

and more than a quarter of Americans are very misinformed about its parameters. It will take more than just stronger prevention and enforcement of the law to prevent sexual molestation and other forms of sexual assault. In order to end this serious epidemic that has plagued America, all segments of the community such as parents, educators, religious leaders, and community leaders must create a nurturing environment us to live comfortably.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 104 "Supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month."

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 104.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 365 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 365

*Resolved*, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of April 28, 2009, providing for consideration or disposition of a conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 through 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 365 permits same-day consideration of a rule providing for consideration of the conference report on the budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 13.

This budget is a critical document and comes at a critical time in our country. We all know this budget is a blueprint of the priorities of the Obama administration and this Democratic Congress. This budget sets the framework for most of the legislation that we will consider this year—everything from the annual spending bills to improvements in education to health care reform to deficit control.

I'm not surprised that my friends on the other side of the aisle aren't pleased with this budget. Republicans voted against the recovery package, and now they are going to oppose this budget.

It's no secret that the Republicans have fundamental differences in the way they would govern this country. But that's why we have elections, Madam Speaker, and the American people spoke loud and clear about what they want their country to stand for. And those principles are set in this budget.

Madam Speaker, this budget must be adopted in order for this Congress to start working on the agenda the American people want us to enact. I am proud to support this budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my very good friend from Worcester for yielding me this customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I have to say that I am really somewhat puzzled as to why it is that we are here debating a same-day rule for consideration of the Federal budget's conference report. As we all know, a same-day rule is a mechanism to circumvent House rules in order to hastily cram through legislation.

Why in the world would the Democratic leadership want to rush through passage of the Federal budget? I recognize that same-day rules have taken place when either party has been in the majority, but why in the world would the Democratic leadership want to do this, Madam Speaker, for the Federal budget?

As I say, we often use this procedure when the government might run out of money. Well, although we know, as of last Sunday, April 26, we saw the deficit day actually created, Debt Day created, as of Sunday, we ran out of money. We now are in deficit spending as of today.

Last year that date was August 4. We spent all of our money up until August 4 of last year. This was last Sunday, the 26th of April. So we are now into borrowed money. But as we all know, Madam Speaker, our appropriations bills that we have passed for this cal-

endar year exist until the next fiscal year begins.

Is there some hard and fast deadline that needs to be met under the Budget Act? The budget resolution should have been completed by April 15. The Democratic leadership wasn't in a hurry when that deadline came and went, and there is no new deadline at all that needs to be met right now.

Maybe, Madam Speaker, Congress is getting ready for a prolonged congressional recess, a district work period. Well, the next recess, as we all know, is about a month away. We are supposed to be working here for another 4 weeks.

Now, Madam Speaker, I ask maybe, just maybe it's the end of a very long, hard workweek of ours here, and we want to complete action before a long 3-day weekend, except today is Tuesday, and there is plenty of time to get this done before we finish legislative business on Thursday. So why, Madam Speaker, are we denying Members and the public the chance to read this budget, a budget, which as we all know now, at least we know the outside numbers, spends \$17.8 trillion.

We have been listening to people over the past several weeks talk about what the number a trillion is. Somebody was saying it totals 31,000 years, longer than recorded history, in seconds. I mean, it's just amazing to contemplate that in this budget it is \$17.8 trillion over a 5-year period of time.

The only thing that I can figure out, Madam Speaker, is that tomorrow marks the conclusion of the President's first 100 days. Now, this is a milestone the press has observed since Franklin Delano's Roosevelt's presidency. It's a very symbolic moment that every President understandably likes to highlight.

The problem rises, Madam Speaker, when his party cares more about symbolism and photo opportunities than taking the power of the purse, our constitutional responsibility here in the people's House, and taking that seriously. We have a profound responsibility to spend the taxpayers' money wisely.

During a time of great economic challenges, when every working family is trying to make every penny count, the responsibility here for us to deal with those tax dollars as wisely as possible is even greater. I would hope that the Democratic leadership would care more about fiscal responsibility than a photo opportunity.

Unfortunately, this is not a new pattern for the House Democratic leadership. Just a few weeks ago we turned the process upside down to try to pass the GIVE Act so that it could be signed by the President just before he left for Europe.

Now, cooler heads did prevail, but it looks like we are headed down that exact same path now. This photo opportunity deadline in the first 100 days is leading us to not go through the regular order for consideration of this budget conference report.

Now I understand why they would like to pass their budget prior to the completion of the first 100 days. And in many ways, Madam Speaker, it is a very, very clear definition of what it's about.

My friend from Worcester talked about the fact that elections have consequences, the people have spoken, and this is what they want? Well, I have got to say that from what I have heard from my constituents and from what I have seen in polling that has been done across the country, and as I have participated in telephone town hall meetings and heard my colleagues from both sides of the aisle talking about this, including the President's cabinet meeting, when he has now been referring to the fact that we need to focus on restraining spending, I clearly don't believe that a budget that is \$17.8 trillion of spending over the next 5 years is what the American people want or wanted when they cast their votes last November.

But I will say that if you look at the first 100 days, this is a clear, clear signal of what it is that we have gotten in this 100 days. And it would make a very nice press story, I know, to have this accomplished from their perspective by the completion of the 100 days.

I do believe that there are things that are much more important than press conferences and photo opportunities. The Federal budget happens to be one of them. The Democratic majority should, I believe, take taxpayers' money and the spending of that more seriously than has been done in this budget or what we have seen with the stimulus bill, the 1,100-page bill that we dropped on a table around here and pointed out very widely that people hadn't read.

Both the President and the majority promised that Members would be able to read the bills we are voting on. I remember when candidate Obama talked about that throughout the campaign. We have had the Speaker of the House regularly point to that.

Nowhere, Madam Speaker, is that more important than when we are in the midst of debating the Federal budget. The last time, we all know this very well, because we have seen amazing gymnastics take place around here, the last time we rushed through a major piece of legislation like this is the one I just referred to, and it was the so-called economic stimulus bill. And that was when we discovered the Federal Government was enabling bonuses for companies funded by the U.S. taxpayer.

Now, I ask, as we look at this \$17.8 trillion package over the next 5 years, what's in this budget, Madam Speaker, that the Democratic leadership does not want us to read?

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this same-day rule. We need to proceed under regular order for consideration of this budget process, and I personally believe that we should do everything within our power to completely overhaul this badly flawed budget structure that we have.

So reject this rule, go at least through regular order, and I hope very much the Democratic leadership will fulfill its constitutional obligations with both responsibility and accountability.

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

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

Madam Speaker, it's a little difficult to hear lectures from a member of the other party, the party that inherited from Bill Clinton a record surplus and then over the next 8 years presided over an economy that turned that surplus into a record deficit, that ruined, that forced this economy into the ditch that we are now trying to dig ourselves out of.

I want to apologize to the gentleman for the Democratic leadership's desire to actually accomplish something, to get things done. That's exactly what we are trying to do here. We have done enough talking. There has been enough speechifying. The American people voted for action. They voted for change. They voted for a new direction.

They didn't vote for more speeches. They didn't vote for more obstructionism. They didn't vote for more of the same of what we had over the last 8 years.

On this budget, just so it's clear, we had more than 14 hours of markup in the Budget Committee. I was there, because I am also on the Budget Committee.

We had a full debate on the House floor. Four substitute amendments were made in order. People had an opportunity to vote for budgets to the left and to the right and everything in between. So there was ample time for discussion. We had an open conference meeting.

The gentleman is going to have over 24 hours to read the budget. Now, for someone who hasn't read the budget, he is spouting out a lot of facts and figures. But he is going to have over 24 hours to read what the conference committee produced, because we are not going to vote on the budget until tomorrow.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me make a couple of points here. First, as my friend began, he said that it was difficult for someone who was part of increasing deficits over the past 8 years under President Bush to stand here lecturing on this issue.

Well, I have to stay, Madam Speaker, that it's very, very convoluted, I believe, to say that we criticized the spending that took place under President Bush. And I will acknowledge we could have done better, even though, with the exception of Defense and Homeland Security, we were able to bring about real dollar spending cuts in

every appropriation bill for the last few years.

But I will say that it's convoluted to conclude that if we want to criticize what took place then, we quadruple the size of the deficit and the national debt, which is exactly what this budget does.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time, Madam Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman's commentary. The fact of the matter is that we are in such trouble right now that in order to get out of this ditch, in order to get out of this terrible debt that we are in, we are going to have to grow our economy, which means in the short term we are going to have to invest in our people and invest in our country.

That is the rationale behind the Democratic budget, behind the budget that President Obama has put forward. But, look, one thing is clear, Madam Speaker, the same old, same old is not what the people want. And for the last 8 years, the Republicans and President Bush have driven this economy into a direction that people have rejected soundly during this last election.

□ 1515

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned the fact that, over the last few years, we'd gotten ourselves into the ditch. This shows the ditch that we're actually in.

In 1993, we passed a budget that dug ourselves out of a ditch and created surpluses, as far as I could see. In fact, in 2001, when we came into session, we had a surplus sufficient to put us on track to paying off the entire national debt held by the public by last year. Instead, we had a complete collapse of the budget beginning in 2001, and there is no telling where this line is going to end up. It took 8 years to get into this ditch.

During the good years when we had fiscal responsibility, not only were we on the way to paying off the national debt, but we created record numbers of jobs. We had a median income increase of about \$7,000 per family, and the Dow Jones Industrial Average more than tripled. Now we have a situation where we have had the worst job performance since the Great Depression, where the median income is actually down when adjusted for inflation and where the Dow Jones Industrial Average is worse than it was when it started. It took us 8 years to get into this ditch.

We have an urgent situation. This budget will cut the deficit in half in 4 years. Now, that is not the end of it. That's not enough. Cutting the deficit in half is not enough, but for one year's work, that is certainly a good step toward getting us out of a ditch that took 8 years to get us into.

Now we have a situation where the new budget will restore PAYGO, that

is, that any new program will have to be paid for. The reason we could get it in this kind of ditch was we passed tax cuts that we hadn't paid for, and we had spending that wasn't paid for. But under this budget, any new initiative will have to be paid for, and that's going to be hard. We're talking about energy initiatives. We're talking about health care initiatives and education initiatives that will be very expensive, but none of them can go into effect unless they're paid for with other spending cuts or with tax increases. Everything will be paid for. This is in stark contrast to what happened in 2001 when we didn't pay for anything. We went right into a ditch, and we didn't create any jobs.

It is urgent that we pass this budget to get back on the track that we were on in 1993 when the budget created jobs, when the median income was up, when the economy was good, and when we were on the way to paying off the national debt, instead of the ditch we're in today where we have had, in the last 8 years, the worst job performance since the Great Depression and huge deficits as far as the eye can see. We're taking a major step in the right direction.

So, Madam Speaker, I would hope that we would adopt the budget so we could get on to the job of restoring the economy and of balancing this budget.

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

I would like to congratulate my good friend from Virginia, Mr. SCOTT, for in the chart that he had before us it illustrated the fact that the economic downturn actually began in the last quarter of the Clinton administration, and that chart correctly points to that. So I congratulate my friend for recognizing that. It was the policies put into place in 2001 and in 2003 that brought about 55 months of uninterrupted job creation and economic growth and a dramatic increase in the flow of revenues because of the growth-oriented tax policies that we did, in fact, implement.

I also would point to the fact, and while my friend proceeds to malign the Bush administration, that it's obviously very clear, too, that we as Republicans had the majority when we saw the economic growth that took place in the late 1990s.

I'd be happy to yield to my friend Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Thank you. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not a fact that the job performance during the 8 years of the Bush administration was the worst since the Great Depression?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, the answer to that is "no." The answer to that is "no." To say that job creation during President Bush's administration was the worst since the Great Depression, I have no idea where that number comes from. I do know this: We saw 55 months of continued job creation and economic growth be-

cause of the policies that were implemented in 2001 and in 2003, which were growth-oriented tax cuts.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend from Lafayette, Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand in opposition to the rule that led to this budget proposal.

Let me just say that, first of all, this Congress is facing some very grave challenges, along with the President, and I think the President has rightfully singled out health care, energy and education as areas that have to be addressed with substantive reform, but I have to say that I vehemently disagree with the prescribed approach. Let's look at a couple of points here.

First of all, let's take energy. This energy proposal lays out a prescription for singling out a number of serious oil and gas tax increases, at the very minimum, totaling \$31.5 billion. Now, this is going to devastate an industry, a domestic oil and gas industry— independent companies, not the big companies like ExxonMobil and Shell and others that do work overseas but, rather, those independent companies that work in the Gulf of Mexico and that supply a major source of oil and gas energy for the United States and for every single American family.

What does this mean for the average family? They're going to pay higher gas prices at the pump. They're going to pay higher costs in electricity. Also, we're going to see massive job loss.

Now, we did have hearings, yes. Oh, we had hearings. I sit on the Ways and Means Committee. I remember Secretary Geithner coming in front of us. I asked him: How many jobs will this budget kill? He could not answer the question. I asked: Do you realize that the oil and gas industry employs about 1.8 million people in the United States with about 6 million additional jobs associated with this industry? A lot of these jobs are going to be killed; we're going to lose them, and they don't come back right away. This is at a time when our energy dependence on foreign oil is serious.

What is our transition strategy as we try to get to a green economy? Well, it's natural gas. Well, guess what? Thirty-five percent of the natural gas used in this country comes from wells that were drilled within the last 2 years. The rig count is now down over 50 percent since September. Do the math. We're going to see higher gas prices.

So I have to say, if the Secretary comes before the committee and offers this budget proposal but cannot answer simple questions such as "What is going to be the impact on unemployment across multiple sectors?" that's a serious concern.

The CBO. I asked the same questions of the Director of the CBO and got the same answer. They have not done the analysis. Well, I think that's incomplete work.

Don't you think we need more information as to what the impact of this budget is going to be on unemployment and on jobs if it's implemented in its entirety? We're talking about good, high-paying jobs. I'm not talking about white-collar executive jobs. I'm talking about pipe fitters, electricians, painters, people who work on boats, across-the-board manufacturing jobs, small manufacturing companies that do fabrication and so forth. These are serious jobs.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield my friend 1 additional minute.

Mr. BOUSTANY. This is a serious issue. It needs to be well-thought-out. Throw on top of those specific tax increases that are proposed on the oil and gas industry this massive cap-and-trade proposal which is still not well-thought-out, and of course, we have more work to do on it, obviously.

I have to say the American people deserve to know what this is going to do in terms of job loss. They really deserve to know, and they deserve to know what this is going to do to the cost of electricity in their hometowns and what it's going to do to the cost of gasoline at the pump and what it's going to cost in heating oil and so forth. That is information we ought to have.

So, before we start proposing these types of expansions of taxes that are going to kill jobs, that are going to create higher unemployment and that are going to run up the costs, we're talking about a recipe for more borrowing, for more spending and higher taxes.

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

Just so that the record is clear—and this is according to *The Wall Street Journal*—as for jobs created per year in Office, George W. Bush was the worst since the Great Depression. Let me read them.

Jobs Created Per Year in Office: Truman, 1.1 million; Eisenhower, 438,000; Kennedy, 1.2 million; Lyndon Johnson, 2.3 million; Nixon, 1.7 million; Ford, 745,000; Carter, 2.6 million; Reagan, 2 million; Bush I, 625,000; Clinton, 2.9 million; George W. Bush, 375,000.

This is the very conservative *Wall Street Journal*, hardly a paper of liberal ideas and thoughts.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I suspect that that was a news story and not necessarily an editorial. I seriously question those numbers, but I would ask my friend the following:

As we look at this issue of accountability and responsibility, I would remind him that this economic downturn, the slowing economy that we've

witnessed, began after my friend's party won the majority. I would ask my friend, if I might, Madam Speaker, if he feels that accountability and responsibility should lie not solely with the President of the United States but also with the party in power here in this institution.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I reclaim my time.

I would say to the gentleman that I not only hold President Bush accountable for the last 8 years and for the disastrous economy that we now have, but I also hold accountable the Republican leadership in Congress, which voted for some of the worst economic policies that have literally driven this country into debt and into a ditch.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a member of the Budget Committee.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

First, Madam Speaker, the consistent reference to the so-called "cap-and-trade policy" from the other side is not in the budget. That will be debated another day. It is not here.

My friend from California talks about the number of months that there was job growth in the prior administration. Madam Speaker, I think most Americans are worried about the number of months they've been out of work and about the number of months until their unemployment benefits expire, and this budget is a part of addressing that concern.

Shortly after taking office, this President signed an economic stimulus law, the benefits of which are now being seen in communities around the United States as construction workers go to work, as first-time home buyers get help with their down payments, hopefully as more cars and trucks are sold, as people can deduct their sales tax, as schools are given more opportunities not to lay off teachers, lunch aides and other personnel.

The President also put forth a long-term economic proposal that we're addressing today in this budget. It's not the number of months that President Bush did this or that. It's other questions about how many months people have been without health insurance. This budget puts us on a track to finally deal with that problem and to get health care costs under control for all Americans and to get coverage for the 47 million who do not have it. This budget, in a very robust way, talks about helping to pay for college education. It will make the largest investment in college and technical training in the Nation's history as a result of what is in this budget.

The gentleman is concerned about the process by which this is being done. We're concerned about the process by

which it wasn't done in the previous 8 years.

Now, having said that, if anyone wants to read the budget, it's on the Internet. Read it. If someone is concerned about the lack of alternatives from the minority, there were dozens of amendments when the committee worked on this budget. Mr. MCGOVERN and I were part of that. There were two full alternatives from the minority that were debated on the floor a couple of weeks ago when the minority had a chance to set forth its views, and those views were considered.

So we think there is a problem with the timing of these plans. We think the American public shouldn't have to wait 8 years for someone to finally address health care and education and the budget deficit, which is cut by two-thirds under this budget. The process is right. The plan is right. The right thing to do is to vote "yes."

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

I would say to my very good friend from New Jersey that it's interesting to listen to his argument. I've heard the President of the United States. I've heard the Democratic leadership—Speaker PELOSI and Leader REID—and Democrats all the way across the board say that the Republican Party is simply the party of "no," that they have no ideas, that they have no proposals that they come forward with. I do appreciate the fact that my friend has acknowledged that, in the markup in the Budget Committee and here on the House floor, there were both amendments and alternatives brought forward.

Now, it is true that those ideas were rejected by a vote here in this House, but what we're debating right now is whether or not we should have a same-day rule which proceeds with the consideration of a measure that does not, in fact, give the appropriate amount of time. This package, this conference report, was filed at 11:37 p.m.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the vote on this is tomorrow?

Mr. DREIER. I do understand that the vote on this is scheduled for tomorrow, but right now, we are debating a same-day rule that allows for the consideration of this.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, the fact is that this measure was filed at 11:37 p.m., and we were told, up until just a short time ago, that we had to do this same-day rule because we were going to be voting on this measure today. So it was not until just the last moment that we found that the debate will take place throughout today and this evening but that the actual vote will take place tomorrow.

So I don't know exactly what has led to this, if it's an awakening about the

notion of some kind of fairness and about the idea of allowing for greater deliberation; but I've got to say, Madam Speaker, that this budget, which dramatically increases, as we all know, the size of the deficit is a budget which, I don't believe, the majority of the American people supported or wanted when they came forward.

□ 1530

The American people are hurting.

I will say, Madam Speaker, that I represent the Los Angeles area part of San Bernardino County. We have an unemployment rate that is well into double digits now both in the Los Angeles area, the Inland Empire. People are hurting. They very much want us to take action to get the economy back on track.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I will yield in just a moment if I can complete my thought.

There are many Democrats who I know in southern California who have indicated to me that when they voted for President Obama, for Barack Obama to become President of the United States, they had no idea that we would see this kind of dramatic transformation—which is something that he talked about—of government that is tripling, quadrupling the size of the government and the national debt.

And it is not just my constituents. There are a number of very thoughtful people who have come forward in the past 4 weeks. They include the likes of Stuart Taylor who writes regularly for the National Journal. He describes himself as an Obama-friendly centrist, and what he has said is that this dramatic surge to the left—which is exactly what this Obama budget does which is being supported by Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership—is really beyond the pale. And there are a number of other people who have been very supportive of the President up to this point who have demonstrated clear disappointment in this kind of direction.

With that, I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend.

So my friend is acknowledging, is he not, that Members who wish to read the budget will have over tonight to do that before there is a vote tomorrow, correct?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, the answer to that is no. When is it that the debate will take place on this issue?

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. ANDREWS. The debate is starting today and concluding tomorrow. The conclusion of debate will be tomorrow.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, this bill was filed at 11:37 p.m. last night, just about midnight, and we are standing here at this moment debating something that I guess really isn't necessary.

The fact is what we have done is we've thrown out standard procedure

for one reason and one reason only: not because the government is about to run out of money, not because we've got an important recess upon us, not because it's the end of the week, but simply because we want a photo opportunity for the completion of the first 100 days of this Presidency.

I understand that optics are important. I recognize that. But I do believe that since we have begun already at this moment the debate on this budget conference report, merely hours—12, 13, 14 hours—after it was filed last night, you can say that the vote is going to take place tomorrow but Members who might want to have the chance to debate, deliberate and think about this issue are not going to have the allocated time to read this.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course I am happy to yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many of the gentleman's Members from his side are here to deliberate and debate this right now, out of curiosity?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, we are at this moment debating this convoluted, unnecessary same-day rule. We are here to debate whether or not we should proceed with consideration of the budget conference report under a totally unnecessary same-day rule.

We have had some very thoughtful remarks by my friend from Lafayette, and I know if my friend would like me to send someone to the cloakroom to call the lode of Republicans to come over and engage in this debate, I know that there would be many more who would join us.

The fact is we have begun this process prematurely. We are not being provided what was promised by the Speaker of the House on her opening day and promised by Barack Obama when he was a candidate to be President of the United States, and that is an adequate amount of time to deliberate over this process.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me apologize to the gentleman, again, for him getting what he wants. The Democratic leadership promised 24 hours for Members to be able to review this bill before there was a vote. They are going to get more than 24 hours. Let me also point out to the gentleman when he talks about this kind of unpopularity of President Barack Obama's ideas and his budget, maybe he hasn't seen the recent polls. By a 56 percent to 32 percent margin, Americans believe that the Obama budget sets the right priorities.

I think what is difficult for the gentleman to accept and members of his party is that the people have spoken. The people have had it with Bush economics. They've had it with the Republican priorities of the last 8 years. They want a change. This budget rep-

resents a change, and they are going to get it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes at this time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report for the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. The previous administration left us with a tremendous challenge to overcome the largest budget deficit ever, the highest unemployment rate in 25 years, housing values in freefall, consumer confidence at record lows. This budget encapsulates a bold vision for making crucial investments in righting our economy and helping our working families.

I am pleased that, at my request, the budget reflects an investment in our Federal workforce, including parity between civilian and military Federal employees. Pay parity ensures equitable treatment for all Federal employees.

I applaud the conference report's increase in the level of funding for international affairs, Madam Speaker. Defense Secretary Robert Gates said in July, under the Bush administration, "It has become clear that America's civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chronically undermanned and underfunded for far too long." Secretary Gates understands, and understood then, the value of diplomacy as a national security tool and we would be well served to support that critical investment. I am delighted the conference report has added back funds for the 150 Function.

This budget is transformative and provides for the critical investments in America that have been neglected for too long. Deficit reduction, middle-income tax relief, health care reform, education and energy independence are the linchpins of this budget.

With this budget, we will cut in half the current deficit of more than \$1 trillion, most of it inherited from President Bush. It would further reduce that deficit by 2014 by two-thirds. This budget reduces non-defense discretionary spending over the next 10 years to its lowest level as a percentage of the gross domestic product in almost a half a century.

This budget supports the middle class by expanding the child tax credit, maintaining the elimination of the marriage tax penalty, carrying forward the Making Work Pay tax credit, maintaining the estate tax and capital gains tax reductions and ensuring that the alternative minimum tax does not hit the millions of working Americans in danger otherwise of being affected.

This budget supports meaningful health care reform. During the last 8 years, the number of Americans without health insurance increased from 13.7 percent to 15.3 percent of the population at the same time health care costs were skyrocketing. Under this

budget, Madam Speaker, we will be able to offer health care to the 46 million Americans currently without insurance.

This budget invests in energy independence and promotes a clean energy economy creating jobs. Increasing our investment in energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies will promote America's energy independence and safeguard our environment.

In recognition of the critical role that education plays in our economic productivity, this budget also builds upon the classroom support provided in the Recovery Act. From enhancing Head Start and other early childhood learning opportunities to making college more affordable through Pell Grants, this budget will prepare our children to become productive, contributing members of the global economy.

This budget is the product of the hard work of Chairman SPRATT, Chairman CONRAD in the other body, and the budget conferees; and it carries forward the bold investments in America that President Obama has promised this country.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

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

I am glad my friend from New Jersey has remained here on the floor.

First of all, I have just got to say that on this notion that we somehow are doing this in a very fair way, my time travel skills have become a little rusty of late, and I will say that the bill was filed at 11:37 last night, and a number of us are just starting to read it, the conference report, that is. I don't know whether we're going to have the vote today or tomorrow, but the fact is we are debating it today. So Members should have an opportunity to do that.

Now my friend began his remarks in the well by saying that this conference report has no mention whatsoever of the issue of cap-and-trade.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course I am happy to yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is not what I said. I said that the conference report does not enact cap-and-trade.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, I will say that during the debate that we had on the budget process, we regularly had Members say that there was no mention of this whatsoever. I know. I managed the rule when we had the first budget. I am just saying that a number of Members did, in fact, on the other side of the aisle make that very clear during debate.

What I would like to do is commend to my colleagues sections 302 and 323 of this conference report, both of which make mention of that.

I would like to yield 30 seconds to the hardworking member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Lafayette, Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I think it's important to recognize that this budget proposes to enact cap-and-trade legislation. It's one of the assumptions in the budget.

The gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned that the American people have spoken about this, but I want to remind him that, again, there are a lot of unanswered questions about the inherent proposals in the budget, such as the impact on unemployment based on some of the assumptions in this budget.

I've got data from the oil and gas industry that shows pretty devastating results across the board on the gulf coast and in manufacturing in other States around the country as a result of the assumptions in this budget.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend.

Madam Chair, let me just say that as interesting as we regularly have the finger of blame pointed at Bush, what President Obama has inherited came from President George W. Bush and, Madam Speaker, as you know very well, a Democratic majority here in the House of Representatives.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would say to my friend from California that the Democratic majority with a Democratic President will demonstrate to the gentleman what we believe in and will enact it.

With respect to the issue of cap-and-trade, the two sections that are referenced in the budget conference report say this: If the Congress enacts cap-and-trade legislation, then the budget numbers will be adjusted to reflect that being enacted. If this conference report passes, there will be no limit on carbon enacted. There will be no revenues raised to enforce that limit. It simply says that if the Congress in subsequent consideration does that, then, in fact, the budget would be adjusted.

The minority has consistently frankly used a number of tax increase per household that the authors of the study on which they rely have said was a misrepresentation.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Speaker, for too many years, administrations of Congress honored our veterans with speeches on Veterans Day, yet dishonored them with inadequate

budgets every other day. Then 2 years ago, when the gentlewoman from California, Ms. PELOSI, became Speaker of the House, she promised it would be a new day for America's veterans. Speaker PELOSI has kept her promise to those who have kept their promise to serve our Nation in uniform.

The results are historic and unprecedented. In just 2 years, the Democratic Congress has increased veterans' health care and benefits funding by over \$17 billion. That is a larger increase than the Republican-controlled House passed cumulatively over 12 years. This Democratic funding increase for veterans means better quality health care for 5.8 million veterans and shorter waiting times for doctor appointments and earned benefits for combat wounded veterans. It means more extensive mental health care services for veterans suffering from PTSD.

□ 1545

Then, candidate Obama last year said he would, if elected President, keep our Nation's sacred trust with our veterans. President Obama fulfilled that promise when earlier this year he asked for a larger increase in the VA budget than any President in American history.

This budget resolution on the floor of the House right now reflects the President's priority for honoring our veterans. It increases VA discretionary spending for veterans' health care and benefits by \$5.6 billion in fiscal year 2010, and by \$27 billion over the next 5 years. And at the President's request, it allows forward funding for the VA health care system, the highest of priorities for our veteran service organizations.

Listen to what respected veterans' organizations have said about this budget resolution. The American Legion said—

Mr. BOUSTANY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. No. I would rather quote the American Legion.

The American Legion said "it applauds the Conference Committee." It goes on to say, "This funding will help cover the ongoing cost of war to care for the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and their families."

The Veterans of Foreign Wars said this, in a letter to Chairmen SPRATT and CONRAD, "The VFW salutes your strong leadership in quickly coming to an agreement, especially one that makes so many meaningful and valuable improvements to the Department of Veterans Affairs. We strongly encourage all in Congress to follow your lead and adopt this conference report." Those are the words of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

They went on to say, "An advanced appropriation for veterans' medical care is among the VFW's highest priorities, and we sincerely appreciate that you brought this excellent proposal

forward." That is the proposal that we will vote yes or no on in this House.

The Disabled American Veterans said this spending blueprint "is good news for our Nation's veterans. Not only does it provide a record increase for the Department of Veterans Affairs, this resolution clears the way for much-needed legislation to ensure sufficient, timely, and predictable funding for veterans' health care." Those are the words of the DAV.

By significantly increasing funding for the VA and by allowing for the first time advanced appropriations for VA medical care, this resolution meets the highest priorities of America's heroes, our veterans.

A vote for this budget resolution is a vote to honor and respect America's veterans. They deserve that vote. They have earned that vote with their service and their sacrifice.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, my friend refused to yield to the gentleman from Lafayette, who wanted to engage in debate, which is what this is all about, so I am happy to yield 1 minute to my friend from Lafayette.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman.

I think it is a mischaracterization to say that we cut veteran spending. We actually raised veteran spending each year we were in the majority. But I want to point out something else, and that is—

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOUSTANY. No, I am not going to yield to the gentleman. I want to complete a thought.

The gentleman was standing here at the podium saying that we are going to spend this and we are going to spend that on veterans; but at the same time, my friend from New Jersey was earlier saying that this is a budget proposal that doesn't enact anything. So I think we are seeing a double standard being discussed over here.

We all recognize this is a proposal, it is a political document, but I have to say that we oppose it because it proposes to borrow too much, it proposes to spend too much, and it proposes to tax too much.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Speaker, first let me say to the gentleman, if he had listened to my words, he would have heard I didn't accuse the Republicans of cutting the VA budget. I did accuse them—rightfully so, and the veterans organizations would agree with me—of underfunding VA health care and benefit needs during the 12 years. You had the ability to increase the VA budget to adequate levels, and you never did it. And the fact is that this budget resolution authorizes an historic increase in VA health care and benefit spending. If the gentleman disagrees with that increase, then he certainly has a right to vote "no." For

me, I am going to stand on the side of the DAV, the American Legion, and the VFW, who strongly support this budget resolution and its support of America's veterans.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time. We are standing here today doing something that is absolutely unnecessary. As I said in my opening remarks, why would we throw the rules out the window and have consideration of what is on occasion needed to rush through legislation, a same-day rule?

The notion of a same-day rule undermines what was promised by candidate Obama, by Speaker PELOSI, and others in the Democratic leadership, and that is, that we would have a higher degree of deliberation. This conference report was, as I said, filed at 11:37 p.m. last night, some 15, 16 hours ago.

We are in the midst of beginning the debate, and we are going to proceed to debate this. And now we have heard, in the last hour or so, that a decision was made that we will vote tomorrow, and that somehow will allow this to look as if it's fair. Well, again, Madam Speaker, we are in the midst of debating a document which Members have not had an adequate enough time to see.

Now, that aside, it is clear that the American people are hurting. I mentioned the fact that I just got back last night from Los Angeles. We have serious problems in our city, in our county, and in the State of California. We have serious problems all across this country. People are losing their homes, people are losing their jobs.

And what we hear from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle is the finger of blame is pointed at George W. Bush, in large part because of deficit spending. And now, what was, as I said, inherited by President Obama from President Bush, yes—and a Congress that has been controlled by Democrats for the last 2 years—they have inherited an economy which is facing serious problems, an economy that is clearly in recession. Madam Speaker, the solution is to do what economists across the board, Democrats and Republicans, not Republican political operatives, but many Democratic economists have said is not the right solution.

My friend from St. Louis, Mr. AKIN, has come to quote the Treasury Secretary under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Henry Morgenthau, who, in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, said, "We've tried spending money. We've spent more money than we've ever spent before. Now, after 8 years of this Roosevelt administration, we have an unemployment rate that is just as high as when we started and an enormous debt to boot."

We know what the economic answer is to the challenges that we have. And I have regularly talked about it here, Madam Speaker, and that is, we need to take what has been promised by our friends on the other side of the aisle, but is totally ignored on a regular basis, and that is a bipartisan approach. And when I say a bipartisan approach, I believe we should take the ideas that were put forth by President John F. Kennedy in the early 1960s and Ronald Reagan in the early 1980s, and what we need to do, Madam Speaker, is we need to have a growth-oriented tax rate reduction that will stimulate the economy and generate the kind of revenue flow that is needed.

We need to pursue market opening opportunities for us around the world rather than sticking our head in the sand and ignoring things like the Colombia Free Trade Agreement and the South Korea Free Trade Agreement. That would go a long way towards creating jobs, good jobs right here in the United States of America if we can again pry open those markets. Those are the kinds of things we should be doing. And all we are getting, Madam Speaker, is a package that dramatically increases the size of the annual deficit and the national debt.

Madam Speaker, in this budget, the deficit alone for the next year is larger than the entire budget was a mere 10 years ago.

So Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to work hard to get the economy back on track. The best way that we can do that is to reject this same-day rule and reject this conference report and get back to the table with something that will get our economy back on track.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me first begin by saying something about the process. The Democratic leadership promised that Members would have 24 hours to review the budget before it was voted on. There will be more than 24 hours to view this budget.

This budget has gone through a long process. We had more than 14 hours of markup in the Budget Committee. I've lost count of how many amendments were offered. Again, there were four substitutes that were made in order and debated and voted on this floor. We had an open conference committee meeting that produced this final product. We are going to have over 24 hours to review it.

So I guess if people want to complain for the sake of complaining, there is not much we can do on this side to deal with that. But the fact of the matter is this has been a fair process and this has been a good process. I want to commend Chairman SPRATT and Ranking Member RYAN and the staffs, both Democratic and Republican staffs, for their incredible work, their tireless work on this budget.

I am proud of the budget we are going to vote on. This is a budget with

a conscience for a change. This is something that our constituents from the east coast to the west coast, I think, are going to find things in here that they can cheer about.

This is a budget that creates jobs with targeted investments in affordable health care, clean energy, and education. It cuts taxes for middle-income families by more than \$1.7 trillion over 10 years. It cuts the deficit by nearly two-thirds in 4 years. And it cuts non-defense discretionary spending as a percent of the economy.

We are going to deal with health care. For years, ever since I came to Congress—I got elected in 1996—the number one issue that every poll shows that Americans want us to deal with is health care. We are going to be able to deal with it, I believe, this year. We are going to deal with college affordability so that everybody who wants to get a college education can get one, and nobody is denied a college education because they can't afford to get one.

We are going to deal with the issue of clean energy. We are going to actually begin to invest in renewable, clean, alternative sources of energy so we are not reliant solely on the oil industry or on foreign imports for our energy. So there is a lot in this budget I think that we all can be very proud of.

You are going to have 24 hours to review the budget. Even if you had 124 hours, my guess is that my friends on the other side of the aisle would be against this budget. They have been against virtually everything this new President has proposed. I think their kind of rationale there, their philosophy for regaining political power is to deny this new President any victory, any accomplishment.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am not going to yield at this time. I didn't interrupt you during your closing statement.

The fact of the matter is that people are tired of a party that says "no" to everything. That was demonstrated loud and clear in the last election. We need to move in a new direction.

I think what the American people are hearing, quite frankly, is they are hearing that help is on the way. That is why 56 percent of the Americans polled agree with the priorities in this budget. They are hearing that help is on the way for all Americans, not just the wealthy few, the wealthy few who have benefited greatly over the last 8 years.

Things are different. Change is happening here in Washington, and I am proud to be part of this process.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered. 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. DREIER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1913, LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT OF 2009**

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-91) on the resolution (H. Res. 372) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1913) to provide Federal assistance to States, local jurisdictions, and Indian tribes to prosecute hate crimes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1626. An act to make technical amendments to laws containing time periods affecting judicial proceedings.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 386. An act to improve enforcement of mortgage fraud, securities fraud, financial institution fraud, and other frauds related to federal assistance and relief programs, for the recovery of funds lost to these frauds, and for other purposes.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Suspending the rules with respect to H.R. 1243 and House Resolution 344, and adopting House Resolution 365.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

**AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ARNOLD PALMER**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1243, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1243.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 1, answered “present” 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Adler (NJ)  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Bocchieri  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bright  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Cao  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castle  
Castor (FL)  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Childers  
Clarke  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Dahlkemper  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis (TN)  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLaHunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Driehaus  
Duncan  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gordon (TN)  
Granger  
Graves  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Halvorson  
Hare  
Harman  
Harper  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heinrich  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Himes  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Inglis  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Jordan (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kilroy  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
Kissell  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Kosmas  
Kratovich  
Kucinich  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NY)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeback  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey (CO)  
Markey (MA)  
Marshall  
Massa  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCullum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMahon  
McMorris  
McMorris  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)

Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minnick  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler (NY)  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Nye  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olson  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Perriello  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis (CO)  
Pomeroy  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Quigley  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Teague  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Walz  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Slaughter

NOT VOTING—8

Brown, Corrine  
Burgess  
Clay  
Jackson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Stark  
Wu

□ 1629

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Ms. SLAUGHTER changed her vote from “yea” to “present.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 344.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 344.