information Security' at a rate for operations of \$879,816,000.

"SEC. 194. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Homeland Security—Office of Health Affairs' at a rate for operations of \$134,250,000.

"SEC. 195. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and Local Programs' at a rate for operations of \$2,912,558,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in Public Law 111-83 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act as follows: in paragraph (12), by substituting '\$12,554,000' for '\$60,000,000' and by substituting '\$0' for each subsequent amount in such paragraph; in paragraph (13), by substituting '\$212,500,000' for '\$267,200,000'; in paragraph (13)(A), by substituting '\$114,000,000' for '\$164,500,000'; in paragraph (13)(B), by substituting '\$0' for '\$1,700,000'; and in paragraph (13)(C), by substituting '\$0' for '\$3,000,000': *Provided further*, That 4.5 percent of the amount provided for 'Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and Local Programs' by this Act shall be transferred to 'Federal Emergency Management Agency—Management and Administration' for program administration.

"SEC. 196. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—National Predisaster Mitigation Fund' at a rate for operations of \$75,364,000.

"SEC. 197. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Homeland Security—Science and Technology—Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations' at a rate for operations of \$821,906,000.

"SEC. 198. Sections 541 and 545 of Public Law 111-83 (123 Stat. 2176) shall have no force or effect.

"SEC. 199. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Smithsonian Institution—Legacy Fund' at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 200. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Labor—Employment and Training Administration—Training and Employment Services' at a rate for operations of \$3,779,641,000, of which \$340,154,000 shall be for national activities described in paragraph (3) under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117: *Provided*, That the amounts included for national activities under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act as follows: by substituting '\$44,561,000' for '\$93,450,000' and by substituting '\$0' for '\$48,889,000'.

"SEC. 201. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Labor—Mine Safety and Health Administration—Salaries and Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$355,843,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$1,450,000'.

"SEC. 202. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Labor—Departmental Management' at a rate for operations of \$314,827,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$40,000,000'.

"SEC. 203. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Health Resources and Services Administration—Health Resources and Services' at a rate for operations of \$7,076,520,000: *Provided*, That the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twenty-second provisos under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 204. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—Disease Control, Research, and Training' at a rate for operations of \$6,369,767,000: *Provided*, That the amount included before the first proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$20,620,000'.

"SEC. 205. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services' at a rate for operations of \$3,417,106,000: *Provided*, That the amount included before the first proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$14,518,000'.

"SEC. 206. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—Program Management' at a rate for operations of \$3,467,142,000: *Provided*, That the sixth proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 207. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant' at a rate for operations of \$2,126,081,000: *Provided*, That the amount in-

cluded in the first proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$1,000,000'.

"SEC. 208. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Children and Families Services Programs' at a rate for operations of \$9,293,747,000: *Provided*, That the fifteenth proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 209. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Administration on Aging, Aging Services Programs' at a rate for operations of \$1,510,323,000: *Provided*, That the first proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 210. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—General Departmental Management' at a rate for operations of \$491,727,000: *Provided*, That the seventh proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 211. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Education—Education for the Disadvantaged' at a rate for operations of \$15,598,212,000, of which \$4,638,056,000 shall become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012: *Provided*, That the tenth, eleventh and twelfth provisos under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 212. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Education—School Improvement Programs' at a rate for operations of \$5,223,444,000, of which \$3,358,993,000 shall become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012: *Provided*, That of such amounts, no funds shall be available for activities authorized under part Z of title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965: *Provided further*, That the second, third, and thirteenth provisos under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 213. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Education—Innovation and Improvement' at a rate for operations of \$1,160,480,000, of which no funds shall be available for activities authorized under subpart 5 of part A of title II, section 1504 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ('ESEA'), or part F of title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and \$499,222,000 shall be for part D of title V of the ESEA: *Provided*, That the first, fourth, and fifth provisos under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 214. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Education—Safe Schools and Citizenship Education' at a rate for operations of \$361,398,000, of which, notwithstanding section 2343(b) of the ESEA, \$2,578,000 is for the continuation costs of awards made on a competitive basis under section 2345 of the ESEA: *Provided*, That the third proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 215. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Education—Special Education' at a rate for operations of \$12,564,953,000, of which \$3,726,354,000 shall become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012: *Provided*, That the first and

second provisos under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 216. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Education—Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research’ at a rate for operations of \$3,501,766,000: *Provided*, That the second proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 217. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Education—Career, Technical, and Adult Education’ at a rate for operations of \$1,928,447,000, of which \$1,137,447,000 shall become available on July 1, 2011, and remain available through September 30, 2012 and no funds shall be available for activities authorized under subpart 4 of part D of title V of the ESEA: *Provided*, That the seventh and eighth provisos under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 218. Notwithstanding sections 101 and 164, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Education—Student Financial Assistance’ at a rate for operations of \$24,899,957,000, of which \$23,162,000 shall be available to carry out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and no funds shall be available for activities authorized under subpart 4 of part A of title IV of such Act: *Provided*, That the maximum Pell Grant for which a student shall be eligible during award year 2011-2012 shall be \$4,860.

“SEC. 219. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Education—Higher Education’ at a rate for operations of \$2,126,935,000, of which no funds shall be available for activities authorized under section 1543 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 or section 117 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006: *Provided*, That the thirteenth proviso under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 220. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration’ at a rate for operations of \$265,869,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting ‘\$0’ for ‘\$16,382,000’.

“SEC. 221. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Library of Congress—Salaries and Expenses’ at a rate for operations of \$445,951,000, of which \$0 shall be for the operations described in the seventh proviso under this heading in Public Law 111-68.

“SEC. 222. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Transportation—Federal Highway Administration—Surface Transportation Priorities’ at a rate for operations of \$0.

“SEC. 223. Notwithstanding section 101, no funds are provided for activities described in section 122 of title I of division A of Public Law 111-117.

“SEC. 224. Notwithstanding section 101, section 186 of title I of division A of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

“SEC. 225. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Transportation—Federal Railroad Administration—Rail Line Relocation and Improvement Program’ at a rate for operations of \$10,012,800.

“SEC. 226. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Department of Housing and Urban Development—Communi-

ty Planning and Development—Community Development Fund’ at a rate for operations of \$4,255,068,480, of which \$0 shall be for grants for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI), and \$0 shall be for neighborhood initiatives: *Provided*, That the second and third paragraphs under such heading in title II of division A of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.”

This joint resolution may be cited as the “Further Continuing Appropriations Amendments, 2011”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Pursuant to House Resolution 115, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 44, the fiscal year 2011 Further Continuing Appropriations resolution.

This temporary CR is an extra special effort by the majority Republicans to avoid a government shutdown that could otherwise occur on March 4, when the current funding resolution expires. This temporary CR contains funding to allow all government agencies and programs to continue at the current rate of spending for the next 2 weeks until March 18, 2011, while reducing spending by \$4 billion through several spending cuts and program terminations. These cuts reflect this Republican majority’s continued commitment to significantly reduce spending, to rein in the Nation’s exploding deficits and debt, and to help our economy continue on the road to recovery.

Madam Speaker, a government shutdown would halt critical and necessary services and programs that Americans across the country rely on, and it is not what our constituents expect or demand.

□ 1410

I would have greatly preferred that the Senate act on the hard-fought and thoughtfully crafted funding legislation that the House passed almost 2 weeks ago which saves the taxpayers \$100 billion compared to the President’s request, but it’s clear that the Senate needs more time. So this short-term CR will provide an additional 2 weeks by cutting spending to show our continued resolve to get our Nation’s fiscal house in order.

The bill before us terminates eight programs for a savings of about \$1.24 billion. These eight programs were all targeted for elimination in the President’s budget request and have also been part of proposed cuts in the past in the House and the Senate by Members of both parties. These eight programs include: Election Assistance Grants, the Broadband Direct Loan Subsidy, the Smithsonian Institution Legacy Fund, the Striving Readers program, the LEAP program, Even Start, Smaller Learning Communities, and a one-time highway funding addition.

In addition, the bill also eliminates more than \$2.7 billion in funding previously reserved for earmarks, eliminations that the House, the Senate, and the White House have all called for this year. The earmark funding cuts in this legislation come from Energy and Water; Homeland Security; Labor, Health and Human Services; legislative branch; and Transportation, Housing and Urban Development program accounts.

This legislation will represent the second of many appropriations bills this year that will significantly reduce spending, continuing a pattern of cuts that will help put our Nation’s budget back in balance and stop the dangerous spiral of unsustainable deficits and debt.

It is my hope that this CR can be passed quickly and that the President will sign it before the March 4 deadline. This legislation should garner broad support today, given the short time-frame for action and given the fact that these spending cuts have received previous bipartisan support by Members of the House and Senate as well as the White House.

Madam Speaker, we’re now 5 months into the current fiscal year and it’s critically important that we complete this budget process so that we can turn our attention quickly to passing funding bills for fiscal year 2012. It is high time we start looking forward instead of constantly looking back to clean up past mistakes and inaction. We must move forward quickly in regular order, passing bills on time in an open and transparent fashion to avoid these budget uncertainties in the future.

Madam Speaker, this is one more step that we have to take to get our fiscal house in order. While this isn’t a perfect or an easy process, it is essential that we pass this bill, avoid a government shutdown, and continue to work on a long-term solution to complete this long overdue funding process. Our constituents expect and deserve no less.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, today we will consider a short-term continuing resolution that will allow the essential functions of our government to continue beyond March 4, the date on which the current continuing resolution will expire.

With no final agreement on the spending levels for the current fiscal year, this measure is necessary in order to avoid a government shutdown, something I believe we should all want to do. I think that 2 weeks is not enough time to reach an agreement on H.R. 1 with the other body, and I’m afraid we’re going to be back here doing this again.

Now, when the House approved H.R. 1 earlier this month, despite the overwhelming opposition of the Democratic

Caucus, it was clear to me that gaining agreement on a compromised version of a full-year continuing resolution would be very difficult, at least before the expiration of the current CR. We opposed H.R. 1 because we believe it would have the effect of slamming on the fiscal brakes too abruptly, resulting in higher unemployment and threatening our Nation's economic recovery.

There is no dispute that cutting Federal spending too deeply and too quickly before the economy has fully recovered risks slowing growth and losing jobs. Moody's estimates that H.R. 1 would reduce real growth in 2011 by 0.5 percent, meaning 400,000 fewer jobs in 2011 and 700,000 fewer jobs by the end of 2012. The Economic Policy Institute projected job losses near 800,000. Goldman Sachs predicts that H.R. 1 would slow economic growth by about 1.5 to 2 percentage points, which translates into the American economy losing up to 2.4 million jobs.

So the recovery of our economy and the reduction of unemployment should be our paramount concern at this time.

I said during the debate on H.R. 1 earlier this month, and I will repeat today, that I believe the approach to deficit reduction that has been adopted by the Republican majority here in the House is far too narrow and too focused on the smallest segment of spending in the budget. It is a risky strategy based on the specious concept of cut and grow, which of course has no basis in sound economic theory.

So where does this leave us? We are now 6 months into the current fiscal year, FY11, and hearings with regard to the fiscal year 2012 budget have begun in both the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

H.R. 1 is clearly not acceptable to the other body, nor would it be acceptable to the President, whose signature is necessary before any funding bill can become law. What the President has already proposed for the coming year—a budget freeze at last year's level—remains, in my judgment, the best and most effective way to reduce the deficit and to support recovery in major sectors of our economy. In fact, we have already adopted a freeze at FY10 levels in the continuing resolution that we are currently operating under.

Democrats approved the CR in December with only one Republican vote, which represents a reduction of \$41 billion from the levels sought by the President in his FY 2011 budget request. This is a significant reduction in the deficit, and a significant part of that came from defense. I want to repeat this. The \$41 billion cut from the Obama FY11 budget was passed in a CR by the Democratic House and Democratic Senate and signed into law by the Democratic President with only one Republican vote.

We are now on the verge of an expiring CR, and we are considering another version that extends the time to resolve the differences by only 2 weeks.

I take the chairman at his word that neither he nor his leadership is interested in shutting down the operation of the Federal Government by declaring a stalemate in these appropriations deliberations. I will concede that it is disconcerting to me and others on our side to read the Speaker's comments this week that would seem to imply that there is a strategy of passing shorter term appropriation bills, with further and further and further cuts 2 weeks at a time.

□ 1420

We were concerned by his statement that seemed to indicate a plan for a piecemeal approach to future spending cuts. He said, "If they won't eat the whole loaf at one time, we'll make them eat it one slice at a time."

I believe we need to set aside these political machinations and get serious about finishing up work on the fiscal year 2011 budget. I will be the first to admit that it is because the Democrats didn't pass our bills last year that we're here working on this. So we have responsibility, too, and that's one of the reasons why we were so eager to engage Chairman ROGERS in trying to get this open rule, to work through the amendments, get a unanimous consent agreement—to help move this process forward because I personally feel we have some responsibility here.

And I think it is obvious that we are going to need more than the 2 weeks to get from here to there.

Now, I appreciate the desire of the gentleman from Kentucky to encourage the Members of his caucus to enter into serious negotiations with the other body with the hope of completing work by March 18.

But in a conference—I've been in conferences for 34 years as a Member and 8 years before that as a staffer—nobody gets everything they want. It's a process of compromise. You work out the differences between the two positions.

So I'm proud of the fact that we start with a cut of \$41 billion that was enacted by the Democratic Congress in December during a very successful lame duck session.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman, who is my friend, mentioned the economists and their opinion of H.R. 1, the budget-cutting bill we passed a couple of weeks ago.

The best source that I think of, right off, is Ben Bernanke, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, who has said H.R. 1 would have no negligible harmful impact on the economy. And if the Chairman of the Federal Reserve says that, I tend to believe him.

Now I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in support of this continuing resolution. It's a reasonable and a thoughtful path for-

ward to avoid a potential government shutdown.

Madam Speaker, the American people have made two things perfectly clear: First, they want their government to stay up and running; and, secondly, they want us to cut spending. We need to do both.

Like many of us, I would have greatly preferred that the Senate act on H.R. 1, the 7-month continuing resolution that we debated for over 90 hours that included, indeed, the largest spending reductions in the history of any Congress.

Ten days ago, this committee and this House took the President's budget and cut it by over \$100 billion, terminating dozens of government programs in the process. And in a city where President Reagan once said "A government bureau is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this Earth," that's quite an accomplishment.

Madam Speaker, the resolution we have before us today is a simple stop-gap measure to provide more time for negotiations to develop a funding bill for the rest of the current fiscal year. It's temporary and it must pass to keep the government open beyond Friday.

This bill contains \$4 billion in savings including just under a billion from programs under the jurisdiction of my committee, Energy and Water Development. These savings are found purely from eliminating earmarks inserted by Congress in the fiscal year 2010 bill.

As with other spending reductions in this temporary bill, the committee has taken great pains to include only savings that both parties and both Chambers support. Both the House and Senate have sworn off earmarks for fiscal year 2011, so these reductions should not be controversial.

My colleagues, we must move this resolution. We need it to provide time to continue negotiations to complete the important work that should have been done by the last Congress—which passed no appropriations bills.

Madam Speaker, I repeat: The American people have made it clear. They want their government to stay open for business. They also want us to cut spending. Let's do it. Let's move ahead. This resolution needs to be passed.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who is also the ranking Democratic member on Health and Human Services.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this 14-day continuing resolution. The House majority is threatening to close down the government. This is brinkmanship. Their desire to engage in brinkmanship damages our economy and creates uncertainty for businesses and families.

Make no mistake, the proposed budget cuts will cost jobs, 700,000 jobs by the end of 2012, according to economist Mark Zandi, who, in fact, was the chief

economist for Senator JOHN McCAIN in his Presidential bid.

Let me be clear. I am very supportive of the removal of earmarks in this resolution. They should be cut. We understand the need for deficit reduction. The question is where do we start?

Our first priority should be to go after waste and special interest spending: \$40 billion to the oil industry which we are providing today, \$40 billion. What about the almost \$8 billion to multinational corporations who take their jobs overseas? And, yes, what about the \$8 billion in agricultural subsidies?

It is too bad that cutting these special interest subsidies is not the priority of the majority's resolution. Instead, this budget makes deep and reckless cuts in the areas that most impact middle class and working families.

Of the \$4 billion in immediate cuts put forward by this 14-day resolution, \$1.4 billion comes out of Education, Health and Human Services, and out of training programs. And, yes, almost a billion dollars, a quarter of the cuts, comes out of education. Education should be one of the last places we look to cut the budget, not the first.

Yes, these cuts could be achieved by eliminating four programs proposed for termination by the President, as well as eliminating funding associated with earmarks last year. But these are not the President's proposals. While he would cut some education programs, he would then reinvest those savings in other education programs considered more effective. This resolution just wipes out the funding.

This resolution severely cuts efforts to reduce illiteracy, which is a serious national problem for economic, as well as human, reasons. The largest program targeted, Striving Readers, represents a consolidation and reorganization of literacy programs that was just launched in 2010. Why would the Republican majority think it is responsible to strip away funding to improve literacy in this country before it even has a chance to work?

I'm particularly concerned and disappointed by the elimination of Even Start. Even Start is about breaking the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving educational opportunities for families. I do not agree with the President's assessment that it should be terminated, and I do not support its elimination in this resolution. This is an effective and a critical program that should be allowed to continue.

I'm not the only one concerned by the consequences of this reckless budget. Three hundred leading economists have signed a letter to the President noting how these spending cuts will diminish our economic competitiveness. Goldman Sachs reported to its investors that the Republican budget will slash economic growth by 2 percent of our economic growth. That would send the unemployment numbers back over 10 percent.

Americans want us to craft a budget for the remainder of the year that creates jobs, reduces the deficit, and strengthens the economy.

□ 1430

Do we start with slashing special interests and waste like the \$40 billion that we are providing in subsidies to the oil companies? And last time any of us looked, they were doing pretty well. They don't need any subsidies. Or do we start by cutting the things that help the middle class, which help our businesses, and working families with children and with seniors?

This resolution increases unemployment. It will hurt our economic recovery. And I urge my colleagues to oppose this reckless resolution.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the chairman for the time.

Madam Speaker, I want to make three very important points right off the bat:

Number one, our debt is almost at 95 percent of the GDP. It's the highest debt we have ever had in history. Last year alone the deficit was \$1.5 trillion. We are borrowing 40 cents for every \$1 that we spend. Now, if you and I were doing that in our households or our business was doing it or anybody else, you would say, okay, we've got to change our spending habits. But somehow there are those in Congress who think that we can continue to defy the laws of gravity. We have got to get our house in order.

Number two, why are we here? We are here because the Democrats last year did not pass a budget, did not pass appropriation bills, and did not complete their work on fiscal year 2011. That's what we're doing. We are trying to clean up the mess that was left to us. And in doing that, we are mindful of our financial situation and trying to reduce some of the spending.

Number three, let me say this. This bill was passed with an open rule. Indeed, I believe we had 127 votes on different amendments. Democrats and Republicans offered a myriad of amendments. Now, for those who are complaining on the floor today that they don't like these cuts, why didn't they offer their amendments on the floor a couple of weeks ago? That would have been the way to do this. Now, the chairman and the Speaker have committed to have open rules throughout this process this year, and so there will be a lot of opportunities to go after some of these programs. And some of the ones that are mentioned, I think I will support those cuts. But I just want to emphasize that everyone has had a bite of this apple.

Finally, let me just say this, Madam Speaker. The Zandi report comes from an economist, a political economist we might say, who was the same person

who told us the stimulus bill would work, the stimulus bill would keep us from going to 8 percent unemployment. We reached 10 percent. I don't think we need to listen to any more of his advice.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the chairman.

I just want to say that I don't think that Mr. Zandi has any more credibility. We have already spent \$800 billion on his advice that the stimulus program would work, and it did not work.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Is the gentleman aware that Ben Bernanke, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, now says that H.R. 1 would have no harmful effect on the economy?

Mr. KINGSTON. I have heard that. And I understand there is something like 150 other economists who have signed a letter to that effect that was led by John Taylor, who is an economist as well.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. And that cutting spending and reducing the deficit will give confidence to the business community to hire people and put people to work.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the chairman.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), one of our distinguished Members.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and let me thank the chairperson. I sometimes have a slip of tongue, Mr. DICKS, and call you "chairman," but I thank you very much for this opportunity.

I want to just try to give a procedural class here today. The procedural class is that this document is a placeholder. I would hesitate to call it a fake document, but that is what it is.

As I left my constituency, the last words I heard were, "Don't you all shut down the government." And I am glad that Mr. DICKS worked hard to submit his amendment in the Rules Committee. It's unfortunate that the wise men and women didn't have a majority. The Republicans would not yield to a thoughtful amendment by Mr. DICKS.

But this is a 2-week document. We know how old, and what—many of us have seen a 2-week-old baby. That's what this is: a 2-week document so we can do the right thing.

It needs to be very clear that before we left in the 110th Congress, Democrats had already cut \$41 billion. Now, many say we didn't have a budget. We had a budget, but we had no compromise, no reconciliation, no fairness, no concern about the American people.

Now we have spent 3 months, March 1, doing nothing, and not one bill creates a job. Goldman Sachs, I know that

there is a critique on Goldman Sachs, but you can't discount the independent, objective assessment of them saying that in the CR that was passed a week ago 700,000 to 800,000 jobs would be lost.

Mark Zandi was the economist and adviser to JOHN McCAIN. I am not sure what politics he has, but he is not in a political office today. And he provides us with an independent assessment that the CR that we voted on, which the Senate would not agree to, would cost us 800,000 jobs. This document will go nowhere.

Unfortunately, the \$4 billion that is cut out of here, and a litany of other unfortunate cuts, is only temporary. I want to live to fight another day. We all want to be able to respond to the needs of this country in deficit reduction and a fair budget. But we could have had a clean CR, and we would have reasonably sat down and made right decisions.

Most economists have said that cutting the government in the middle of a budget year is ineffective. The bipartisan fiscal commission said: Project to 2012 and 2013; don't cut 2011.

It's important for the American people to know this is in the midst of your budget year. So Pell Grants for students who are in college right now, who have already gotten an amount rendered to them, operating on maybe a \$1,000 grant to finish out in May, what we're doing is cutting them in the midst.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. That's what was voted on a week ago. What we're doing now is to recognize that people who govern are responsible for making sure the doors of this government stay open.

I care about homeland security as a member of the Homeland Security Committee. I care about the DEA task force fighting drug cartels. I care about children getting education, health care, the environment.

So let me just say this. We're doing this because we believe in the American people, but don't you for a moment think that this document is worth anything. We've got to get to business and fight for the American people and preserve education. That's what Democrats stand for, and that's what we'll fight for.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, as has been pointed out, 2 weeks ago this Chamber voted emphatically to cut spending and to right-size our government. This CR that's before us today is a necessary stopgap that will keep the government operating until we can finalize an

agreement on those spending cuts that was contained in H.R. 1.

The homeland security sections of the CR before us today strikes the right balance between funding priority programs that are essential to our Nation's security and, at the same time, keeping our discretionary spending in check. This CR cuts over \$264 million in earmarks from the Department of Homeland Security's budget, while at the same time sustaining the current staffing levels of our frontline operating agencies like Border Patrol, CBP, ICE, and the Coast Guard, proof that we can cut spending and fund these functions of government that are truly vital.

As I said 2 weeks ago on this floor, the Department of Homeland Security is not immune from fiscal discipline, and no program or agency is beyond the belt-tightening that our government so desperately needs.

□ 1440

By implementing these cuts, we are not choosing between homeland security and fiscal responsibility. Both are serious national security issues that must be dealt with immediately. Through a series of prudent choices, this CR achieves both.

Madam Speaker, this CR is a reasonable first step in addressing our government's fiscal crisis. There is absolutely no reason why the President or our colleagues in the Senate cannot support these overdue spending cuts. The American people are demanding no less.

Mr. DICKS. I yield myself 1 minute.

You know, as I have said here today, everyone is in favor of doing deficit reduction. We want to do it in a way that won't hurt the economy. What I am concerned about is that if we have this large cut and then the States and local governments cut \$125 billion at the same time, we will have about \$185 billion of cuts, and that is going to cause a decline in economic growth.

I mean, it is basic economics. The way you get the deficit down is get people back to work, get people jobs, get them back to work. When the economy is as fragile as it is, it's a question of timing.

What the commission members said is don't do it in 2011; do it in 2012 and 2013 and then deal with the entire budget, deal with the entitlements, deal with the taxes, do the whole thing. Do the budget agreement that we all know we have to do, and that's going to take bipartisanship. That's going to take both parties, the President and the Senate and the House.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

We are going to have to get together and work out an agreement and come out together and support it in order to get this through. This is what we did with Bob Dole and Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan.

So, this can be done, but we have to have everything on the table. Again, I worry about the 2 week Continuing Resolution. I think that's a bit ambitious.

Again, I want to point out to my colleagues that it was the Democratic House and Senate and President who passed the bill, the CR that cut \$41 billion from Obama's FY 2011 request, \$41 billion.

So I want to make sure you all don't forget that. I am going to try to continue to remind you of that fact.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Labor-HHS subcommittee on appropriations, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

Mr. REHBERG. Thank you, Chairman ROGERS.

Madam Speaker, I rise to express my deep frustration with this extension. Here we go again, debating another continuing resolution. I am starting to feel like Bill Murray in "Groundhog Day." In that movie, the main character wakes up every morning to relive the same day again and again. He never moves forward because he is stuck on Groundhog Day.

Last year, Republicans in the House put the country on notice that we would try to reduce spending by \$100 billion this year. The Senate knew, and the American people knew, and they gave us a substantial majority in the House.

We worked responsibly and openly on a continuing resolution to meet that goal. After considering scores of amendments and engaging in long days of thoughtful debate, we succeeded. In response, the Senate majority leader summarily dismissed our good-faith efforts and recessed the Senate for a week.

Despite giving us an unprecedented 3 years of trillion-dollar deficits, the majority leader dismissed our efforts to reduce spending less than 2 percent from the total fiscal 2011 budget.

In the interest of continuing our work on behalf of the American taxpayer and finding some common ground, Republicans are offering this 2-week extension, another continuing resolution made necessary only because the Democrat leadership refused to adopt a budget last year. It is like Groundhog Day all over again.

During this short extension we propose to save \$4 billion—too much for Senator REID. He suggests a freeze on spending for 30 days while he contemplates our proposal. The national debt will increase another \$136 billion during that time.

This is part of a big stall. Keep stalling. Keep implementing unaffordable health care entitlement programs. Keep threatening, keep spending, all the while ignoring the will of the people.

But the growing \$14.5 trillion national debt is dragging our country into economic ruin, and a looming

health care law with \$2.5 trillion in new spending, when fully implemented, is about to bury us. And make no mistake, I am not happy that funding for the implementation of health care law continues in this continuing resolution.

At some point soon, before it is too late, the majority leader and his Democrat colleagues need to meaningfully address our spending problem. Unfortunately, all indications are that our good-faith effort to find common ground with this 2-week extension will not bring the Senate to the table to negotiate.

The President and the Senate majority hold the balance of power in Washington D.C., but they stand against the majority of Americans.

I will support this measure, but I have been pushed to my limit. "Groundhog Day" may have been an entertaining movie, but it shouldn't be the basis for a system of government. It's time for the Senate to get to work.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 13 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Kentucky has 15½ minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we are beginning to usher in in the next 2 weeks a season of compromise on this very important question before the country. I hope and I am confident that Chairman ROGERS and Mr. DICKS are capable of striking a very sound compromise for the people of our country.

Here is where we are. When the fiscal year began on October 1, there were a series of resolutions that said let's live under the budget that spent what last year spent, and we have lived under that budget until this time. That budget saves \$41 billion below what the administration asked for last February.

The majority, about 10 days ago, passed a bill that said it wants to spend \$100 billion less than what was proposed by the administration last February. Now, logical people would say that we are very well on the way to a sensible compromise.

We are on track to save \$41 billion below what was requested. The majority wishes to spend \$100 billion less than that.

I am certain that talented legislators like the chairman, like Mr. DICKS, left to their own devices and leadership, can find a way to have us strike a middle ground for the rest of the fiscal year. I am hoping that this is the last one of these temporary extensions we have so that those who rely upon the continuing funding of government de-

partments—vendors, employees, and institutions—will be able to do so.

I think it's fertile for a good compromise, and I certainly hope the House reaches it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AUSTRIA).

Mr. AUSTRIA. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this short-term continuing resolution, which must be passed this week to avoid a shutdown of many important programs and services.

Our first priority today is job growth. That's why we are putting into place policies that will stop the runaway spending here in Washington and help bring more certainty to our financial and business markets to grow our economy and create long-term sustainable jobs.

Last week, I had the opportunity to visit the largest single site employer in the State of Ohio, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and I was told that if the government shuts down that thousands of people may be asked not to come to work. If we don't pass this short-term CR, this is one place that would surely suffer from a shutdown, which is responsible for numerous national defense programs that depend on continued funding.

Without funding, programs like this across the country will not get off the ground in a timely manner, may incur programmatic delays and costs, jeopardize the national defense programs they support, and put thousands of jobs, including small businesses, on the line. We must do the responsible thing and pass this short-term resolution, which will buy us time to find a long-term solution to our budget crisis.

Madam Speaker, people across America, and especially in Ohio, have spoken very clearly that Washington needs to cut spending.

□ 1450

Nobody said these cuts were going to be easy, but they are absolutely essential to help put our country back on a fiscally sustainable path that will create jobs and strengthen our economy for future generations.

With the leadership of Chairman ROGERS, this House has already passed a CR to help protect national defense, but in addition to that made more than \$100 billion in cuts; and when we pass this short-term CR, we will have passed another \$4 billion in cuts. It's time for the Senate to do their job and pass a CR. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this short-term CR and show that we're listening to the American people by passing a CR that includes substantive cuts and will put us on a fiscally sustainable path forward.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader and former Speaker, the gentlelady from California, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding time and for presenting the

Dicks substitute, which was not allowed to come to the floor, but nonetheless I salute him for his leadership in that regard.

Madam Speaker, Members of Congress agree, I think, on two things today: that we must move this process forward so that government does not shut down, and that we must reduce the deficit. As we do that, we must create jobs and strengthen the middle class. That is someplace where we may have some separation, because as the distinguished ranking member, Mr. DICKS, has said earlier, in December of 2010, congressional Democrats and the President of the United States cut spending by \$41 billion—\$41 billion. On that day in December, only one Republican voted for those cuts—only one.

February, 2 months later, Republicans passed a spending bill that does not create jobs but, in fact, has been said to destroy 700,000 jobs. That's approximately 100,000 jobs a week since we passed our "cut it" bill.

February 2011, Republicans passed the same spending bill that reduces U.S. economic growth by 1½ to 2 percent. Now some have questioned, Is it really as much as 700,000 jobs? Is it really as much as 1½ to 2 percent? But no one questions whether there will be job loss or whether there will be a slowing down of our economic growth among serious economists.

We are going in the wrong direction. How fast may be the question. But we are going in the wrong direction. That is why it's very important for us to proceed with great care and great caution here because, again, we have the opportunity to create jobs, to strengthen the middle class, and to do so in a way that is fiscally sound.

When I hear our colleagues talk about the deficit and the immorality of a big deficit—and I completely agree that we owe it to our children and our grandchildren not to leave them a debt—but all this talk about deficit is what we have, as Democrats, taken the lead on for decades.

Do you remember—because many of you were here at the time—that when President Clinton became President he inherited an enormous debt? He instituted pay-as-you-go, we had an economic agreement that was passed in the Congress, and the deficit began to reduce to a path of \$5.6 trillion in surplus. Another President Bush took office; pay-as-you-go went out the window; and, again, the turnaround into growing deficits.

So for all of this talk about the immorality of deficits, where were you when those deficits were instituted in the late eighties? Some of you were here. In the 2000s, many of you were here. And, again, we have to take our country on a path of deficit reduction. Many of you were here when the tax cuts for the high end were implemented, creating no jobs, except increasing our deficit, sending the bill to our children and the credit to the Chinese Government.

How about when we did the prescription drug bill, giving away the store to the pharmaceutical industry and the price tag to our children by increasing the deficit? How about two wars, unpaid-for wars? God knows we will do anything to protect and defend our people. And I would hope that everybody subscribes to that. Why would we have tax cuts for people at the highest end? Why wouldn't they pay their fair share of protecting the American people and American interests and their interest wherever they may exist in the world?

And so we had in the 8 years of President Bush's administration a complete reversal, an \$11 trillion swing, \$5.6 trillion in surplus to nearly \$5 trillion in debt.

And now people are saying it is an immorality to have national debt and to have these deficits. We thoroughly agree. And that's why, once again, we must take our country down a path of deficit reduction, but to do so in a way that is job creating and strengthening of the middle class.

As I said, in December 2010 Democrats cut \$41 billion in spending. Only one Republican voted for that. February 2011, Republicans passed a spending bill that could destroy 700,000 jobs and reduce and slow down our GDP, our gross domestic product, by 1.5 to 2 percent. If you want to say it's going to slow down less than that, it's still going in the wrong direction.

I commented on Mr. DICKS' proposal because in the bill that we have before us, we have a situation where the Republicans have stripped the bill of important initiatives to the education of our children. In fact, President Obama made some of those cuts, too; but he didn't do it in a way that hurt the children.

What we debate today undermines our future by stripping support for some pressing educational challenges without redirecting those critical resources to meet the educational needs of our children. What Mr. DICKS proposed would have reversed that. He would have eliminated those educational programs in a way, as did the President, in the context of a comprehensive budget that also redirected funds to other initiatives addressing these needs.

If we do not, as a Congress, understand that education is essential, is key to all of our success—key to all of our success—then, frankly, the American people are way ahead of us on that. That's why I asked when we debated the bill before the break to see a quarter of a million children thrown off Head Start and many teachers fired alongside that, is that a smart cut? Sure, we have to tighten our belt. But let's do it, again, in a very smart way.

I just want to know where everybody was in the days when this deficit grew in the 8 years of the Bush administration. That's why we're in the situation we are in today. That's why we must, again, make some very difficult decisions.

So what is before us today is for the short term. It is saying, let's just keep the government open 2 weeks so we use that time to do the right thing and so we use that time to have a reality check—a reality check—on how we got these deficits in the first place. Tax cuts at the highest end do not create jobs but increase the deficit and are not the appropriate path to deficit reduction. Cutting education and therefore the innovation that goes with it and the strength of our children and affecting our economy is not the way to do it.

Many people here have met much experience on the way to do it, and they sit on both sides of the aisle. So let's get through this today, recognizing the challenge that we have, understanding that this bill before us is not a good one, but it's not final.

□ 1500

And when we come together, we need to meet the three criteria: Does it create jobs? Does it strengthen the middle class? Does it reduce the deficit? Because all of those who say that it is immoral for us to grow the deficit and pass those bills on to our children and grandchildren are right. I just don't want them to ignore the fact that we got here a certain way, and please do not ask us to go down that path again with the sanctimonious attitude that it is a morality for us to do exactly the same thing again, ignoring again the tremendous, tremendous suffering of the American people and their need for jobs, ignoring the aspirations of our children and their need for education by making the cuts that are in here without them rechanneling to a better place.

This is as serious a debate that we can have in the Congress of the United States because it affects our children and their future, because the deficits have gotten so far out of hand.

I am very proud of the fact that 30 years ago—in 1982, 29 years ago—when Democrats gathered in Philadelphia for a midterm conference, pay-as-you-go was placed on the agenda, passed as a resolution, and became part of the Democratic platform. Fiscal responsibility is a part of who we are. Our Blue Dog Coalition has had this as their mantra: pay as you go. Do not add to the deficit. If we all share that view, we should all be able to come together because the numbers will add up or they will not add up, and the bill for sure will be sent to our children and grandchildren.

Some of you have children; some of you have children and grandchildren. Would you ever dream of sending them a bill for a personal expense? If you were to leave them anything, would you leave them a bill? We cannot leave the children of America with any bills for any fiscal deficit either. It wouldn't be the right thing to do. But in order for us to do the right thing, it is time for a serious reality check, and that is the opportunity Mr. DICKS was giving

us today. The Rules Committee rejected that. I hope that in the weeks ahead, depending on what happens here today, we can move on with it so we can spend whatever time it takes to do it right. Nothing less is at stake than the economic security of our country, the well-being of our children, the well-being of our children and the confidence that the American people have in what we are sent here to do for them.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to point out to the body that over the last 2 years, the Congress went on a spending spree and increased spending by 84 percent in just 2 years. You ran the deficit up; the annual deficit, now two in a row, trillion-dollar-plus deficits per year, record breaking. We have never had that before. You ran the debt up to where now we are bouncing against the ceiling and the Congress will be called upon to increase the debt ceiling.

There were no appropriations bills passed last year at all. Thus that's why we are here today. So let's talk about the spending spree that we're trying to slow down and stop, Madam Speaker, with this bill.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), a member of our committee.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman clarifying some things we just heard because I was at a loss thinking I was going to need much more than 3 minutes to rewrite some of what we just heard there and correct the historical account of the last several years.

We've heard the lamenting and wailing today from the other side of the aisle. It is amazing to hear about why we are here? Why are we in this position today?

We are hearing government shutdown from the Democrats. You're not hearing that from the Republicans. You're hearing no, we have to cut spending and reduce the size of government. But we hear we're at the brink, we're about to shut down government, and we have to wonder: Why are we here?

Well, the chairman brought it up so eloquently just a minute ago. When they were in the leadership last year, and it wasn't that long ago, 1 year ago, they had the opportunity. They had the opportunity to pass their own budget. They didn't do it.

So instead, they passed a CR. The CR went for 4 or 5 weeks. It wasn't enough. Let's do another one because again, they couldn't pass a budget. They passed another CR for 2 more weeks. Again, it wasn't quite enough. So let's go 3 days because we don't know now to pass a budget nor have an appropriations meeting. And then, yet again, let's pass another one for just over 2 months. That is why we are here today. That is why the Republicans are stepping up and leading. That is why the Republicans passed a CR a few weeks ago cutting a hundred billion dollars.

But yet again the Democrats, they do not want to step up and lead at this time in our Nation.

So here we are again, the chairman of appropriations and the Republicans have stepped up and said it is time to lead. So \$2 billion a week in cuts, yes, that is what we are proposing. Should it be more? Sure it should be more.

To those who have said we were cutting the wrong programs, I assure you, you'll have your chance to cut those programs because, again, we will be cutting more.

So this measure, hopefully it will pass both Chambers, and we will avert the government shutdown. And the question is then: What happens next? The American people want to know that.

Well, I want the American people to know this: that there are more spending cuts on the way. Now, some of my colleagues on the other side will say, we don't need to cut spending. In fact, we have heard that. We've heard that they want to freeze spending instead, which is akin to tying a brick to the accelerator of this vehicle that is going off the cliff when we need to take our foot off that accelerator. Again, it is the status quo that we hear from the other side.

We heard a minute ago from the leader of the Democrats, the former Speaker, and her quote was: They took the lead in deficits.

Oh, is she so right. In fact, they have led 3 straight years of deficit spending, consecutive years, trillion-dollar deficits, and now a \$14 trillion debt. What leadership that is.

The status quo is unacceptable. The American people deserve so much more. So today, let's stop that threat of a government shutdown, and let's save the taxpayers \$4 billion. Let's come back and let's save them billions upon billions more. But let's get ready because deeper spending cuts are necessary. And as we saw from that Government Accountability report, duplicative programs exist.

Madam Speaker, it is time to eliminate some of those programs, continue eliminating portions of this government, and get this fiscal house back on track.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip and former majority leader, who will help correct the record.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have now heard and watched on television and I have been on the floor with two members from Georgia, both of whom are brand new to this body who were talking about the history. Well, I want to tell my friend from Georgia a little bit of history. I have been here 30 years. I have served some 20 of those years under Republican Presidents. Every one of them has run a deficit of \$100 billion or more. In fact, during that cumulative period of 30

years, notwithstanding the Obama administration, and I will discuss that in a second, Mr. Reagan, Mr. Bush I, and Mr. Bush II ran deficits of over \$6 trillion that they signed the bills to spend. Over \$6 trillion. Bill Clinton was President for 8 years. The last 4 years, we didn't raise the debt at all, unlike every one of the Republican administrations, where we raised it on a regular basis. Not at all during the last administration, the last 4 years of Mr. Clinton's administration, and he ran—the only President in your lifetime, and very frankly mine, and I may be twice as old as you are—a \$62.9 billion surplus. Look it up. No argument.

But let me say something. Irrespective of who is responsible, we are responsible for fixing it. Republicans and Democrats. The American people know that we have a crisis confronting us. They know there is no option other than to deal with this realistically. I would call everybody's attention in this body—Republican, Democrat, liberal, conservatives—to an article written by David Brooks today in *The New York Times*. Read it. Read it. David Brooks is a conservative columnist of the *New York Times*. We all ought to read this and take it to heart. I called it to my caucus' attention this morning.

Our deep debt is a serious danger to our economy, to our future, and our children's opportunities. The American people want us to bring the debt down. They said so very loudly. And I doubt there is a Member who disagrees.

□ 1510

Democrats believe that spending cuts are part of the solution. Let there be no mistake. We need to cut spending, but we also believe that those cuts must be smart and targeted, not pegged to an arbitrary number.

One of your staffers, when you put the Pledge to America, came forth with a figure of \$100 billion. That's a nice round figure; \$100 billion sounds good. It's good PR. It's good spin—\$100 billion. Read David Brooks. No analysis was given to that figure. No hearings were held on that figure. Nobody could testify on the cuts that were proposed to reach that figure.

We have to cut the spending. We can do without some spending, not the vital investments, however, that are helping to grow our economy, that are helping our private sector innovate and creating the jobs of the future.

During the Clinton administration, I will tell my young friend from Georgia there were 22 million new jobs. During the Bush administration, we lost 8 million jobs. A 30 million job turnaround. That's why there was so much spending of which Mr. ROGERS spoke. And \$700 billion of that, of course, was asked for by the Bush Presidency, Secretary Paulson and Mr. Bernanke, so that we didn't fall into a depression for the first time since Herbert Hoover. This President has been trying to bring us out and, frankly, is succeeding.

Unfortunately, Republicans passed a spending bill full of shortsighted and indiscriminate cuts. Do we need cuts? Yes. Do we need shortsighted and indiscriminate cuts? No. Just over a week ago, you would cut billions in energy and medical research, kick 200,000 children out of Head Start, make college more expensive, and stop 21st-century infrastructure projects in 40 States. That's what Mr. Zandi is talking about. That's what Goldman Sachs is talking about. Cuts like these could cripple America's competitiveness and job growth.

According to Moody's Analytics chief economist Mark Zandi, who advised Senator McCain's Presidential campaign, Republicans' cuts would cost America a total of 700,000 jobs. The Economic Policy Institute puts it at 800,000.

Rather than such job-destroying policies, both of us, both parties, need to come together and reason together. Frankly, the American public doesn't care who works with whom. They just want it to work. This is no way to fund the largest enterprise in the world—on 14-day cycles. The gentleman criticized us for doing it, and we should have been criticized.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Let me tell my friend what he didn't mention: One of the reasons we did it was that we couldn't get 60 votes in the United States Senate in order to move a bill forward.

Keeping our government running is vital to our economy. None of us should want to shut down the government. It is also vital to the millions who rely on government every day. The sooner we can agree on a long-term package of smart cuts, not reckless, arbitrary, job-destroying cuts, the sooner we can stop funding the government in disruptive 2-week increments. The gentleman was correct that we ought not to do that. We need to pass a 7-month funding so that government and all who rely on the government, who work for the government, and who have contracts with the government can rely on some certainty.

You've talked a lot about certainty on your side of the aisle. You're absolutely right, we need certainty. The business community needs certainty. Individuals need certainty, and the government needs certainty.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Rather than passing 2-week continuing resolutions, I urge Republicans and Democrats to work together on a long-term solution—in this case, "long term" is 7 months—to reduce spending, to try to balance our budget, and to try to bring rationality to this process. We cannot, my friends on the Republican side of the aisle and

the Democratic side of the aisle, continue to look at 15 percent of the budget and expect us to get to where we need to be from where we now are.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a brand-new member of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. Madam Speaker, we can debate today who is at fault for the crisis we are in; but I think we have an agreement, which is, with record spending, deficits and accumulated debt, coupled with 20 months straight of 9 percent unemployment, it is time for us to get serious about the crushing effect of a runaway debt on this economy.

As Speaker BOEHNER said, "Just like a bankrupt business can't create jobs, a bankrupt country can't create jobs."

Small business owners, individuals and families now find themselves at the mercy of this debt that we as a government have recklessly accumulated. It's not Democrats or Republicans. It's those families and individuals and business owners who are the real casualties of this government spending spree. So now we must choose a pathway. We are at a crossroads: reasonable spending reductions and keeping the government open or heading towards devastating tax increases and crushing deficits.

The tax increases that would be needed to actually alleviate these bloated deficits would wipe out individuals, families and businesses. According to the CRS, current income tax rates would need to double across the board to close the expected deficits of this administration. You can't create jobs under these devastating taxes. We must reduce spending.

We have a choice as the American people. We can choose prosperity; we can choose lower taxes; and we can choose reduced debt. Or we can go other the other direction and choose record-breaking deficits, historic taxes and devastation all across this country.

Madam Speaker, we have a choice to make today, and it is my hope the Members of this body will choose to keep the government open, will choose to begin making modest reductions, and will pass this necessary resolution to begin the pathway towards prosperity again in this country.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, last November, the people I represent in Virginia's Fifth District sent an urgent message that

America must make a bold departure from the status quo and put a stop to the out-of-control spending that has come to define Washington over the past 2 years. No longer can we continue on the path of unchecked, reckless spending that has crippled our economy and has left us with a massive \$14 trillion in debt, \$1.6 trillion in deficit spending, and an unacceptably high unemployment rate.

Last year, the 111th Congress completely failed in its fundamental responsibility to adopt a budget for the American people. Remarkably, they have punted that responsibility and have kept the Federal Government operating over the last 5 months by adopting continuing resolutions.

Fortunately, the new 112th Congress has accepted this responsibility to clean up the mess of the last Congress. Indeed, the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats, worked late into the night last week to get a proposal to the Senate that recognizes the critical need to adopt a budget while cutting a historic \$100 billion in spending for the rest of this fiscal year.

After 5 months of failed leadership by Senate Democrats, we now find they need more time. This is truly unbelievable. Over the past week, back home in the Fifth District, I was reminded again and again by my constituents that now is the time for leadership, not for excuses.

While the House takes up another resolution today that will continue to temporarily fund the government while keeping our commitment to the people to cut an additional \$4 billion in spending, it is critical that the Senate join us to produce a responsible funding resolution that makes the cuts necessary to get our fiscal house in order. For the sake of the next generation of Americans, we must act, and we must act now to secure our future.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member and former chairman of the Interior and Environment Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia, JIM MORAN.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, so many of our brand-new colleagues seem to have run on the thesis that government can't be the solution to any of your problems, rather that "it" is the problem, that it can't be counted upon to help people, that it can't even be counted upon to invest in America's long-term interests. It seems as though, now that they've been elected, they're doing everything they can to prove themselves to be right.

This is no way to run a government. A 2-week CR?

Now, we don't have any great problem with the components of this CR except for the fact that it's 2 weeks.

□ 1520

It should be a 7-month CR. In fact, we should really tackle the appropriations bills themselves. But if it's a 7-month CR, it shouldn't be a dump truck of legislation that includes in it virtually

every controversial issue that this Congress has dealt with over the last 20, 30 years.

My good friend from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, will recall that quaint phrase that we would deploy in committee, that this amendment is not in order because it constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill. Well, we legislated everything. This bill has more poison pills in it than Rasputin's medicine cabinet. Everything is thrown in here, and it was thrown in in the middle of the night. You know, bills that we had considered carefully in committee that had come to the floor, that they were debated carefully and then resolved, and yet sometimes in a 10-minute debate those bills were dispensed with. That's not the way an appropriations bill should be brought to the floor. It ought to be a clean, continuing resolution if we're going to do a CR.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. The fact is we know we can do this. We can get a good appropriation bill. We can make surgical cuts and we can agree on those surgical cuts. But let's not try to put together a dump truck that includes in it every possible controversial issue that we know we can't resolve. That's not in the long-term best interest of the American people, and, in fact, it ought to be an embarrassment to our appropriations process.

So I would hope that we would vote against this continuing resolution simply because it's only a 2-week CR. We can do better.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I wish they had done better last year and passed one appropriations bill.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 44, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the MilCon and VA Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, I first would like to yield to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I have to take a moment here to, I guess, comment back on the distinguished whip's comments a minute ago.

It's great that he pointed out his knowledge of history and his years of experience here, and he's right about a few things. He talked about the years

of Bill Clinton and the spending cuts and the deficit reduction and debt reduction, all those kinds of things. He's absolutely right. But he didn't tell you the rest of the story, and that is the Republicans took the majority in 1995 and were part of that process, in leading through the legislative process not through the executive process.

And then he talked about George Bush and the 8 million job losses. And if you look back, if you look at the rest of the story on that again, that starts in about 2006 and 2007 and 2008. And if we think about who was in charge at the time, yes, it was the distinguished whip, who was the leader at the time, and the former Speaker. So they were right. They were right about history, but they weren't telling the whole story, and that is that the Republicans were leading during those difficult times and providing the spending cuts when necessary.

To the gentleman a minute ago who said government is not the solution, you're absolutely right. And to finish that quote from Ronald Reagan, more so, it is the problem.

Mr. CULBERSON. Reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, I think it's important to remember that the people of America spoke decisively in the November election. It was as clear a referendum on the direction that President Obama and Speaker PELOSI were taking the Nation as we could have, and the Nation decisively rejected the agenda that Speaker PELOSI and President Obama were promoting.

The spending that Chairman ROGERS spoke about was out of control over these last several years. I know in the time I served under President Bush I voted against about \$2.6 trillion of new spending under President Bush. And in just the last 2 years, under President Obama and Speaker PELOSI, my staff calculates I've had to vote against about \$7.6 trillion in spending under President Obama. I know that the level of spending under President Bush was higher than it should have been, but it has absolutely gone vertical under President Obama.

The country decisively rejected the direction that President Obama was taking the Nation. The country elected this new majority to cut spending, to repeal ObamaCare, and to put the Nation back on track towards a balanced budget, and that's what this appropriations bill does. In this 2-week period, we're doing our best at every opportunity, on every occasion. Chairman ROGERS and all of us are working to cut spending and to get the Federal Government out of our pockets, off our backs, and out of our lives.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I was just glad to hear the litany of these things that you voted against. Are you still for those Civil War battlefields?

Mr. CULBERSON. Reclaiming my time, there are a few core functions the government has to do, and I'll tell you that national defense, for example, we've protected the Pentagon and national security. We've protected the investments in medical and scientific research and in law enforcement. And you will find on every bill that we present we're going to work to cut spending in every possible way.

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

I think this has been a very spirited debate in the best traditions of the House. I want to point out a few facts to again correct the RECORD.

First of all, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act probably brought down the unemployment rate from 12 or 13 percent to 9.5 percent. We would have a 12.5 percent unemployment rate today if it weren't for the American Recovery Act.

The only deficit that has been cut around here was the \$41 billion that was done by the Democrats and enacted in December and passed to March 4.

Now, again, we did not get our work done. Mr. ROGERS and I are going to get the work done. But again, gentlemen and ladies, it's the economy. You've got to put people back to work. And if the net impact of what you do, the cuts you make are to throw people out of work, to cause the economy to stumble and stop the recovery and increase unemployment, then the deficit will go up.

The only way you get this better is to drive down unemployment, get people working, get businesses producing, get the revenues coming in. That will do it. But what the best economists in this country say is your medicine is not going to cure the patient. It could well harm the patient and cause things to get worse, not better. So that's why some people believe it's a timing issue.

And now, again, I want you to know, we will work together in these next 2 weeks. We've got to get this thing resolved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. May I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let's be clear what it is we're voting on here today. This is a short-term, 2-week CR. It cuts \$4 billion, a little over \$4 billion in spending that both parties have agreed to in the past, both bodies in the House and Senate have agreed to in the past, and agreed to by the White House.

So what are we talking about here? This is a 2-week extension. It's about as clean as you can make it. And, oh, by the way, speaking about that bill we passed 2 weeks ago, H.R. 1, that cuts \$61 billion off of current spending, Ben

Bernanke, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, said as late as today that that bill will have no harmful effect on the economy. I don't know that there's a bigger, better source on the economy than the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, and he says no problem.

Now, what the Democrats want to do, Madam Speaker—this is pretty simple—they want to freeze spending. They want to freeze spending at the biggest bloated level we've ever had.

□ 1530

They increased spending 84 percent over the last 2 years. Now they want to freeze and they'll go no higher. Well, it's bloated. We want to take it back down to where it's reasonable, where we can live with it. So we don't want another \$1.7 trillion-a-year deficit like they've had the last year and, before that, something approaching that.

So I ask Members to vote for this short-term CR, to give us time to work with the other body on H.R. 1 to find out what their position is, about which we have no idea at this moment. They haven't acted. And so to avert a close-down of the government, which is what we're after here, we want to give the Senate time to look at H.R. 1 and tell us what their position is so we can have a conversation about it. And, frankly, 2 weeks is plenty of time, plenty of time in the House. I know the Senate works a bit more slowly, but 2 weeks should be plenty.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge Members to vote for this reasonable, fair, budget-cutting extension of the time to shut down the government. Vote "yes" and keep the government operating.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, today's legislation proposes to extend Federal Government operations for an additional two weeks while cutting roughly \$4 billion in spending from FY 2011, if the proposed cuts are ultimately extended for the rest of the fiscal year.

Democrats understand the need to get serious about our deficits and debt, but we also understand the difference between making smart, deliberate cuts to spending while maintaining targeted investments that create jobs, grow our economy and strengthen our international competitiveness. In that regard, I am especially disappointed that the majority did not make in order an amendment offered by ranking Member DICKS, which would have restored some of the education cuts in today's bill by finding the necessary savings in unused Census funds. It seems to me those are the kinds of distinctions, priorities and choices this body should be able and willing to make.

Furthermore, based on our experience with H.R. 1, I am concerned that the majority is ignoring the explicit advice of two fiscal commissions and a growing chorus of bipartisan commentators warning that we must not in the guise of fiscal discipline cut so indiscriminately, so fast that we sabotage job creation and weaken our ongoing economic recovery.

Madam Speaker, sooner rather than later, we need to come to a final agreement on federal spending for the rest of FY 2011. That agreement should chart a credible course towards long term fiscal sustainability while

making the kinds of investments that will allow us to win the future in the 21st century.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support for H.J. Res. 44, the Continuing Resolution (CR) to make further continuing appropriations for Fiscal Year 2011 to keep our Federal Government open through March 18, 2011.

Though I have serious reservations about this CR offered by my Republican colleagues, I absolutely refuse to let our Federal Government close on my watch. Allowing the Federal Government to close while this nation continues to recover from its economic downturn does no good for anyone. Closure of the Federal Government at this juncture would deal a crushing blow to the people all over the United States who are looking to Congress to do its part in bringing about much-needed economic relief and to get this country back on course.

Moreover, states all around this nation are in the midst of recovering from their own economic crises. The closure of the federal government would deal them a crushing blow. Worse still, it would only serve to increase the hardship and suffering visited upon the citizens of those states. We must remember that these citizens are also our constituents and we must not let unfettered zeal to make spending cuts blind us to the point where we allow cuts to the funding necessary for economic recovery.

This insufficient, fake CR contains many horrible cuts to important programs. It unjustly heaves a heavy weight upon the backs of the American people who should not be made to bear this burden. These cuts include but are not limited to:

- Critical Education Funding at All Levels from Head Start to Higher Education
- Health and Human Services Funding
- Energy Funding
- Critical Transportation Funding
- Military and Veteran's Affairs Funding
- Science and Technology and NASA Funding

However, this is only a two-week CR and the critical funding it cuts can be recouped and restored. I look forward to fighting hard over the next two weeks to restore this crucial funding. The cuts contained in this CR squarely impact the people and programs we need to support the most in order to bring about job creation and sustained economic growth. I am committed to doing all that I can to restore these funds while making fiscally responsible, well deliberated appropriations for funding the Federal Government for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2011. I urge my colleagues to join me in this commitment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 115, the joint resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. KEATING. 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. Keating moves to recommit the joint resolution H. J. Res. 44 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 18, line 21, strike the quotation marks and final period.

Page 18, after line 21, insert the following: "SEC. 227. For the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Further Continuing Appropriations Amendments, 2011 and ending on the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act, no major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) shall be eligible for any tax benefit or relief under the following provisions of such Code to the extent attributable to such period:

"(1) Section 43.

"(2) Section 45I.

"(3) Section 469 with respect to working interests in oil and gas property.

"(4) Sections 613 and 613A, with respect to percentage depletion for oil and gas.

"(5) Section 199 with respect to income derived from the production of oil and gas.

For purposes of this section, the amount of any tax benefit or relief for any taxable year shall be treated as attributable to the period described in the preceding sentence in the same ratio that the portion of such period which is part of such taxable year bears to the entire taxable year."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer this motion to recommit which I believe will greatly improve our fiscal health and ensure that we're responsible to all taxpayer dollars and the taxpayers of this great Nation.

We all agree—all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike—that cuts in wasteful spending are vital to our country's future. The decision that stands before us is whether we should adopt reckless cuts to some of our most important programs or not: education cuts, cuts to college scholarships, reading teachers, Head Start.

As a D.A. for the last decade, I know the effects of cuts to police officers and firefighters, and I know what they mean to our public safety. Reckless cuts: cuts to border protection, cuts to the hubs of cybersecurity research so that we can better protect ourselves in our infrastructure, cuts in cancer research and other life-saving ventures of the National Institute of Health.

It's worth repeating that Moody's chief economic expert, Mark Zandi, the former adviser to the McCain for President campaign, just this week estimated that the reckless Republican cuts will cost our country 700,000 jobs. Investment groups estimate that the reckless cuts will cut the economy by a growth this year of almost one-half.

Our alternative? Our alternative is an alternative of sensible spending cuts. In this motion, we're offering such a sensible spending cut.

Let's stop sending taxpayers' money to the most profitable companies in the world. The time is now to stop subsidizing the largest oil companies. I think it shocks every American taxpayer to know that they're required to fork out over \$40 billion in subsidies over the next decade to the most economically profitable of companies—especially as oil soars to a hundred dollars per barrel. My constituents in Plymouth, Massachusetts, are paying almost \$3.50 per gallon and have had enough. Even ex-Shell CEO John Hofmeister says enough is enough. He said, "With high oil prices, such subsidies are not necessary."

So let's put a stop to this welfare program for Big Oil right now. Cuts to police, cuts to fire, cuts to cancer research, cuts to border security, cuts to reading teachers—or oil subsidies to the most profitable of companies.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. If I understand the gentleman's motion correctly, it would, for a 2-week period, attempt to change the Tax Code to single out resource companies and increase their costs of doing business. This misguided policy can only lead to higher energy prices, continued reliance on foreign oil, and economic hardship that hampers job creation.

At a time when gasoline is currently approaching \$4 a gallon around the country and when our resources are being threatened by the instability in the Middle East, we should be encouraging domestic energy production—not cutting it down.

We're talking about a 2-week continuing resolution to keep the government running past Friday, reduce spending, and avoid a government shutdown. This is neither the time nor the place to inject an unrelated job-crushing, controversial rider to the CR that will absolutely hinder its chance of passing in the Senate before this Friday when the current CR expires.

I urge defeat of this ill-advised motion.

I now yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), chairman of the Interior Subcommittee Appropriations.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, if this wasn't such a serious subject that we're discussing here, the Federal budget and how we're going to fund it for the next 2 weeks, it would almost be funny.

Almost every Member of the Democratic Party that has stood up and talked about this CR has said something like this—even the sponsor of this motion said something along these lines: Democrats know we have to reduce spending. Democrats want to reduce spending. Yet the very first time

they have a chance to vote to reduce spending, reductions that the administration agrees with in its 2012 budget and eliminating earmarks, the Democrats vote “no”? It’s strange but true.

In fact, instead of cutting spending, they propose to increase revenue. Or increase taxes.

In this fragile economy with energy prices rising, we should be encouraging more energy and gas development and production in the United States. We need more supply, not less supply. This would reduce the supply.

Oil prices are rising again; and with the wave of unrest in the Middle East and North Africa, there are fears that we could soon see a return to \$4 or \$5 gas in the United States this summer.

□ 1540

The moratorium put in place following the Deepwater Horizon accident was lifted last fall by the administration; but the administration has issued just one deepwater permit in the gulf, and that was issued just yesterday. The Federal judge called this de facto deepwater drilling moratorium unreasonable, unacceptable, and unjustifiable.

The public will have no patience for more delays, more excuses, and higher taxes if gas prices continue to rise, especially when we have untapped resources here in the United States not being utilized. We need to be encouraging more production in this country, not discouraging production in this country.

Oil and gas from Federal lands, both onshore and offshore, provide an important energy source and domestic jobs and billions of dollars of revenue to the United States. This is a job-killing proposal. This is an issue that needs to be addressed carefully and in great detail. A rush to impose new taxes and fees through a motion to recommit is hasty and unwise. We ought to let the committees of jurisdiction address this issue. I strongly, in the strongest terms, encourage my colleagues to vote against this ill-conceived motion to recommit.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the joint resolution, if ordered; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 176, nays 249, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—176

Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carmahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inlee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeke  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nader  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Capps  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Townes  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

NAYS—249

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishkek  
Berg  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Cardoza  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Costa  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Elliott  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Harper

Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorriss  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Nugent  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Capito  
Castor (FL)  
Giffords  
Hanna  
Hinojosa  
Marchant  
Young (FL)

□ 1605

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. GRAVES of Georgia, CHANDLER, and SMITH of Nebraska changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CLARKE of Michigan, CARNEY, LEWIS of Georgia, SCHIFF, TIERNEY, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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 joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 335, noes 91, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

AYES—335

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachus

Barletta	Franks (AZ)	McIntyre	Stearns	Turner	Westmoreland
Barrow	Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Stivers	Upton	Whitfield
Bartlett	Galleghy	McKinley	Stutzman	Van Hollen	Wilson (SC)
Barton (TX)	Gardner	McMorris	Sullivan	Walberg	Wittman
Bass (NH)	Garrett	Rodgers	Terry	Walden	Wolf
Benishkek	Gerlach	Meehan	Thompson (CA)	Walsh (IL)	Womack
Berg	Gibbs	Mica	Thompson (PA)	Walz (MN)	Woodall
Berkley	Gibson	Michaud	Thornberry	Webster	Yoder
Biggert	Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)	Tiberti	Weiner	Young (AK)
Billbray	Gonzalez	Miller (MI)	Tipton	Welch	Young (IN)
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Miller (NC)	Tsongas	West	
Bishop (GA)	Gosar	Miller, Gary			
Bishop (NY)	Gowdy	Moran		NOES—91	
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Mulvaney	Amash	Hanabusa	Paul
Black	Graves (GA)	Murphy (CT)	Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Blackburn	Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)	Bachmann	Hinchee	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Green, Al	Myrick	Baldwin	Hirono	Rangel
Bonner	Green, Gene	Neugebauer	Bass (CA)	Honda	Richardson
Bono Mack	Griffin (AR)	Noem	Becerra	Jackson (IL)	Richmond
Boren	Griffith (VA)	Nugent	Berman	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Boswell	Grimm	Nunes	Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Boustany	Guinta	Nunnelee	Capuano	Jones	Ryan (OH)
Brady (PA)	Guthrie	Olson	Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Brady (TX)	Hall	Owens	Chu	King (IA)	T. Sanchez, Loretta
Braley (IA)	Harper	Palazzo	Clarke (MI)	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Brooks	Harris	Pastor (AZ)	Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Broun (GA)	Hartzler	Paulsen	Clay	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)	Pearce	Cleaver	Lofgren, Zoe	Sutton
Bucshon	Hayworth	Pence	Clyburn	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Buerkle	Heck	Perlmutter	Cohen	Markey	Tierney
Burgess	Heinrich	Peters	Conyers	Matsui	Tonko
Burton (IN)	Heller	Peterson	Cummings	McCollum	Towns
Butterfield	Hensarling	Petri	Davis (IL)	McDermott	Velázquez
Calvert	Herger	Pingree (ME)	DeLauro	McGovern	Visclosky
Camp	Herrera Beutler	Pitts	Edwards	McNerney	Wasserman
Campbell	Higgins	Platts	Ellison	Meeks	Schultz
Canseco	Himes	Poe (TX)	Farr	Miller, George	Waters
Cantor	Holden	Polis	Finer	Moore	Watt
Capito	Holt	Pompeo	Frank (MA)	Nadler	Waxman
Capps	Hoyer	Posey	Fudge	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Cardoza	Huelskamp	Price (GA)	Garamendi	Neal	Woolsey
Carnahan	Huizenga (MI)	Price (NC)	Gohmert	Olver	Wu
Carney	Hultgren	Quayle	Grijalva	Pallone	Yarmuth
Carter	Hunter	Quigley	Gutierrez	Pascrell	
Cassidy	Hurt	Rahall			
Chabot	Inslee	Reed		NOT VOTING—6	
Chaffetz	Israel	Rehberg	Castor (FL)	Hanna	Marchant
Chandler	Issa	Reichert	Giffords	Hinojosa	Young (FL)
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Renacci			
Coble	(TX)	Reyes			
Coffman (CO)	Jenkins	Ribble		□ 1614	
Cole	Johnson (IL)	Rigell	Ms. WATERS changed her vote from		
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Rivera	“aye” to “no.”		
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, Sam	Roby	Mr. COSTELLO changed his vote		
Cooper	Jordan	Roe (TN)	from “no” to “aye.”		
Costa	Keating	Rogers (AL)	So the joint resolution was passed.		
Costello	Kelly	Rogers (KY)	The result of the vote was announced		
Courtney	Kildee	Rogers (MI)	as above recorded.		
Cravaack	Kind	Rohrabacher	A motion to reconsider was laid on		
Crawford	King (NY)	Rokita	the table.		
Crenshaw	Kingston	Rooney			
Critz	Kinzinger (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen			
Crowley	Kissell	Roskam			
Cuellar	Kline	Ross (AR)			
Culberson	Labrador	Ross (FL)			
Davis (CA)	Lamborn	Rothman (NJ)			
Davis (KY)	Lance	Royce			
DeFazio	Landry	Ryunan			
DeGette	Langevin	Ruppersberger			
Denham	Lankford	Ryan (WI)			
Dent	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes			
DesJarlais	Larson (CT)	Scalise			
Deutch	Latham	Schiff			
Diaz-Balart	LaTourette	Schilling			
Dicks	Latta	Schmidt			
Dingell	Levin	Schock			
Doggett	Lewis (CA)	Schrader			
Dold	Lipinski	Schwartz			
Donnelly (IN)	LoBiondo	Schweikert			
Doyle	Loeb sack	Scott (SC)			
Dreier	Long	Scott (VA)			
Duffy	Lowey	Scott, Austin			
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Scott, David			
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner			
Ellmers	Lujan	Sessions			
Emerson	Lummis	Sewell			
Engel	Lungren, Daniel	Sherman			
Eshoo	E.	Shimkus			
Farenthold	Mack	Shuler			
Fattah	Maloney	Shuster			
Fincher	Manzullo	Simpson			
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Sires			
Flake	Matheson	Slaughter			
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)			
Fleming	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (NJ)			
Flores	McCaul	Smith (TX)			
Forbes	McClintock	Smith (WA)			
Fortenberry	McCotter	Southerland			
Foxx	McHenry	Speier			

largest student-run philanthropy in the world, with 700 dancers, more than 300 supporting organizations, and more than 15,000 volunteers involved in the annual event.

Since 1977, THON has raised more than \$78 million for The Four Diamonds Fund at the Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital. This year, THON 2012 took place from February 17–19. At this year's event, Penn State York broke its own record, raising \$17,160.71, the largest amount that has ever been raised for THON, and it made it to the top 10 in fundraisers among the Penn State campuses.

THON has helped so many families through The Four Diamonds Fund, and this critical support for pediatric cancer research has enabled some pediatric cancer survival rates to increase to nearly 90 percent.

I want to congratulate the Penn State University IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon on its continued success in support of The Four Diamonds Fund and for their amazing, record-breaking total for this year's event.

#### DEAD BABIES DESERVE JUSTICE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I came to the floor of the House, and I think I was genuinely pleading with my colleagues in responding to the tragedy of an incident that occurred last Thursday, when a person who was supposed to have been attending to seven babies under 3 years old now has been found allegedly to have left to have gone grocery shopping, to have come back to a grease fire in the kitchen, and to have found that four babies, 3 and under, were killed.

Two are now in the burn unit. These are possibly babies supported by Federal funding for child care—by someone 22 years old and licensed by the State of Texas. In all we do to provide funding for desperate parents, can we at least expect the criteria to be reasonable?

Now we have the District Attorney's Office indicating that they can't find the suspect, that he has fled because they waited 3 days to file any charges against someone who was responsible for four dead babies. We understand they have asked the U.S. Marshal. We don't even know whether they have asked the State Department to help.

It is a crying shame, and I am getting to the bottom of it. Dead babies deserve justice.

#### SHERIFFS ON THE BORDER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 months since David Hartley was brutally murdered by pirates on

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

□ 1620

#### CONGRATULATING THE PENN STATE IFC/PANHELLENIC DANCE MARATHON

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the Penn State IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon, referred to as THON, is a yearlong effort to raise funds and awareness for the fight against pediatric cancer. THON is the