

## OIL SPILL PREVENTION ACT

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, this week, I introduced the Oil Spill Prevention Act of 2010. This Deepwater spill is the worst environmental disaster in U.S. history. My bill would prevent future disasters from happening.

Number one, we want to reform the Interior Department by separating revenues—a structural separation of revenues in leasing from inspections. In other words, we've got people that are doing the leases on the revenue side cutting deals on environmental exemptions.

Second, strengthen the oversight of inspections. Sixteen inspections were missed with BP. That's got to stop with BP and the industry. We need to reschedule and make sure every safety inspection is done.

Three, eliminate the liability caps on major oil spills. Today, it's at \$75 million. That's a joke. This is going to be tens of billions of dollars to fix.

We need to act now. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my bill and we'll eliminate spills.

□ 1030

## HOLDING BIG OIL ACCOUNTABLE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, the gulf coast catastrophe underscores the need for comprehensive energy and climate reform to rein in Big Oil and reduce our reliance on dirty and foreign fuels. For too long under the Bush administration, Big Oil was able to operate with complete disregard for safety; and instead of standing up for the people, businesses and the environment, House Republicans continued to side with Big Oil.

The Democratic-led Congress is moving America in a new direction for energy independence, working to lower costs for consumers, making America more secure, and launching a cleaner, smarter, more cost-effective energy future that creates millions of clean energy jobs and reduces global warming.

## HONORING MARINE LANCE CORPORAL TIMOTHY G. SERWINOWSKI

(Mr. LEE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEE of New York. I rise today to honor a great man, Marine Lance Corporal Timothy G. Serwinowski. Just 21 years old, Lance Corporal Serwinowski was killed in action while serving in southern Afghanistan this past Sunday. A native of Tonawanda, New York, and a 2007 graduate of North Tonawanda High School, Tim enjoyed sing-

ing and playing the guitar. He played football throughout high school and was honored by his coaches during his senior year for his "excellence and leadership," and he took those traits to the marines.

When asked why he wanted to enlist with the marines, he said, "If you're going to do it, you go with the best." Tim strove to be the best, and his life was taken far too soon. Both Tim and his family—some who I know personally—have paid the ultimate sacrifice for our country, and we owe it to them our renewed commitment to bring our men and women home as soon as possible. Tim served our Nation with valor and with honor, and he will be deeply missed by the many whose lives he has touched.

## PASS A JOBS BILL BY PUTTING PARTISAN POLITICS ASIDE

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it's time to put partisan politics aside and pass a jobs bill that would do the following: extend unemployment benefits to the thousands and thousands of our fellow citizens that find themselves unemployed due to no fault of their own, that would protect the health of our seniors dependent on Medicare by restoring a 21 percent cut in Medicare reimbursement to our doctors, and extend tax credits and benefits essential to the American people.

Surely there are three Republican Senators that are willing to break with their partisan beliefs and stand up with the American people so that those that are unemployed can get their benefits and take care of their families; the doctors can continue to take care of Medicare patients; our seniors will continue to see their doctors; and we can provide the necessary tax credits and benefits that the American people are demanding and asking for.

I ask everybody to think of the American people instead of their own narrow interests. Let's get this thing done.

## PROTECT FREEDOM OF POLITICAL SPEECH FROM THE DISCLOSE ACT

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, we're going to start talking about a rule and then go into the substance of a bill called the DISCLOSE Act. The DISCLOSE Act supposedly talks merely about disclosure of political speech, but what it really does is affect the First Amendment to the Constitution which says, Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. It does not say, Congress will pass laws which allow some people to speak but

not others, and yet that's what the bill does that's being brought to us.

If you happen to be a big organization, a large special interest with a lot of money and have been around a long time, you are exempt from the disclosure requirements. But if you happen to be somebody like, oh, the tea party or a smaller group or you don't have all the money or you haven't been around for 10 years, you have the imposition of the burden of disclosure which, in some cases, will make it impossible for you to exercise free speech.

You know, the First Amendment talks about speech. My friends on the other side of the aisle love to talk about how it protects, oh, nude dancing or something like that. How about talking about political speech.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5175, DEMOCRACY IS STRENGTHENED BY CASTING LIGHT ON SPENDING IN ELECTIONS ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1468 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1468

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5175) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit foreign influence in Federal elections, to prohibit government contractors from making expenditures with respect to such elections, and to establish additional disclosure requirements with respect to spending in such elections, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a

demand for division of the question. All points of order against such further amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry further amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on House Administration or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of June 25, 2010, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 4. 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 through the legislative day of June 25, 2010, providing for consideration or disposition of a measure that includes a subject matter addressed by H.R. 4213.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BERKLEY). 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 North Carolina, Dr. FOXX. 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 material into the RECORD on House Resolution 1468.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1040

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

Madam Speaker, the resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 5175, the DISCLOSE Act, under a structured rule. The resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The resolution provides 1 hour of debate on the bill. The resolution provides that the substitute amendment, recommended by the House Administration Committee, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted.

The resolution makes in order five amendments printed in part B of the

Rules Committee report. The resolution waives all points of order against such amendments except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The resolution provides one motion to recommit without or without instructions, provides that the Chair may entertain a motion to rise only if offered by the chair of the House Administration Committee or his designee, and provides that the Chair may not entertain a motion to strike the enacting words of the bill.

The resolution permits the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules through the legislative day of Friday, June 25, 2010.

The resolution waives a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote for same day consideration of a report from the Rules Committee through the legislative day of Friday, June 25, on a measure that includes a subject matter in H.R. 4213.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and in strong support of the underlying bill. During my time in Congress, I haven't had a single constituent say to me, "You know, Jim, I think there should be more special interest money in politics."

Obviously, the conservative activist judges that now make up the majority of the Supreme Court don't live in my district. Because in January, the court tossed aside decades of established law and legal precedent by ruling that corporations and unions can spend unlimited amounts of money in Federal elections.

As Justice John Paul Stevens pointed out in his dissent, the decision "would appear to afford the same protection to multinational corporations controlled by foreigners as to individual Americans."

It is a sad state of affairs when Swift Boating has entered the language as a verb. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court's decision makes Swift Boating easier for the special interests. Large multinational corporations would now be able to create shadowy groups and pour millions and millions of dollars into supporting or defeating candidates. If BP doesn't like somebody, they could create "Americans For Sensible Energy" and run attack ad after attack ad after attack ad.

While we cannot undo the court's decision, we can and we must try to minimize its impact. That is why the sensible, bipartisan legislation before us today is so important. The DISCLOSE Act will go a long way toward restoring openness and transparency in our political process. I want to commend CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and MIKE CASTLE for their work on this bill.

The legislation does several important things. It requires the heads of these third-party organizations to stand by their ad, just like political candidates are required to do. It requires the organization to list its top five contributors onscreen at the end of the ad.

It would ban U.S. corporations that are controlled by foreign interests and

foreign companies like BP from making political expenditures in our elections. I know there are some on the other side who have been apologists for BP who may be troubled by that, but I think most Americans believe that foreign influences should not dictate our elections.

And it would prohibit entities that receive large amounts of taxpayer money like Wall Street banks and Government contractors from pouring money into politics.

The bill is supported by the League of Women Voters, Public Citizen, Common Cause, and other national reform groups.

To be sure, the bill isn't perfect. It contains an exemption for certain, long-standing organizations that take a small amount of corporate or union money. I know a lot of us are not particularly pleased with that change, but we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

Moving forward, I would urge my colleagues to examine a bill offered by my colleague from Massachusetts, MIKE CAPUANO, the Shareholder Protection Act. This bill would give shareholders a voice in how companies spend their money.

Opponents of this bill that we are considering today have already begun making noises about challenging it in court. I would remind them that polls show that the American people are overwhelmingly supportive of this reform. We must do all we can to bring more openness and transparency to our political process. The DISCLOSE Act before us today is a vital step. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

I rise today in defense of the First Amendment to the Constitution and to urge my colleagues to oppose this rule for H.R. 5175, the so-called DISCLOSE Act, and the underlying bill.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the Republican whip.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the previous question motion and in support of the latest YouCut spending reduction sent to the floor directly from the American people. This week's proposal, sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), will restore \$15 billion to the American taxpayer by stopping new IRS funding for the purpose of hiring employees to enforce a controversial individual mandate under the Democratic majority's health care overhaul.

To the Democratic majority, who has worked tirelessly to discredit the YouCut movement, Madam Speaker, I continue to urge them to join us. But I would also like to give a wake-up call. This week we received the one millionth vote, an amazing milestone that

reflects the discomfort from coast to coast about Washington's runaway spending spree.

Sadly, my friends on the other side of the aisle continue to ignore the will of the people and their desire to see us act with the same responsibility with their money that they do around their own kitchen tables.

America is at a crossroads. Our message to the Democratic leadership is crystal clear: Stop ignoring the American people. Stop spending money we don't have. Stop ruining the next generation's future. It is time for us to come together to cut wasteful spending now. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would just want to point out to the previous speaker that the American people want us to fix this economy, which we are trying to do. And I would also point out that we have created more jobs this year than in the entire 8 years of the Bush administration. I think what we are doing is the American people's work.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for making the point he just made.

Madam Speaker, I also would like to make a further point, which is that 87.5 percent of the American people support what the DISCLOSE Act will do, which is to shed light on elections.

Madam Speaker, nearly a century ago, Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis wrote about the dangers of corporate interests dominating our economy, stifling competition, and harming our Nation. And he reminded us in the face of these forces that sunlight is the best of disinfectants.

Today, many of us will rise, and I do now in that same tradition, to shed sunlight on our democratic process and preserve the integrity of our elections, to call on my colleagues to pass the DISCLOSE Act, and in doing so to protect the voices and the votes of the American people.

I want to acknowledge key leaders on both sides of the aisle who have taken leadership on this legislation. Chairman CHRIS VAN HOLLEN certainly has been tireless in his efforts to pass this DISCLOSE Act, as has Chairman ROBERT BRADY, chair of the House Administration Committee. I also thank Congressman MIKE CASTLE and Congressman WALTER JONES, who early on supported this legislation.

Earlier this year, the Supreme Court overturned decades of precedents in a court case called the Citizens United case. The decision undermines democracy and empowers the powerful. It opens the floodgates to corporate takeover of our elections and invites unrestricted special interest dollars in our campaigns. And it even left open the door to donations from companies owned by foreign governments. Imagine.

In response, Congress and the President immediately went to work on the DISCLOSE Act.

□ 1050

This legislation restores transparency and accountability to Federal campaigns and ensures that Americans know when Wall Street, Big Oil, and health insurers are the ones behind political advertisements. The bill requires corporate CEOs to stand by their ads in the same way candidates do, prevents corporations controlled by foreign or even hostile governments from spending money in Federal elections, and keeps government contractors and TARP recipients from making political expenditures. Imagine a TARP recipient getting taxpayer money to bail them out, using that money to impact elections. And it compels corporations and outside groups to disclose their campaign spending to shareholders, members, and the public.

In the spirit of Justice Brandeis, these landmark provisions will add sunlight to our campaigns, which is why the DISCLOSE Act has gained the support of good government advocates such as the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, Public Citizen, Democracy 21, and Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, to name a few. These organizations, like so many Members of Congress, agree with the words of the President's State of the Union Address this year when he said, "Elections should be decided by the American people."

The DISCLOSE Act reaffirms a fundamental American value: The right to vote is afforded to the people, not the special interests. With this bill, no longer will corporations be able to drown out the voices of ordinary citizens. By voting "yes," we are putting power back into the hands of the voters.

I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" today on this legislation.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I will now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, our national debt is over \$13 trillion and our annual deficit is expected to be nearly \$1.6 trillion this year alone. The American people have had enough of this out-of-control spending. And today House Republicans offer another measure to cut spending that was chosen by the American people in the YouCut program.

This provision will cut funding for the IRS, which is authorized to hire thousands of new agents to enforce the unconstitutional individual health care mandate. This cut will save taxpayers up to \$10 billion. The purpose of the health care law was supposed to be to reduce costs and to make health care more affordable. Does anyone truly believe that thousands of new IRS agents will really reduce health care costs? The new IRS agents' job will be to verify that you have acceptable government-approved health care, or they

have the authority to impose a fine of up to 2 percent of your income.

What we need to do is to help to create new jobs, not hire an army of new IRS agents to impose job-killing taxes, new mandates, and new penalties on the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can make this commonsense cut in spending under our YouCut program.

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

My Republican colleagues claim that they have the best interests of the American people at heart, that they want to help the taxpayers. Yet I find it somewhat ironic that they propose that we cut money for jobs, money for health care, money for senior citizens, and then at the same time they defend British Petroleum and tell the American people that the American people should pay for the cleanup of that terrible oil spill and not British Petroleum.

Look, what we are talking about here is a bill to require disclosure so that companies like British Petroleum, other foreign-owned companies, can't come into the United States and influence elections. Now, I don't know why that's so controversial. I guess if a particular interest was overly generous to me, like Big Oil is to my friends on the Republican side, that they would have objections. But look, I think the American people overwhelmingly want transparency and disclosure.

If some oil company is going to come into my district and Swift Boat me and try to hide who they are by saying that they are a committee for clean oceans, that's deception. The American people ought to know that it's being paid for by Big Oil. We have, right now, all across the country, ads that are distorting the health care bill that was passed here in the Congress. But they are all paid for by the insurance industry, yet you can't find the words "insurance industry" on any of those ads.

People deserve to know who is spending millions and millions of dollars on these ads. Whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, you ought to be for transparency. And that is what this bill is about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, every citizen in this country, in fact, every school child above the fifth grade ought to know what the First Amendment of the Constitution says. But we know that our education is lacking these days, so I am going to read the amendment. And I am hoping that as our speakers speak, we keep it on the floor so people can read it, because I think folks need to be reminded of what it says. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and

to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." It's very simple, but it's very important.

I now yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I am sorry the Speaker is no longer here because she, frankly, hopefully inadvertently, misstated the law. She said that with the decision by the Supreme Court, it would allow companies, even those that are controlled by foreign countries or foreign governments, to affect our elections. That is absolutely dead wrong. It did nothing with the prohibition that remains that does not allow and has not allowed for decades foreign governments or foreign nationals to affect our campaigns. This decision by the Supreme Court does not.

The problem with this is I haven't found a single person on the other side of the aisle that read the opinion. If they did, they would know what they are saying is absolutely wrong. They call it the DISCLOSE Act. It is, in fact, the disguise act. It was designed in secret. No effort to bring those of us on the committee on the Republican side into it. I asked for copies of it. They refused to give it to us. We, in fact, got their last manager's amendment 2 hours, yesterday, before we had to go to the Rules Committee to talk about our amendments. They disallow, in this rule, a single amendment brought forward by any of us on the committee that held the hearings.

I had five amendments I asked to present. Several of them would require the unions to be treated the same as corporations. That was denied. They don't want you to have a chance to level the playing field. Look, in "Alice in Wonderland," it is said, "If I had a world of my own, everything would be nonsense. Nothing would be what it is, because everything would be what it isn't. And contrarywise, what is, it wouldn't be. And what it wouldn't be, it would. You see?" That basically sums up the Speaker's statement.

If I had the chance under the House rules to speak to the public, this is what I would say. This is your First Amendment. It's not my First Amendment. It's not the Democratic leadership's First Amendment. And yet they are auctioning off parts of this First Amendment by this bill. Why do I say that? Some people are more equal than others.

If you happen to be a special interest that's existed for 10 years, if you happen to have a certain amount of money in your coffers that come from corporations, if you happen to have a certain number of members—it was a million, but some special interest said, We don't have a million; let's bring it down to 500,000. Okay. Now it's 500,000. So those people, those interests are exempted from all of the disclosure requirements in here.

And here is the other thing they do under this rule. This bill allows the law

to go into effect within 30 days without any regulations being promulgated. In fact, it's impossible for regulations to be promulgated. So those who have a true exemption don't have to worry about the law. Those who are trying to figure out how to comply with the law have to worry about if they make a mistake because, if they do, what happens?

□ 1100

They are subject to criminal penalties. We're talking about the First Amendment to the Constitution, the First Amendment. That's talking about robust political speech, and you heard what my friends on the other side said: oh, my God, we've had these ads against us; oh, we don't like that; oh, my gosh, we've got to do something about it.

There is nothing this bill does about the suppression ads that were run against me in the last campaign 3 hours before we closed, "robocalls" to my district, including to my house, in which they say, this is a news alert, news alert, President Obama's won the election. It doesn't matter what happens in California. It's already decided. This has been a news alert.

Now, no one specified an individual. No one specified a party. Very, very clever. The idea was to suppress those who were supporting the Republicans from coming out. It does nothing with that. I mean, people ought to understand this is a precious gift given to us by God, then recognized by our Founding Fathers, and we're fooling around with it here.

Let me just tell you this. This bill allows us 1 hour to talk about this, 1 hour. Guess what we have spent 10 hours doing in this Congress. Naming post offices. We've named 61 post offices in this Congress. We are ridding the world of unnamed post offices. We can spend 10 hours on post offices, but we can't spend more than an hour talking about the Constitution, talking about the First Amendment.

And they're auctioning pieces of the First Amendment in this bill. If you happen to be one of those lucky enough to win the auction, you don't have these disclosure rules, and you can continue to talk and you can continue to make your political statement; but if you didn't win the lottery—

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If you didn't win the lottery, you're left out.

This is an affront to the Constitution. This is an affront to the proceedings of this House, and just because someone says it is doesn't make it so.

This is a DISCLOSE Act that was designed in secret, giving unions and interests special exemptions. If you happen to be on the lucky side of the draw, you may like it, but you ought to read

it because this is a destruction of the First Amendment in the name of partisanship.

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

One of the reasons why the American people overwhelmingly support the DISCLOSE Act is because quite frankly they are concerned, and rightly so, that money is becoming more and more of an influence in politics. Not just money from big corporations in the United States; they are also justifiably concerned about foreign influences.

Sovereign wealth funds, the investment funds controlled by foreign governments of foreign interests, could be controlled by China. If they're here in the United States, they have the right to be able to under an innocuous name spend millions and millions of dollars in negative ads against a candidate or positive ads for a candidate. Why should anybody want a foreign government or foreign interest to have a greater impact on American elections than regular people?

One of the reasons why this is important is to let the sunshine in, for there to be transparency, for those who run these ads to be able to stand by their ads. All of us have to stand by our ads when we stand for reelection to Congress. I have to say that it's paid for and authorized by JIM MCGOVERN. That's what we have to do.

What is so wrong with requiring big corporations to do the same thing? What is so wrong with saying we don't want foreign interests to influence our elections? These are American elections. We don't want China involved in these elections or any other country; and we know that they can, under the status quo, influence our elections and play a role in our elections through these sovereign wealth funds.

So I would simply say I think the American people are right. There's nothing in the First Amendment that says we can't ask somebody to stand by their words. We're not inhibiting free speech. We're just saying if British Petroleum is going to run a Swift Boat ad against anybody here, they ought to say who they are, not make up some name that somehow they're dedicated to clean oceans or to a good environment.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Let me reiterate to my good friend from Massachusetts what the gentleman from California said. Citizens United did not do anything to repeal the ban against foreign money influencing American elections. So this bill has nothing to do with what the gentleman from Massachusetts just said.

I rise in opposition to the bill and to the rule. While H.R. 5175 is being touted by its supporters as increasing disclosure and transparency, the bill will

ultimately serve as a roadblock to Americans who wish to exercise their First Amendment rights. The Supreme Court explicitly stated in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* that there is “no basis for the proposition that, in the context of political speech, the government may impose restrictions on certain disfavored speakers.” We’ve sure heard a list of those disfavored speakers from the other side of the aisle. However, this is exactly what this unconstitutional bill will do.

The Citizens United decision struck down provisions of campaign finance law because of the unconstitutional restrictions on free speech, a right explicitly guaranteed by the First Amendment. The bill is simply a legislative workaround to Citizens United. The Supreme Court was very clear that prohibitions on full legal speech are unconstitutional and will only be a matter of time should this bill become law that it’s struck down as well.

The most glaring of this bill’s unconstitutional provisions is the banning of political speech by government contractors and companies with as much as 80 percent ownership by American citizens. While a business may receive only a limited portion of its revenue from a government contract, under this bill, that business would be prohibited from engaging in political dialogue on issues that are vital to its operations.

Additionally, this bill punishes companies that attract overseas investors by banning political speech on companies where foreign nationals have at least a 20 percent stake. It is unfortunate that the supporters of this bill want to silence the voice of predominantly American companies. The bill further complicates matters for publicly traded corporations by forcing them to determine the percentage of company stock ownership by the nationality of the investor, which will most likely prove to be impossible.

It is clear that the DISCLOSE Act will institute unconstitutional restrictions. However, the crafters of this legislation have been careful to exempt labor unions from the restrictions. The desire to treat unions and corporations differently abandons the government’s long-standing policy that treats them equally. However, this is not unexpected given a story published in *The Hill* newspaper last month which revealed that the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees plan to spend in excess of \$50 million in this fall’s elections, part of which will go to protecting incumbents. It is no wonder that the Democratic supporters of this bill—

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. It is no wonder that the Democratic supporters of this bill have made special exceptions for unions, and that any attempts in

the House Administration Committee to rectify this discrimination between unions and corporations were defeated on party-line votes.

It is evident that, while this legislation increases disclosure requirements, it imposes unconstitutional restrictions on free speech just in time to influence the outcome of the midterm elections.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the DISCLOSE Act and vote “no” on the rule and uphold their oath of office.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me again point out that one of the reasons why the American people overwhelmingly support this bill is because they don’t want financial institutions, TARP recipients, to be able to use taxpayer money to run negative ads.

One of the reasons why the American people overwhelmingly support this act is because they know the status quo basically is the BP protection policy, which is you allow foreign companies to be able to set up these sovereign wealth funds and be able to funnel money into elections to run ads for and against people.

We know that the insurance industry wants to spend a lot of money in this election, but they don’t want to tell anybody they’re an insurance industry when they attack the health care plan.

We know that the Big Oil companies are going to want to run a lot of ads to try to keep their friends in Congress, those who apologize for their bad behavior; but they also know if they announce to the American people that oil companies are paying for this that they will get a different reaction.

□ 1110

So this is important. And I think the American people are way ahead of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished manager of the Rules Committee for his leadership.

I thought I would just hold up this book that has many items in it, but the most precious document is the Constitution. And I do want to say that it is clear that the First Amendment, the number one amendment in the Bill of Rights, is not violated, but enhanced by this legislation. That’s why the commonsense judgment of Americans are wholeheartedly supporting this.

I had my doubts because there are exemptions here that may help organizations that I would disagree with and do not support, but frankly, this legislation reflects the First Amendment because what it says is we want transparency that in essence tells us who you are. That is no greater affirmation of the First Amendment than one could imagine.

So it is important to acknowledge concerns expressed, but it is equally important to say that we stand on the

side of a fair and impartial election, an un-ugly election. And when you get unfettered money in elections, it becomes ugly. So that if you were in the hurricane plains, if you will, of the gulf region and you had a referendum to ask your utility company to stop putting utility poles above ground, spend some money to put them underground so we’re not in the dark for 8 and 9 weeks during a campaign season and they take their money in the referendum and work hard to defeat it, that is to undermine the needs of the people of that region. Or you have insurance companies who are not seeing what the American people are now seeing, that, wow, this health care bill really can help me, and they begin to massively campaign against the implementation of the health care bill against America’s interests.

This is what this is about because when you see who’s putting these political ads up—maybe helping another candidate, a pro-insurance, big business candidate who cares nothing about the people of this Nation—you will say, you know what? I want to side with letting this health bill work itself out. I want to side with young people being covered. I want to side with seniors getting money back from health reform. That’s what legislation is about.

So I would offer to say to my colleague on the other side of the aisle you are wrong. This Constitution and the First Amendment provides that no law should impede your right to access, to association, and to freedom of speech, but impeding it does not mean don’t tell us who you are, it does not mean contributions can hide in the dark. And every single candidacy, be it city council, or mayor, or be it a Federal election, will have the opportunity to have funds dumped on them with a means of replying.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Here’s what I’d like to do in an election—I’d like us to be able to engage and tell you what our issues are, whatever we’re running for. And yes, we have to run with the resources that we raise; and when I say that, no matter what office you are running for, no matter what party you are in. Without this legislation big money will control the people’s voice.

But what we most want to do is to break the locks and chains that big money causes in elections. We want to take away the right of those who want to demonize someone who, for example, may be interested in comprehensive immigration reform. That’s their viewpoint, they’re running on that. Maybe they’re not. Or someone who’s running against it. We don’t want to have big money demonize a perspective that maybe the public should hear.

So I don’t know what the opposition is on the other side because the First

Amendment is protected. And I believe, though it's a struggle because we know that there are elements that do raise the concern to some, but I would argue that we should want to break those locks and break those chains of big money telling the American people what to do.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 5175, the underlying bill, and the rule.

Madam Speaker, after weighing the pros and cons of H.R. 5175, the DISCLOSE Act, I have decided to support the bill. This was a decision that took a lot of deliberation, but in the end it is clear that in the absence of supporting H.R. 5175, we run the risk of witnessing the greatest deluge of unreported cash from the richest corporations and special interests that has occurred throughout the history of American politics.

Without some mechanism to ensure that the American people know who is spending potentially millions to influence their vote, we threaten the fundamental core of our democracy—the result will amount to a corporate special interest takeover of our elections. This is the reality. This is what is at stake.

Right now, any corporation can spend unlimited amounts of money on our elections. The bill is not perfect, but it provides unprecedented transparency and disclosure of political expenditures by powerful special interests. Much has been said, and many of you have concerns, about exemptions in the bill. Let me be clear: all groups will be forced to disclose more than they do now.

Every single 501(c)(4) will be forced to “stand by their ad” so you know exactly which group sponsors the advertisement. Additionally, any exempted groups will be prevented from spending a single corporate dollar on campaign-related expenditures. We are far better off with these reforms than with nothing at all.

Madam Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues that this legislation is bipartisan. Our former colleagues, Marty Meehan of Massachusetts, and Christopher Shays of Connecticut helped authored the bipartisan campaign reform act. Yesterday, they released a joint statement in support of the DISCLOSE Act: “Voters have a fundamental right to know who is spending money to influence their elections and where that money is coming from. With hundreds of millions of dollars being spent by corporations and labor unions to influence elections, secrecy about these expenditures is simply unacceptable. We urge our former colleagues in the House to vote for the DISCLOSE Act and for the right of citizens to know who is spending money to influence their votes.”

The DISCLOSE Act ensures that shadowy special interests and sham organizations are not able to hide their funders, and is critical if we ever hope to keep our constituents informed on who is trying to influence their vote. This bill breaks the “locks and chains” of “big money” in our democratic process of elections. I would submit this is the time to move forward. As such, I urge my colleagues to support the DISCLOSE Act, H.R. 5175

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC June 23, 2010.

CONGRESSWOMAN JACKSON LEE URGES  
SUPPORT FOR H.R. 5175, THE DISCLOSE ACT

DEAR COLLEAGUE: After weighing the pros and cons of H.R. 5175, the DISCLOSE Act, I

have decided to support the bill. This was a decision that took a lot of deliberation, but in the end it is clear that in the absence of supporting H.R. 5175, we run the risk of witnessing the greatest deluge of unreported cash from the richest corporations and special interests that has occurred throughout the history of American politics. Without some mechanism to ensure that the American people know who is spending potentially millions to influence their vote, we threaten the fundamental core of our democracy—the result will amount to a corporate special interest takeover of our elections. This is the reality. This is what is at stake.

Right now, any corporation can spend unlimited amounts of money on our elections. The bill is not perfect, but it provides unprecedented transparency and disclosure of political expenditures by powerful special interests. Much has been said, and many of you have concerns, about exemptions in the bill. Let me be clear: all groups will be forced to disclose more than they do now. Every single 501(c)(4) will be forced to “stand by their ad” so you know exactly which group sponsors the ad. Additionally, any exempted groups will be prevented from spending a single corporate dollar on campaign related expenditures. We are far better off with these reforms than with nothing at all.

The DISCLOSE Act ensures that shadowy special interests and sham organizations are not able to hide their funders, and is critical if we ever hope to keep our constituents informed on who is trying to influence their vote. This bill breaks the “locks and chains” of “big money” in our democratic process of elections. I would submit this is the time to move forward. As such, I urge your support of the DISCLOSE Act, H.R. 5175.

Very truly yours,

SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

While other matters are being debated in the course of this, this rule also provides for consideration of a conference report on the Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act, and I rise in strong support of this legislation with a word of caution.

It was my great privilege to serve on the conference committee for this Iran sanctions bill that will be considered today. I believe this legislation represents measurable and meaningful progress in the United States' effort to economically and diplomatically isolate Iran in the midst of its headlong rush to obtain nuclear weapons, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

My word of caution is directed both to my colleagues in Congress, though, and to this administration. It is important not only that we adopt the Iran sanctions bill today, it is important that this administration implement this legislation.

We know the nature of the threat. Iran has made no secret of its intent to use nuclear weapons to threaten the United States or our allies, especially our most cherished ally, Israel. President Ahmadinejad said in 2005 in Iran that humankind “shall soon experience a world without the United States and

without Zionism.” Led by this anti-American, anti-Israeli president, Iran has a long history of associating with terrorist organizations. If Iran obtains a nuclear bomb, it will only be a matter of time before terrorist organizations around the globe have access to this technology, and America and our allies—and our most cherished ally—will be threatened as a result.

It is also essential that we consider this legislation in the wake of the failed leadership at the United Nations. The adoption of so-called “sanctions” by the U.N. is nothing more than a hollow gesture which will do nothing except embolden Iran in its nuclear ambitions. We must lead by example.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this bill. I urge the President to sign this bill. But a word of caution: These sanctions include a number of waivers demanded by the Obama administration, but it is essential that President Obama carry out the clear congressional intent and cripple Iran's energy and financial sectors in implementing this legislation.

Iran could be merely months away from acquiring nuclear weapons; they continue to test vehicles that could deliver it. This is a time for decisive action by the American Congress and the American administration. Failure to act by this Congress or failure to implement these sanctions by this administration could lead to a second Holocaust. If we act and this administration implements these sanctions, we may yet see a future of security and peace in the Middle East, but if we fail to act, history will judge the Congress and this government in the harsh aftermath of a flash of light, a rush of wind, and a second historic tragedy.

Let us act. Let us adopt Iran sanctions. And Mr. President, do not waive these sanctions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

□ 1120

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, let's keep America the best democracy, not the best democracy that money can buy.

The pollution of our political process with tens of millions of dollars in spending by the world's largest multinational corporations strikes at the very heart of our American democracy. Whatever these giant interests cannot already get with their army of lobbyists here in Washington and with the millions of dollars that their executives already contribute to campaigns, they now want to buy directly with money from their corporate treasuries—and they are no fools.

The limitless dollars that these folks lavish on elections are simply wise investments for many of them. They are well designed to spend a few million now in order to claim a few billion dollars in unjustified spending from the public treasury later. Often, the same folks who are reaching into the public

purse are the folks who, through special tax expenditures and tax loopholes, don't contribute but pennies on the dollar compared to what a small business might be having to pay in its corporate tax rate or what a working or middle-class family might be having to pay, struggling to make ends meet.

Without the DISCLOSE Act, a tobacco company can come here masquerading as a phony "health care" coalition. A Wall Street bank can come and ask for another bailout, claiming that it is part of a "consumer alliance." A polluter can defeat those who want to hold it accountable by asserting that it is part of "Citizens for Clean Air and Clean Beaches." Insurance monopolies determined to deny American families access to care at prices they can afford are already out there with groups like Americans for Better Health Care, which is really designed to stymie families efforts to access health care.

DISCLOSE Act opponents have a great deal not to disclose. They want to be assassins, silent assassins of character, where they buy one hate ad after another while denying the public an opportunity to know that the views being expressed in that 30 seconds are, in fact, limited to those of a narrow corporate self-interest that is determined never to be held accountable for its misconduct.

The public, without the power of these corporate deep pockets, would also be denied access to the knowledge of who is really wielding the power. Who can look at Washington these days and say that the problem up here is too little influence of corporate cash?

A vote for the DISCLOSE Act is a vote to stop the corruption of our political system and to stop the slide into plutocracy. It is a vote for a fully-informed and fully-empowered American people to take charge of our democracy and to ensure the change that will make a meaningful difference in the lives of our families.

I urge its adoption.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the ability to speak on the floor of this House is a great honor and a very powerful thing. However, simply saying something on the floor does not make it true.

I would like to now yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this incredibly restrictive rule and to the underlying legislation.

The lack of democracy and openness that exists in this House is evident when the House Rules Committee self-executes a 45-page manager's amendment to a 92-page bill and then makes in order only 5 of the other 36 submitted amendments. By the way, only one of those amendments made in order was offered by a Republican.

This, of course, has all been done in the name of a bill cynically titled De-

mocracy is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections Act. I've got a suggestion to my friends: How about strengthening democracy by actually allowing robust debate and unlimited amendments? That would actually help restore comity and bipartisanship to this polarized House.

With that said, Madam Speaker, I would like to also address the underlying legislation.

In this bill, the majority is engaged in a self-serving, hypocritical political exercise. The underlying legislation is a response to a 5-4 Supreme Court decision in the Citizens United vs. Federal Election Commission case. Good people can disagree about that case and about its ramifications. However, when the majority party decides to reshape the political playing field with a bill written by its political tacticians and introduced by the chairman of its own campaign committee, we have reached a new low.

The clear aim of this legislation is to tilt the political playing field in favor of the Democratic Party. Simply put, this bill facilitates the involvement and political activities of groups supportive of the Democratic Party while limiting the political activities of those who may not support the Democratic agenda. A clear example of this is where the bill applies onerous restrictions on corporations which may wish to involve themselves in political activity while the bill carves out large exceptions for unions, which traditionally support the Democratic agenda.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a prescription for chicanery in our elections, and it will fundamentally restrict our First Amendment rights. Therefore, I urge Members to oppose this rule and the underlying legislation. Limiting the freedom of speech in pursuit of partisan political advantage is fundamentally wrong.

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

Madam Speaker, I think it is important to remind everybody that the Supreme Court decision in the Citizens United case essentially allows unlimited special interest money, corporate money, to drown out the voices of everyday people. That is really what the issue is here. The majority of Americans, I think, are alarmed by that. That is why an overwhelming majority support the passage of this DISCLOSE Act.

Those of us who are arguing for the passage of this bill believe the voters have a fundamental right to know who is spending money to influence their elections and where that money is coming from. I am puzzled that my friends on the other side of the aisle, who are speaking out against this, don't share that same concern; but voters deserve to know who is spending money to influence their elections. They deserve to know whether it is a Big Oil company or a union, and they deserve to know whether it is a foreign special interest that is trying to influence the election.

So I would urge my colleagues to get behind this effort, an effort that is overwhelmingly supported by the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I am sure it is not intentional, but falsehoods are being spread on this floor.

There is no poll that shows the American people support the DISCLOSE Act. It would be amazing if they did since we didn't get the last version of it until 2 hours before we went to the Rules Committee yesterday. The poll they are referring to took place back in February or March, which was before they had their backroom deals coming up with this particular bill.

We now have 438 organizations which oppose this. Among them are the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Right to Life Committee, and the Sierra Club. Why would those people be getting together to oppose this bill? Because they believe in the First Amendment, and they understand that the First Amendment says all should be treated the same.

That is not the cornerstone of this bill. They are specifically not treated the same. The bigger you are, the stronger you are, the less disclosure you have. The smaller you are, the newer you are, the more disclosure that is required. They even have put something in this bill that will make it impossible for certain ads to play on television. They have increased the number of names that have to appear, such that, in some cases, it will take 17 seconds to say all of those names and all of those organizations. There are things known as 15 second ads now. I guess you have minus time on TV.

They say that unions have to be exempt, but corporations have to be affected. Now, remember, corporations are not just for profit. They keep talking about oil companies. They forget about the National Right to Life. They forget about all of these other organizations that actually have a corporate structure. Most political organizations do. That's what we are talking about.

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Then they say, Well, we don't want to be controlled by foreign entities. We offered an amendment in the Rules Committee to cover that. It was defeated on a party-line vote by the majority party.

So, please, let's at least be honest. If you're going to disclose, disclose your motivations. Disclose the words in here. Disclose the deals that you've made. Disclose who has won the auction for their piece of the First Amendment.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question and the rule because American families continue to struggle with rising health care costs.

Recently, the Congressional Budget Office and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services reported that health care costs for families and for services will rise even higher due to this massive new health care law.

□ 1130

Today's YouCut vote helps to stop one of the major problems with the new health care law, and it could save taxpayers across this country between \$5 billion and \$10 billion.

Under the new health care law, the IRS will be in charge of verifying that every American taxpayer has obtained government-approved, acceptable health coverage for every month of the year. In other words, if the IRS determines that a taxpayer lacks government-approved health insurance for even a single month, then the IRS can have the power to withhold tax refunds. This is an unprecedented new role for the IRS—one that injects the IRS even farther into the personal lives of American families. So today's YouCut vote would prevent the IRS from hiring thousands of examiners and auditors required to implement this new individual mandate.

As a former heart surgeon, I know we can do better and I know we can agree on many commonsense approaches to cutting health care costs for families and for seniors. We have many proposals to do this which are not part of this health care law. But I'll tell you this: An individual mandate enforced by the IRS is not one of them.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and vote against this rule. Join me and cut \$5 billion to \$10 billion from the IRS while preventing yet another mandate on health care from the Federal Government.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of defeating the previous question, which is the next vote here on the House floor. I worked for Ronald Reagan. We have a \$1.5 trillion deficit this year. The last thing that we should do is to raise taxes. The first thing that we should do is cut spending.

As many folks here know, the Republican side has been offering five different proposals every week for the last month or so, letting folks across America vote on the proposal that they think merits the most sense. This week, it was my proposal that won. That is, we are going to tell the IRS

that we're not going to hire another 15,000-some IRS agents in the next couple of years to monitor health care, and we will save the taxpayers \$5 billion to \$10 billion—billion, as in big. That's not a bad proposal. Save the taxpayers some money by not hiring 15,000 more bureaucrats.

What are these folks going to do? They're going to make sure that every American verifies that they have health insurance. Maybe they will look at page 737 in the health care bill, which says that every business will have to file a new 1099 with the IRS for any \$600 business-to-business transaction. So if you're a homebuilder and you just happen to show up at that same Chevron or Shell gas station every other week to fill up your car or your pickup and you spend more than \$600 over the course of the year there, you're going to have to file a 1099.

Let's fight the deficit—not by raising taxes but by cutting spending. This proposal does that. We were denied at the Rules Committee to allow this amendment to be offered, which is why we want to defeat the previous question, offer this amendment to cut spending, and help the taxpayers across the country.

Madam Speaker, I would urge all my colleagues to support this.

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

I find it puzzling to hear my friends on the other side of the aisle all of a sudden talk about the deficit. When Bill Clinton left office, he left the Republicans and George Bush a record surplus. There was no deficit. We were paying down the debt. They took that surplus and they turned it around and drove this economy into a ditch.

President Obama gets elected to office; he inherits the worst economy. It's just a Great Depression. My friends on the other side don't take any responsibility for that. In 1 year under President Obama, we have created more jobs in this country than George Bush did during 8 years while he was in office. The American people want us to focus on jobs and job creation.

I would just make another suggestion, since we're talking about how we protect the taxpayers. I would urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to stop apologizing for the way the Federal Government is treating BP, to stop apologizing for the fact that this administration wants British Petroleum to live up to its responsibility and pay for the cleanup of that mess in the gulf. I wish my friend on the other side of the aisle would stop trying to defend Big Oil from taking its responsibility. BP should pay for it, not the American taxpayer. If you want to do something for the American taxpayer, then demand that BP do what it is right.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute again to the gentleman

from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I'm shocked that my friend from the other side of the aisle would criticize the President's relationship with BP in terms of the massive contributions that he received while he was running for office. I don't think that ought to be part of this debate.

But you ask about treatment. I have here just an example of one, two, three, four, five sections of the bill in which there's a specific exemption given to unions versus corporations. That is the kind of favored versus disfavored status created by the government that is, on its face, unconstitutional. People ought to understand that when you start making these distinctions, you are creating an unconstitutional act, because we do not want government saying that certain groups are okay and certain groups are not okay, that certain language is okay and other language is not okay, depending on who happens to be in office. This is an attack on the First Amendment. And here you have one, two, three, four, five sections of the bill made in order.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have to constantly remind our colleagues across the aisle that Republicans were in charge of the Congress when President Clinton was in office his last 6 years and that Democrats were in charge of Congress the last 2 years of Mr. Bush's administration. We know that Democrats created the economic crisis. And we are not apologizing to BP. We know that BP should pay for all of the problems that have been caused in the gulf. However, we'd like to see this administration do something to respond to the disaster down there and stop blaming others as they do on everything.

In a little over a week, on July 4th, we will be celebrating our Nation's independence. John Adams wrote in a letter to his wife, Abigail, that it "ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance."

Today, we're not liberating the American people, as our Founding Fathers did. Instead, our colleagues are attempting just the opposite. They're attempting to erode our right to free speech when there's so many other pressing issues that our Nation faces today.

For one, we could be addressing the 21 percent cut in Medicare reimbursement payments to doctors that went into effect on June 18. The Senate, after some debate, was able to pass, by unanimous consent, a 6-month extension on the 21 percent cuts last Friday. This legislation would provide a 6-month extension, fully paid for. However, the Speaker has said she sees "no reason to pass this inadequate bill until we see jobs legislation coming out of the Senate." But the Democrats in charge have seen these disastrous

pay cuts to physicians coming for some time but have only offered bills full of budget gimmicks or 1-month extensions. I've heard from physicians in my district who are fearful of these cuts and the negative impact they have on their patients when they will no longer be able to afford to see Medicare patients. This is a real crisis we should be dealing with instead of a bill riddled with assaults on our constitutional rights.

Even some Democrat Members have some concerns with this bill. To quote one Democrat Member who spoke during the Rules Committee yesterday, with this bill "we are auctioning off parts of the First Amendment. Don't make this bill unconstitutional on purpose." H.R. 5175 contracts our freedoms when we should be expanding them.

□ 1140

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and extraneous material be placed in the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that I can amend the rule to allow all Members of Congress the opportunity to vote to cut spending. Republican Whip Eric Cantor recently launched the YouCut initiative which gives people an opportunity to vote for Federal spending they would like to see Congress cut. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have cast their votes, and this week they've directed their Representatives in Congress to consider H.R. 5570.

According to the Republican whip's YouCut Web site, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that "over the next 10 years, the IRS will require between \$5 billion and \$10 billion in funding to implement the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, also known as the new health care law. These funds will be used to hire thousands of additional IRS agents and employees. Reforming our health care system shouldn't require expanding the IRS. By prohibiting funding for the expansion of the IRS for this purpose, we can protect taxpayers while we work to repeal and replace the law."

H.R. 5570 would prohibit taxpayer funds from being appropriated to the Internal Revenue Service for the purpose of hiring new agents to enforce the Democrats' health care law. Under the new law, additional agents would be specifically hired to enforce the Democrats' unconstitutional individual health care mandate. By preventing their hire, this week's YouCut vote could save the taxpayers between \$5 billion and \$10 billion. In order to provide for consideration of this common-sense legislation, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9 minutes.

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

Madam Speaker, first of all, the underlying bill that we are talking about here today does not violate the First Amendment of the Constitution. That's just a ridiculous argument. And we are supporting this bill because we believe that no one spending large sums of money on campaigns should be able to hide behind a made-up shell. I don't think that's controversial. I don't care whether you are a Republican or a Democrat; you should want to know who is spending all this money, who is behind these ads. Why is that such a terrible idea?

You know, I don't think it's too much to ask that these organizations identify in their campaign ads those entities providing funding for those ads. This is about sunlight and transparency. This is about giving the American people the information that I think they all want. Who is behind these ads? Who is funding these ads?

My friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be clinging to secrecy. Well, secrecy in elections does nothing except to advance deception. And so when a Member of the Republican Party, for example, apologizes for the way the Federal Government is treating BP, BP can then under the status quo set up a mechanism to funnel money into ads in favor of that candidate or, you know, against his opponent, and BP does not have to identify itself. It could fund this under a shell of Citizens for Good Government or Citizens for a Clean Environment.

We need to understand that one of the problems is the way that our government has evolved here. Money has played too big of a role. I cannot believe that our Founding Fathers could ever have imagined that money would play such a big role in campaigns, millions and millions and millions of dollars spent on congressional campaigns, on Senate campaigns. Too much time is devoted to raising money. Too much emphasis is placed on money to be able to run for office. This says nothing about capping how much we can spend on campaigns, but what it does say is that those entities that are running ads in favor of us or against us have to tell the American people who they are.

I think the reason why so many Americans support this effort is because they get it, and they want to know the truth. I think the reason why so many Americans support this is they don't want foreign governments or foreign special interests to influence our elections. As I said before, these sovereign wealth funds can be set up. China can set one up based here in the United States, come up with a shell name for the organization, and actually spend millions and millions of dollars in an election to influence the out-

come. That should not be. I don't care what your political philosophy is. We should not want foreign governments or foreign interests to influence our elections. Elections here should be decided by the people of the United States, not by other countries, not by foreign interests.

And I would again remind my colleagues that as we speak, there are millions and millions of dollars being spent on negative ads all over the country against Republicans and against Democrats, and they are sponsored by organizations that have nice names, but may be funded by an industry that has a particular interest in the outcome of that election. I think it is important when these negative health care ads are being run, that people know they're being paid for by the insurance industry. I think it's important to know that when we have ads defending the behavior of BP, that we know they are to be spent by interests that are tied directly to Big Oil.

So this is about transparency. This is about full disclosure. This has nothing to do with abridging anybody's right to speech. It just says that you have got to stand by what you say. That's not a radical idea. It's an idea that everybody in this House—I don't care what your political philosophy is—should embrace.

So I would urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill, and I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. FOXX is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 5175 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5570) to provide that no funds are authorized to be appropriated to the Internal Revenue Service to expand its workforce in order to implement, enforce, or otherwise carry out either the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except

one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5570.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

**THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS**

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy impli-

cations. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. McGOVERN. 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 ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting House Resolution 1468, if ordered;

Suspending the rules with regard to House Concurrent Resolution 285; and

Suspending the rules and agreeing to House Resolution 1464, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]  
YEAS—243

Ackerman	Delahunt	Kildee
Adler (NJ)	DeLauro	Kilpatrick (MI)
Altmire	Deutch	Kilroy
Andrews	Dicks	Kind
Arcuri	Dingell	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Baca	Doggett	Kissell
Baird	Donnelly (IN)	Klein (FL)
Baldwin	Doyle	Kosmas
Barrow	Driehaus	Kratovil
Bean	Edwards (MD)	Kucinich
Becerra	Edwards (TX)	Langevin
Berkley	Ellsworth	Larsen (WA)
Berman	Engel	Larson (CT)
Berry	Eshoo	Lee (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Etheridge	Levin
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lewis (GA)
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lipinski
Bocchieri	Filner	Loebsack
Boren	Foster	Lofgren, Zoe
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Lowey
Boucher	Fudge	Lujan
Boyd	Garamendi	Lynch
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Maffei
Braley (IA)	Gordon (TN)	Maloney
Brown, Corrine	Grayson	Markey (CO)
Butterfield	Green, Al	Markey (MA)
Capps	Green, Gene	Marshall
Capuano	Grijalva	Matheson
Cardoza	Gutierrez	Matsui
Carnahan	Hall (NY)	McCarthy (NY)
Carney	Halvorson	McCollum
Carson (IN)	Hare	McDermott
Castor (FL)	Harman	McGovern
Chandler	Hastings (FL)	McMahon
Chu	Heinrich	McNerney
Clarke	Herseht Sandlin	Meek (FL)
Clay	Higgins	Meeks (NY)
Cleaver	Himes	Michaud
Clyburn	Hinchee	Miller (NC)
Cohen	Hinojosa	Miller, George
Connolly (VA)	Hirono	Minnick
Conyers	Hodes	Mollohan
Cooper	Holden	Moore (KS)
Costa	Holt	Moran (VA)
Costello	Honda	Murphy (CT)
Courtney	Hoyer	Murphy (NY)
Critz	Inslee	Murphy, Patrick
Crowley	Israel	Nadler (NY)
Cuellar	Jackson (IL)	Napolitano
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Neal (MA)
Dahlkemper	(TX)	Nye
Davis (AL)	Johnson (GA)	Oberstar
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
Davis (IL)	Kagen	Olver
Davis (TN)	Kanjorski	Ortiz
DeFazio	Kaptur	Owens
DeGette	Kennedy	Pallone

Pascrell	Sanchez, Linda	Stupak
Pastor (AZ)	T.	Sutton
Payne	Sanchez, Loretta	Tanner
Perlmutter	Sarbanes	Teague
Perriello	Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)
Peters	Schauer	Thompson (MS)
Peterson	Schiff	Tierney
Pingree (ME)	Schrader	Titus
Polis (CO)	Schwartz	Tonko
Pomeroy	Scott (GA)	Towns
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Tsongas
Quigley	Serrano	Van Hollen
Rahall	Sestak	Velázquez
Rangel	Shea-Porter	Walz
Reyes	Sherman	Wasserman
Richardson	Shuler	Schultz
Rodriguez	Sires	Waters
Ross	Skelton	Watson
Rothman (NJ)	Slaughter	Watt
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Ruppersberger	Snyder	Weiner
Rush	Space	Welch
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Wilson (OH)
Salazar	Spratt	Woolsey
	Stark	Wu
		Yarmuth

**NAYS—181**

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)	Mitchell
Akin	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Alexander	Giffords	Murphy, Tim
Austria	Gingrey (GA)	Myrick
Bachmann	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bachus	Goodlatte	Nunes
Bartlett	Granger	Olson
Barton (TX)	Graves (GA)	Paul
Biggert	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Bilbray	Griffith	Pence
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Blackburn	Harper	Platts
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Bonner	Heller	Posey
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Boozman	Herger	Putnam
Boustany	Hill	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rehberg
Bright	Inglis	Reichert
Brown (GA)	Issa	Roe (TN)
Brown-Waite,	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Jones	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Jordan (OH)	Rooney
Buyer	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	King (NY)	Roskam
Camp	Kingston	Royce
Campbell	Kirk	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Scalise
Cao	Lamborn	Schmidt
Capito	Lance	Schock
Carter	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Cassidy	LaTourette	Latta
Castle	Latta	Sessions
Chaffetz	Lee (NY)	Shadegg
Childers	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Coble	Linder	Shuster
Coffman (CO)	LoBiondo	Simpson
Cole	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Davis (KY)	E.	Sullivan
Dent	Mack	Taylor
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Terry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Djou	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Dreier	McCarl	Tiahrt
Duncan	McClintock	Tiberi
Ehlers	McCotter	Turner
Emerson	McHenry	Upton
Fallin	McIntyre	Walden
Flake	McKeon	Westmoreland
Fleming	McMorris	Whitfield
Forbes	Rodgers	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Melancon	Wittman
Fox	Mica	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)
Gallely	Miller, Gary	

**NOT VOTING—8**

Barrett (SC)	Ellison	Visclosky
Blunt	Hoekstra	Wamp
Brown (SC)	Moore (WI)	

□ 1214

Messrs. FLEMING, HUNTER, NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. MYRICK, Messrs.

CAO, KING of New York, Ms. FALLIN and Mr. MCINTYRE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. DAVIS 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 (Mr. SALAZAR). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 205, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—220

Ackerman	Fudge	McNerney
Altmire	Garamendi	Meek (FL)
Andrews	Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)
Arcuri	Gordon (TN)	Melancon
Baca	Grayson	Michaud
Baird	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Becerra	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Berkley	Grijalva	Mollohan
Berman	Gutierrez	Moore (KS)
Berry	Hall (NY)	Moran (VA)
Bishop (NY)	Halvorson	Murphy (CT)
Blumenauer	Hare	Murphy (NY)
Bocchieri	Harman	Murphy, Patrick
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Nadler (NY)
Boucher	Heinrich	Napolitano
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Neal (MA)
Braley (IA)	Himes	Oberstar
Brown, Corrine	Hinchee	Obey
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Olver
Capps	Hirono	Ortiz
Capuano	Holden	Owens
Cardoza	Holt	Pallone
Carnahan	Honda	Pascarell
Carney	Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)
Carson (IN)	Inslee	Payne
Castor (FL)	Israel	Pelosi
Chandler	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Chu	(TX)	Perriello
Clarke	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Cleaver	Kagen	Pingree (ME)
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Polis (CO)
Cohen	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Connolly (VA)	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Conyers	Kildee	Rahall
Costa	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rangel
Costello	Kilroy	Reyes
Courtney	Kind	Richardson
Critz	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rodriguez
Crowley	Kissell	Ross
Cuellar	Klein (FL)	Rothman (NJ)
Cummings	Kosmas	Roybal-Allard
Davis (AL)	Kucinich	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Salazar
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Delahunt	Lee (CA)	T.
DeLauro	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Dicks	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Dingell	Loeb	Schauer
Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff
Doyle	Lowe	Schrader
Driehaus	Luján	Schwartz
Edwards (MD)	Lynch	Scott (GA)
Edwards (TX)	Maffei	Scott (VA)
Ellison	Maloney	Serrano
Ellsworth	Markey (CO)	Shea-Porter
Engel	Markey (MA)	Sherman
Eshoo	Marshall	Sires
Etheridge	Matheson	Skelton
Farr	Matsui	Slaughter
Fattah	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Filner	McDermott	Snyder
Foster	McGovern	Space
Frank (MA)	McMahon	Speier

Spratt  
Stark  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Teague  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus

Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters

Watson  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING DESIGNATION OF  
YEAR OF THE FATHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 285) recognizing the important role that fathers play in the lives of their children and families and supporting the goals and ideals of designating 2010 as the Year of the Father, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

YEAS—423

Aderholt  
Adler (NJ)  
Akin  
Alexander  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boustany  
Boyd  
Brady (TX)  
Bright  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Cao  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castle  
Chaffetz  
Childers  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Cooper  
Culberson  
Dahlkemper  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis (TN)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Djou  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
Fallin  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Barrett (SC)  
Blunt  
Brown (SC)

NOES—205

Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Guthrie  
Hall (TX)  
Harper  
Hastings (WA)  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Hill  
Hodes  
Hunter  
Inglis  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan (OH)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline (MN)  
Kratovil  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (NY)  
Lewis (CA)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Minnick

Mitchell  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Tim  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Nye  
Olson  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Putnam  
Quigley  
Radanovich  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberti  
Turner  
Upton  
Walden  
Watt  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Wu  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Ackerman	Cantor	Doyle
Aderholt	Cao	Dreier
Adler (NJ)	Capito	Driehaus
Akin	Capps	Duncan
Alexander	Capuano	Edwards (MD)
Altmire	Cardoza	Edwards (TX)
Andrews	Carnahan	Ehlers
Arcuri	Carney	Ellison
Austria	Carson (IN)	Ellsworth
Baca	Carter	Emerson
Bachmann	Cassidy	Engel
Bachus	Castle	Eshoo
Baird	Castor (FL)	Etheridge
Baldwin	Chaffetz	Fallin
Barrow	Chandler	Farr
Childers	Childers	Fattah
Bartlett	Chu	Filner
Barton (TX)	Bean	Flake
Chu	Clarke	Fleming
Clarke	Clay	Forbes
Clay	Cleaver	Fortenberry
Cleaver	Clyburn	Foster
Clyburn	Coble	Coffman (CO)
Cohen	Coffman (CO)	Cohen
Connolly (VA)	Cole	Frank (MA)
Conyers	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Costa	Connolly (VA)	Frelinghuysen
Costello	Conyers	Fudge
Courtney	Cooper	Gallegly
Critz	Crowley	Garamendi
Crowley	Cuellar	Garrett (NJ)
Cuellar	Culberson	Gerlach
Cummings	Cummings	Giffords
Davis (AL)	Dahlkemper	Crenshaw
Davis (CA)	Davis (AL)	Critz
DeFazio	Davis (CA)	Crowley
DeGette	Davis (IL)	Cuellar
Delahunt	Davis (KY)	Culberson
DeLauro	Davis (TN)	Cummings
Deutch	DeFazio	Dahlkemper
Dicks	DeGette	Davis (AL)
Dingell	Delahunt	Davis (CA)
Doggett	DeLauro	Davis (IL)
Doyle	Dent	Davis (KY)
Driehaus	Deutch	Davis (TN)
Edwards (MD)	Diaz-Balart, L.	DeFazio
Edwards (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	DeGette
Ellison	Dicks	Delahunt
Ellsworth	Djou	DeLauro
Engel	Doggett	Dent
Eshoo	Donnelly (IN)	Dingell
Etheridge		Doggett
Farr		Doyle
Fattah		Dreier
Filner		Driehaus
Foster		Duncan
Frank (MA)		Edwards (MD)
		Edwards (TX)
		Ehlers
		Ellison
		Ellsworth
		Emerson
		Engel
		Eshoo
		Etheridge
		Fallin
		Farr
		Fattah
		Filner
		Flake
		Fleming
		Forbes
		Fortenberry
		Foster
		Coffman (CO)
		Cohen
		Frank (MA)
		Franks (AZ)
		Frelinghuysen
		Fudge
		Gallegly
		Garamendi
		Garrett (NJ)
		Gerlach
		Giffords
		Crenshaw
		Gingrey (GA)
		Gohmert
		Gonzalez
		Goodlatte
		Gordon (TN)
		Granger
		Graves (GA)
		Graves (MO)
		Grayson
		Green, Al
		Green, Gene
		Griffith
		Grijalva
		Guthrie
		Gutierrez
		Hall (NY)
		Hall (TX)
		Halvorson
		Hare
		Harman
		Harper
		Hastings (FL)
		Hastings (WA)
		Heinrich

NOT VOTING—8

Brown-Waite, Hoekstra  
Ginny, Visclosky  
Crenshaw, Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1223

Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia and JACKSON of Illinois changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.