

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 3307, HEALTHY, HUNGER-FREE KIDS ACT OF 2010

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1742 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1742

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 3307) to reauthorize child nutrition programs, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1742.

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

There was no objection.

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

H. Res. 1742 provides a closed rule for consideration of S. 3307, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The rules waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions of the bill. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit the bill with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin, as many of my colleagues know, my colleague

from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) has decided not to seek reelection and move on to other endeavors in his home State of Florida. I just want to publicly thank him for his friendship over the years, and also thank him for his great service not only to the people of Florida but to the people of this country. This may be the last rule that we handle together, so I wanted to take this opportunity simply to acknowledge his service and to thank him.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today to pass a very good bill that will improve the lives of our children. And I believe that we must seize that opportunity.

I want to thank Speaker PELOSI and Chairman MILLER, Congresswoman DELAURO, Congresswoman MCCARTHY, and others who have worked so hard on this issue. And I want to say a special thank you to First Lady Michelle Obama. She has been an incredible champion for our children, particularly in the areas of nutrition and obesity.

□ 1110

She has challenged us to live up to one of our highest moral obligations—to make sure that the children of this Nation have the nutritious food they need to grow, to thrive, and to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I chair both the House Hunger Caucus and the Congressional Hunger Center, and I've said many times that hunger is a political condition. We have the resources to end hunger, particularly childhood hunger, and what we need is the political will to make it happen.

President Obama has pledged to end childhood hunger in America by 2015. If we support that goal, then we must pass this bill. I hope that the Members of this House, all of us, Democrats and Republicans, can come together today to summon the political will necessary to move forward on this issue.

There is not a single community in America that is hunger free. Talk to any food bank. They will tell you that the demand has never been greater, and far too many of the people who need help are children.

The child nutrition bill that we will take up today gives us a chance to provide healthy meals to hundreds of thousands of children who need them. It's also important to remember that hunger and obesity are two sides of the same coin. The fact is that highly processed, empty calorie foods are less expensive than fresh, nutritious foods. That's why so many families are forced to make unhealthy choices. This bill increases the reimbursement to schools for meals by 6 cents a meal, 6 cents, and that's the first increase in 30 years.

Too often, the only nutritious food our kids get is in a school setting, and this bill also increases access to after-school programs. And the bill helps communities to establish farm-to-school networks, which are not just good for children, but they're also good for our local farmers.

Now, it's no secret, Mr. Speaker, that I've had concerns with how this bill is paid for, and I remind my colleagues that this bill is fully paid for. The cuts to the SNAP, or food stamp, program don't make a lot of sense to me. I don't believe we should be taking access to food away from some people in order to provide it for others. But we have been assured, repeatedly, by the President and the White House that they will work with us to restore these cuts, and I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues to make sure that the White House lives up to that commitment. Quite frankly, if I did not believe that this commitment to restore SNAP funding was real, I would have had a hard time voting for the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, this exact same piece of legislation, passed unanimously in the Senate. Every single Member in the Senate, including a Who's Who of the most conservative Republicans, voted for reauthorizing our child nutrition programs. Unfortunately, from what I heard in the Rules Committee last night, that probably won't happen today in the House.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have no problem expanding wasteful weapons systems. They have no problem expanding tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires on Wall Street, but apparently, some of them have a problem with expanding access to nutritious food for our children.

They say it's an outrageous example of Big Government or that a high school basketball team would be prohibited from having a bake sale. Nonsense. Utter nonsense. As the president of the national PTA has said, "The measure will effectively eliminate the constant presence of junk food in school while allowing reasonable practices like periodic PTA or other school group fundraisers, such as bake sales, and the sale of hot dogs and sodas at after-school sporting events."

An extra few million for a hedge fund manager who doesn't need it? No problem, so my Republican friends say, but heaven forbid we spend another 6 cents to make sure our kids have a more healthy school lunch. Those may be their priorities, Mr. Speaker, but they're not mine, and they're not the priorities of the people in my district.

Some of my friends on the other side will say that they want no children in our country to go hungry. Fair enough. Here's their opportunity to put their vote where their rhetoric is. Here's their opportunity to demonstrate that their concern for the hungry in this country is more than just lip service.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the politics here. It's pretty simple. If the President's for it, my Republican friends are against it. But I would ask them and I would plead with them to check those politics at the door just this once. Please don't sacrifice an opportunity to improve the lives of millions of our children on the altar of partisan politics.

The need to act is clear. Our moral obligation is clear. Our children are getting sicker and sicker and sicker. If kids don't have enough nutritious food to eat they don't learn. We are wasting millions and millions of dollars on health care for diseases like diabetes and heart disease that are preventable with healthier diets.

Today, we could begin to turn that tide. Please join us in doing the right thing. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the time.

First, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I don't know if I will have the privilege again of speaking on this floor while you're presiding, and I want to thank you for your service and especially for your friendship.

And to Mr. MCGOVERN, I thank him for his kind words. I said a few days ago in some remarks here on the floor that this is a great honor of being a Member of Congress of the United States I will never forget, and for the rest of my days, I will feel that honor. And I thanked all of my colleagues, those who have helped me during the years here and the many battles that I've been involved in, and those who have opposed me. And so I think it's appropriate to point to the example of the graciousness demonstrated by Mr. MCGOVERN. We've had very strong debates on this floor, and yet, he demonstrated that graciousness once again today. I thank him for his words, and as I did the other day, I thank all of my colleagues, those who have agreed with me and those who have opposed me, for the great honor of having been able to serve along with them here in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we have been discussing the issue of the effect of the debt on the economic reality of the American people, and as a matter of fact as this Congress starts reaching an end, I think it's appropriate to bring forth the fact to remind our colleagues that this is going to be, I believe, the first Congress where we have not seen even one open rule. So we stand here today with another piece of legislation being brought to the floor with no amendments allowed by the Rules Committee and, in this case, a product from the Senate before us that has had absolutely no input from Members of the House.

I think that all of us in this House, certainly an overwhelming majority of the membership of the House, would support—I certainly do—the continuation and reauthorization of reduced and free school food programs. The bill before us unfortunately does not improve upon the current situation in that regard.

□ 1120

In fact, the bipartisan National Governors Association has outlined several

problems that they have with this underlying legislation, and I was reading some hours ago their objections. Governors Ritter of Colorado and Rell of Connecticut highlighted new certification and monitoring mandates that will be forced on States by this legislation in order for the States to be able to continue their important participation in these programs.

Actually, I was disturbed to learn from the bipartisan National Governors Association that the underlying legislation sets a federally mandated minimum price that school districts must pay for meals. In the past, if a school district negotiated lower food costs, that was considered applying smart business practices by the school districts. But no longer. With a mandatory minimum, school districts are now going to have to pay more for their food programs, which of course will be passed along to middle class families in the form of higher meal costs.

So I think, in reality, what we are seeing in this legislation is a tax increase on working families. Unfortunately, a substitute that was brought forth in the Rules Committee by the minority, by Ranking Member KLINE, which would have reauthorized these important programs, was not allowed to be offered. That substitute amendment would have extended and strengthened the existing important programs but would have avoided the new mandates on States and communities.

There is another issue, Mr. Speaker, that I think is important to bring out. In order to pay for the new programs in this legislation, the congressional majority decided to use previously appropriated funding intended for the Food Stamp Program. The Food Stamp funds were provided under the so-called stimulus legislation, so it's as though the majority is admitting that taxpayer dollars were incorrectly spent, and they are now using those stimulus funds to pay for these programs.

The stimulus bill was not subject to the so-called PAYGO requirements because the majority labeled it as "emergency spending." Under the rules of the House, emergency spending cannot be used as a PAYGO offset for future spending because it was never originally offset. As a result, the rule that we are debating must again waive the important PAYGO requirements.

Now, I know it's difficult to follow. I was trying to understand it in the Rules Committee last night. But the end result is that this bill is paid for by funds that are borrowed by the Federal Government. So I guess we could say that we are voting to provide our children with nutritious school lunches which will be paid to foreign entities in the future, with interest, foreign entities from which we are borrowing funds, thus adding to our national debt and imposing new fees on families.

By the way, we could have reauthorized these programs without adding to

our national debt and imposing new fees on families. Adding to our national debt in that way and imposing new fees on families is not the solution to improving the Nation's school meal programs at a time when, obviously, many are struggling.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me just respond to my colleague briefly by saying, when he talks about borrowing, I can't help but be reminded of the fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle have borrowed countless billions of dollars to pay for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. They have no problem with doing that. They have no problem with borrowing money to pay for wars. That all goes onto our credit card. They have no problem with that.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here is improving the quality of nutritious food that our kids will have access to. In doing so, we accomplish a number of things.

One is we end up with healthier kids who, quite frankly, will grow up to be healthier adults, which—guess what?—will cost less to our public systems. We are ensuring when our kids get healthy meals that they can learn better in school. I don't think there is any debate—maybe there is on that side of the aisle—about the fact that there is a tie between kids' ability to concentrate and learn and having adequate food and having healthy food.

So I would say to my colleague Mr. DIAZ-BALART, we are paying for it, and I know we are paying for it because I don't like the offset. I don't like the fact that the offset that the Senate gave us was in the SNAP Program. I've been fighting that offset. That is a real offset and it has real consequences. It is one of the reasons we are lobbying the White House: to find an alternative offset.

But let's not diminish the fact that, by passing this bill, we are actually saving this government countless billions, if not trillions, of dollars down the road by making sure that our kids have access to nutritious food in the school setting.

At this point, I yield 3 minutes to a valued member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and would like to join him in expressing my great honor in having served with the gentleman from Florida.

It is my hope that he and I have another opportunity to manage a rule together. It is my expectation we will have the opportunity to manage another rule together. But in the event that that doesn't happen, I would like to express my warm wishes for his continued success in his future. I very much look forward to seeing what the gentleman from Florida will be involved with next, and I look forward to staying in touch and in close contact for many years in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3307, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010. The passage of this bill, which would reauthorize the Child Nutrition Act, is critical to our Nation's children—to their health and well-being and to their academic success in school. Making sure that our children get a world-class education can't be accomplished if our children don't get the proper nutrition to make it through the day and learn.

I have a background of involvement in public education, both as the superintendent of a charter school I started as well as the chairman of the Colorado State Board of Education. I have tasted and eaten many school lunches. I have seen firsthand how the lack of access to nutritious food prevents too many kids from reaching their full potential—intellectually, academically, and physically.

Childhood hunger and poor nutrition are two of the greatest public health challenges—and yes, education challenges—that face our country. Nearly one-third of American children are overweight or obese, and many of those who are overweight or obese also suffer from malnutrition. This number has been on the rise nationally as well as in my home State of Colorado.

This bill tackles both hunger and obesity by addressing access to food and the nutritional quality of food, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the House version of this bill. This bill facilitates a coordinated approach across all levels of government, the private sector, communities, school districts, and families to make real positive change.

Specifically, this bill ensures up to 115,000 more eligible children access to school meals through direct certification, reduces paperwork, makes qualification easier, and creates savings for school districts. It increases the lunch reimbursement rate by 6 cents per meal. That is the first real increase in over 30 years. It requires updated Federal nutritional standards for school meals, strengthens local school wellness policies, and continues to provide schools with increased resources and training to improve meal quality.

In particular, I am pleased that this bill will strengthen school districts' wellness policies. These provisions, which I introduced in the House in H.R. 5090, the Nutrition Education and Wellness in Schools, or NEW Schools Act, were also supported by the White House Task Force on Child Obesity report and included in the bill.

Our schools should be our first defense against childhood obesity and unhealthy nutrition habits that stay with kids as they mature into adults and even have an intergenerational effect across their lives. While hunger affects people of all ages, it is particularly devastating for children.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Overall, this is a very strong bill that makes the necessary and responsible investments and that represents a critical step in answering President Obama and First Lady Obama's call to end childhood hunger. For the sake of the health and well-being of our Nation's schoolchildren and our future, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to pass the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act.

□ 1130

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to my friend from New York (Mr. LEE), who is the author of the proposal that we will be discussing subsequently, the YouCut proposal.

Mr. LEE of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The American people are truly frustrated, and we saw that in the November election. They are demanding that Congress start to do what they were brought here for, and that is to get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced the STOP the Overprinting Act earlier this year as a commonsense way to cut spending in Washington, and I appreciate your support in selecting it as this week's YouCut winner.

When a Member of Congress today introduces or cosponsors a bill, we receive five printed copies of the legislation, regardless of the length. The best example I can show is the 2,000-plus page health care bill that stands here. So, in essence, you would be getting 10,000 copies of paper in your office when, in fact, each office has it readily accessible online—a waste of money. This bill was introduced months ago, and we finally now have an opportunity to do something about this needless spending that's going on.

When the bill was introduced, just on this bill alone, the Government Printing Office had to print nearly a half million pieces of paper. Again, that's just on one single piece of legislation. In this last Congress, we've had more than 14,000 bills that were introduced—a lot of unnecessary cost and waste when the American people keep scratching their head as to what's going on in Washington. We have a very simple way to save money. This week's YouCut vote will save \$35 million over the next 10 years.

The unfortunate thing about Washington is that unless that amount has either a "B" or a "T" after it, bureaucrats are ignoring it. That has got to stop, and that's why we saw such a huge change in the November election.

Simply put, we've got the information online. Let's start doing what the private sector has been doing for years—going paperless. This is a very simple way to do it. We've got to start managing a budget and doing what the private sector is doing and looking for every way that we can start saving a dollar. Starting now, we truly can change that attitude in Washington

and start cutting wasteful spending by supporting this YouCut bill.

Over the past several months, House Republicans have been stressing this for some time, and we have proposed over \$155 billion in savings for taxpayers through this YouCut initiative. Despite the more than 2.5 million votes cast, Republicans—and those of you who have cast your votes through YouCut—have been met with a lost resistance on the other side. Hopefully, that will change.

Again, thank you for your vote and for your participation in cutting Washington spending through this YouCut initiative.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), who will focus on the important issue of child nutrition.

Mr. BACA. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I thank the gentleman from Florida and wish him the very best of luck in his future. He has been a good friend and a terrific legislator, too, as well here.

I rise in support of S. 3307, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act.

Too many families are struggling to put food on the table. There are 40 million people going hungry in the United States right now. We recently passed the SNAP program. We recently put stimulus money to increase the SNAP program to provide food for many individuals. There is 9.6 percent unemployment in the United States, 14 percent in my district alone. These are individuals that are struggling to put food on the table.

Can you imagine a child that does not have the ability to put food in their stomach? One in four American children are currently at risk of going hungry. You have to feel what a person who is actually going hungry and doesn't know where their meal is coming from. And one in three American children are either overweight or obese. When we talk about it's going to cost the taxpayers money, no, it's actually going to save the taxpayers money in the long run because it's costing us, right now, \$147 billion in what we are paying for obesity right now. It would reduce our health costs in that area, reduce our costs overall.

As chair of the House Agriculture Committee on Nutrition, I chaired hearings both in Washington and in California to explore ways to fight childhood obesity and increase access to healthy food. Today's legislation offers a step forward in addressing both child hunger and obesity. This bill expands the after school and summer meals programs, better connects eligible children with free meal benefits, improves and expands the school breakfast programs, extends the WIC certification period for children, and puts more fresh fruits and vegetables into our schools.

We passed the No Child Left Behind. Well, can you imagine a child going to school and having to pass a test?

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

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

Mr. BACA. Many children have a difficult time passing a lot of these tests because they're going hungry.

None of us are pleased with the cuts to the SNAP program made by this bill, but I am committed to work with the administration and my colleagues on the House Agriculture Committee to ensure that we fully fund the SNAP program.

I urge my colleagues to stand up with our children and pass this much-needed legislation. I ask you to support this.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, on Election Day, the American people sent a very clear and unmistakable message—that it is time to reduce the size of government and to cut spending. In fact, they have been demanding that we take these steps for some time, but unfortunately the leadership in this Congress has been unwilling to listen.

The Republicans in this House have heard the calls of the American people and earlier this year began a YouCut program in which the American people actually get to choose specific spending cuts that we attempt to bring to the floor. We understand the need to change the culture around here from one of spending to one of fiscal discipline, cutting spending and ending the practice of piling a mountain of debt onto future generations.

Today's YouCut looks to end the practice of wasteful spending by eliminating the mandatory printing of all congressional bills and resolutions by the Government Printing Office, potentially saving over \$35 million over the next 10 years. Certainly that is something that we can all agree is a commonsense cut.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on the previous question so that we can have the opportunity to bring this commonsense spending cut to the floor. If they do not intend to join us in the effort to end the spending now, American taxpayers can rest assured that our new Republican majority will bring this cut and many, many others, Mr. Speaker, forward in the next Congress as we endeavor to get America's fiscal house in order.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentlewoman that when they are in charge next year, I am happy to support her in eliminating excessive paperwork. But I wish she and others would understand the importance of what we are discussing here today, feeding hungry kids, making sure that our children get nutritious meals at schools. I mean, I've got to be honest with you. I think that's a hell of a lot more important. The fact that, to some of my friends on the other side of

the aisle, this appears as if it's some sort of a trivial issue tells me that they haven't been to food banks and they haven't been in some of their schools talking to teachers and talking to the people who oversee the food service program about the challenges that so many school districts face in providing healthy meals to our kids.

We all talk about how we want to control health care costs. Let's give our kids healthy food in school settings. That will do more to control health care costs and ensure that kids will have a healthy adulthood. You want to deal with the issue of better test scores? Making sure kids have a good, nutritious meal in a school setting is one of the ways to do that.

□ 1140

That's an important issue. This is a big deal what we're talking about here today. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has come to this floor, and I would appreciate if my friends on the other side of the aisle would join us in supporting this underlying bill so we can get it on the President's desk at the end of the day to get him to sign this so we can move forward in an area that is of great importance.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) who's been a champion on this and so many issues dealing with food insecurity and hunger and good nutrition.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman. And I might just say to the prior speaker on the other side of the aisle that the American people did not vote to cut food for kids in our country. They voted to cut the tax cuts that are provided to the corporate special interests in this Nation, which the other side of the aisle seems to have no problem with.

I rise today in support of this rule. The Hunger-Free Kids Act represents a long overdue, a much-needed commitment to the health and to the well-being of our schoolchildren. We all know the double-edged problems that millions of young people currently face.

Today's kids are threatened by both a growing obesity epidemic, and far too many struggling families in this economy are facing gnawing hunger. According to a recent report, one out of every four young adults is too overweight to serve in our military. At the same time, according to the Food Research Action Center, one out of every four households with children experienced food hardship this year—meaning they did not have the money to purchase the food their families needed.

Don't let people fool you with words like "food hardship" and "food insecurity." It results in hunger. Kids in this Nation are going to bed hungry every single night.

This bill marks a significant step forward against both fronts of this dan-

gerous pincer movement. By expanding access to and emphasizing good nutrition for all schoolchildren, this bill will reduce hunger. It will reduce obesity. The Hunger-Free Kids Act will add 115,000 new students into the school meals program by using Medicaid data to certify eligible kids. It will provide an additional 21 million meals a year by reimbursing providers for after-school meals to low-income children.

While expanding access to meal programs, this bill also works to improve the nutritional quality of all of the food in our schools. It sets national nutrition standards that will finally get all of the junk food infiltrating our classrooms and our cafeterias out the door. And for those schools who comply with these revised nutrition standards, it provides the first real reimbursement rate increase—6 cents a meal. And that is the largest increase we have seen in over 30 years.

This bill will also strengthen the farm-to-school networks so that more healthy produce, local foods, even the foods that are grown in the school gardens can find their way into the menus.

Our kids consume roughly 35 to 50 percent of their daily calories during the school day. By passing this bill, we can help see they are getting enough nutritious food to stay healthy, to grow, to learn, to succeed.

Given the current economic climate, I know some will ask, How can we afford this bill? I say how can we afford not to pass it? Leaving millions of children hungry and malnourished in the name of budget-cutting is penny wise, pound foolish, and is unconscionable—especially from those who would now say let's provide the richest 2 percent of the people in this Nation with a tax cut of over \$100,000 a year. They're eating well, they're eating high on the hog, and kids are going to bed hungry every night in our Nation.

Countless studies have shown that kids with access to a nutritious breakfast learn more and perform better in school. From the very beginning, I have been working, and others have been working, to expand access to Federal aid, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—yes, the food stamp program—for eligible children. We want to make sure that all of our kids have access to the nutrition that they need for a healthy future.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Using the food stamp as an offset at a time when one in five kids receives food stamp assistance moves us away from that goal.

Nevertheless, this legislation is a big step forward. I, for one, and others have said we will continue to push to see that the SNAP funding is restored; we will work with the White House to make sure those funds are restored. I'm happy to see the Congress moving in the right direction today and pledge to

fight to continue to have access to the resources that will allow us to have all kids who are eligible for these resources have the accessibility to gain these resources.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule. Nothing that we do in this body is as important as ensuring that our children, our grandchildren, and the next generation of Americans have the tools, the opportunities and the nutrition that they need to thrive and to succeed. Our kids deserve no less.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out I think it's important to clarify that if our proposal today, the YouCut proposal, to eliminate for the taxpayer unnecessary spending on paperwork, if that's adopted it would not negate in any way consideration of the underlying bill on the lunch programs.

At this point I would like to yield 2 minutes to my friend from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I applaud the first lady, Michelle Obama, for her efforts in childhood obesity. I hail from the State of West Virginia, which has probably some of the highest percentages of childhood obesity; and I think the issue in the underlying bill is tremendously important for our Nation and for the future, as is the nutritional aspects of that.

And as the gentleman from Florida said, I'm going to talk on the YouCut because I believe cutting spending and not passing on generational debt to those same children is an important issue as well.

Over the last few months, millions of Americans have used YouCut as a way to voice their concerns over the out-of-control spending in Washington, and many have offered their own solutions on how the government can be more efficient and more accountable. Unfortunately, most of these have fallen on deaf ears as the Congress has voted repeatedly not to try to rein in the spending of taxpayer dollars, and we simply cannot continue down this path. Each week we have brought a simple, yet effective way to cut spending before the House, and it has failed every time.

So today I will support eliminating the requirement to print copies of every single bill and resolution—imagine how many pages that is—that's been introduced in Congress because all of these are already available online.

I want to congratulate Mr. LEE of New York for bringing forth this proposal. This will save millions of dollars over the next decade—a small number in the grand scheme of things—but nevertheless a significant start.

There is no question that cutting the deficit will require some tough decisions on our part, but let's start out now on one which everyone can agree, and I think this should be one of them.

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

When my friends talk about passing on to future generations debt, I can't

help but wonder where they were when President Bush passed these tax cuts that added over a trillion dollars to our debt, totally unpaid for, most of it going to millionaires and billionaires. And I want to know where they are right now, they want to extend the tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires and they still don't want to pay for it.

But somehow when it comes to debt and piling it on to future generations, when it comes to tax cuts for very wealthy people, they're silent. Where were they when President Bush at 2 o'clock in the morning, they kept a roll call open for 3 hours and passed a Medicare prescription drug bill that cost hundreds of billions of dollars that was totally unpaid for. That cost a lot more than was advertised. Totally silent.

Where are they when some of us are saying, we ought to pay for these wars. If you want them, you ought to pay for them or end them. I'd prefer to end them, but for those who want them you ought to pay for them. They're silent.

When it comes to closing loopholes for big corporations that routinely stick it to the American people, no, no, we can't do that. Even though it might save money for taxpayers, we can put it toward deficit reduction. No, no, no. Those are very wealthy special interests. They want to protect them, whether it's Big Oil or big pharmaceuticals or whatever, at any cost.

□ 1150

So when I hear them talk about debt, I am reminded of the fact that when President Clinton left office we had a surplus. They ran this place and drove this economy into a ditch. And quite frankly, it's been a nightmare trying to dig us out of this ditch.

And I give the President great credit for his courage in trying to move this country forward in the area of health care, and today in the area of trying to move this bill forward on child nutrition. So they have no credibility when it comes to talking about reducing deficits or debt.

And, in fact, as we speak, they are trying to figure out a way I think probably to defeat this bill, to take the money that this bill costs, the offsets for this bill, take that money and put it toward tax cuts for rich people. I mean, that's what they want to do.

So again, I would urge my colleagues to understand the importance of what we are doing today. We are trying to make sure that our kids get healthy food and nutritious food in school settings. We are trying to pave the way for healthy futures for our kids. We want to make sure our kids can learn better. This is important stuff that we are talking about here today, and I would urge all my colleagues to support the rule and to support the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I believe it's fitting that those of us on

this side of the aisle are bringing forward another proposal, a YouCut proposal that's been voted on and recommended to this House by a significant number of our constituents. They continue to sound the alarm on government spending, and we must, this Congress must finally listen.

To date, participants in Republican Whip Cantor's YouCut initiative have voted to cut over \$180 billion in spending. This week, those participating have voted for a proposal by Congressman LEE of New York, who we heard from before, to end the unnecessary printing of congressional bills and resolutions.

I think it's appropriate that we finally acknowledge the existence of the Internet, and that much unnecessary spending is taking place through the printing of documents. That was appropriate and logical in the past, but not after the development of many new technologies.

So I will be asking Members to vote "no" on the previous question so we can have a vote on Congressman LEE's proposal. And again, I remind my colleagues that a "no" vote on the previous question will not preclude consideration of the underlying legislation that we have been debating today.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

Having said that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends will do what they always do. They will come up with some stunts to try to get us to delay or to not pass this bill today. That's just what they do. And the fact is that if we change this underlying bill in any way—and I would urge my colleagues to be prepared for probably an uncomfortable or an ugly motion to recommit later on in the debate. But if any of their procedural stunts prevail, then we will end up not passing this bill—the Senate will not consider an amended child nutrition bill; it ends it right here and now—and that would be a tragedy.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stop the politics just for a few minutes and do the right thing when it comes to this child nutrition bill. This is a bill that will improve access for our kids. This is a bill that increases the focus on nutrition quality and on children's health. It is a

bill that will improve program management and program integrity. It is fully paid for at no cost to the taxpayers.

And I would say to my colleagues on the Democratic side who are concerned about the current offset, that we have a commitment from the White House to fix that in a future vehicle so that the offset is not the SNAP cuts. But the underlying bill here is a good bill, is a good bill that will mean a world of difference for hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our kids all throughout this country. Making sure that hungry kids get at least one, hopefully more than one nutritious meal a day in a school setting is something we all should be for. It should not be the subject of partisan politics.

Making sure our kids get healthy, nutritious food and not junk in school should be a priority of all of ours, Republican and Democrat alike. This shouldn't be a partisan issue. I mean, the fact that we are here today and there is some controversy around this bill tells me that it's just politics as usual. My friends on the Republican side don't like it because the President likes it. Well, you know what? That's been the routine throughout the entire tenure of this President. But for once, for once, just put the party politics aside and do what's right.

I cochair the House Hunger Caucus and the Congressional Hunger Center. Hunger is a problem in this country. There are tens of millions of our citizens who are hungry. Seventeen million children in this country, the United States of America, the richest country on this planet, are hungry. It's a national disgrace. All of us in this Congress should be ashamed of that fact, that we haven't been able to help be part of the solution in a more significant way. This is one way that we can be part of that solution.

I have a list of national organizations and State organizations, too many to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but it is significant. The support across this country for this legislation is significant.

I want to thank the Speaker of the House and Chairman GEORGE MILLER and ROSA DELAURO and CAROLYN MCCARTHY and BARBARA LEE and so many others who have been part of this legislation. I want to thank Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN, who was a champion of this legislation over in the Senate.

But we must act today. We must do what's right for our kids, not for our political party, but for our kids. So enough of the stunts. Let's say "no" to all the stunts today. Let's say "yes" to this important child nutrition reauthorization bill, "yes" to a healthier future for our kids, "yes" to making sure they can better learn in school, "yes" to developing better and healthier habits that will last them a lifetime. This is a good, this is an important bill. This is a big deal today. This is a huge deal, and everybody should join and support the final passage of the bill.

So I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule. I urge my colleagues not to fall for any motion to recommit stunts when the bill is under consideration.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the program, YouCut has offered the potential for Republicans and Democrats to join together to begin tackling America's unsustainable fiscal situation. That's why I was encouraged yesterday when President Obama embraced an idea originally chosen by YouCut voters by declaring a freeze on all non-military Federal employee salaries for the next two years.

This proposal was not an easy one for the President to make, nor was it a pain-free vote for House Republicans when we offered it back in May, as there are thousands of Federal employees who do important work for our country. But make no mistake, no one said that getting America back to opportunity, responsibility and success was going to be easy. We have to make tough choices together if we want to get our economy back to where it needs to be.

This week's YouCut proposal was developed by CHRIS LEE and would eliminate the mandatory printing of bills introduced before Congress, a practice that wasted nearly three million paper copies and approximately \$7 million taxpayer dollars during the 111th Congress alone. With all of the digital technology that's available, surely Congress can find a more efficient and fiscally responsible way to do its business. Changing this body's printing practices would be a simple and important step in the right direction. We must start injecting some common sense into Washington, and this is a no-brainer.

As we look to the new Republican majority, YouCut will serve as an important tool as we strive to transform the culture of spending in Washington into one of savings. As we wrap up this Congress, Mr. Speaker, I encourage our Democrat friends across the aisle to join us in voting for this common sense spending reduction.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1742 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 2. 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. 4640) to amend title 44, United States Code, to eliminate the mandatory printing of bills and resolutions by the Government Printing Office for the use of the House of Representatives and Senate. 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. 4640.

(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 implications. 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.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 1742, if ordered; adopting House Resolution 1741; and suspending the rules with regard to House Concurrent Resolution 323; House Resolution 1735, if ordered; and House Resolution 1430, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 180, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 587]

YEAS—232

Ackerman	Davis (AL)	Hirono
Altmire	Davis (CA)	Holden
Andrews	Davis (TN)	Holt
Arcuri	DeGette	Honda
Baca	Delahunt	Hoyer
Baird	DeLauro	Inslee
Baldwin	Deutch	Israel
Barrow	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Bean	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Becerra	Doggett	(TX)
Berkley	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson (GA)
Berman	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (GA)	Driehaus	Kagen
Bishop (NY)	Edwards (MD)	Kanjorski
Blumenauer	Edwards (TX)	Kaptur
Boccheri	Ellison	Kennedy
Boswell	Ellsworth	Kildee
Boucher	Engel	Kilpatrick (MI)
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Kilroy
Braley (IA)	Etheridge	Kind
Brown, Corrine	Farr	Kissell
Butterfield	Fattah	Klein (FL)
Capps	Filner	Kosmas
Capuano	Foster	Kratovil
Cardoza	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Carnahan	Fudge	Langevin
Carney	Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Giffords	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez	Lee (CA)
Chandler	Gordon (TN)	Levin
Chu	Grayson	Lewis (GA)
Clarke	Green, Al	Lipinski
Clay	Green, Gene	Loebsack
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lofgren, Zoe
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Lowe
Cohen	Hall (NY)	Lujan
Connolly (VA)	Halvorson	Lynch
Conyers	Hare	Maffei
Cooper	Harman	Maloney
Costa	Heinrich	Markey (CO)
Courtney	Herse	Marshall
Critz	Higgins	Matheson
Crowley	Hill	Matsui
Cuellar	Himes	McCarthy (NY)
Cummings	Hinchey	McCollum
Dahlkemper	Hinojosa	McDermott

McGovern	Polis (CO)	Slaughter
McMahon	Pomeroy	Smith (WA)
McNerney	Price (NC)	Snyder
Meek (FL)	Quigley	Space
Meeks (NY)	Rahall	Spratt
Michaud	Rangel	Stark
Miller (NC)	Reyes	Stupak
Miller, George	Richardson	Sutton
Mitchell	Rodriguez	Tanner
Mollohan	Rothman (NJ)	Teague
Moore (KS)	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Moore (WI)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Moran (VA)	Rush	Tierney
Murphy (CT)	Ryan (OH)	Titus
Murphy (NY)	Salazar	Tonko
Murphy, Patrick	Sanchez, Linda	Towns
Nadler (NY)	T.	Tsongas
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Neal (MA)	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Oberstar	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Obey	Schauer	Walz
Oliver	Schiff	Wasserman
Ortiz	Schrader	Schultz
Owens	Schwartz	Waters
Pallone	Scott (GA)	Watson
Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Watt
Pastor (AZ)	Serrano	Waxman
Payne	Sestak	Weiner
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)
Perriello	Sherman	Woolsey
Peters	Shuler	Yarmuth
Peterson	Sires	
Pingree (ME)	Skelton	

NAYS—180

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

NOT VOTING—21

Alexander	DeFazio	Melancon
Barrett (SC)	Fallin	Minnick
Brown-Waite,	Hastings (FL)	Myrick
Ginny	Hodes	Radanovich
Burton (IN)	Marchant	Speier
Buyer	Markey (MA)	Welch
Costello	McMorris	Wu
Davis (IL)	Rodgers	

□ 1228

Mr. GERLACH changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 174, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

YEAS—230

Ackerman	Ellison	Levin
Altmire	Ellsworth	Lewis (GA)
Andrews	Engel	Lipinski
Arcuri	Eshoo	Loebsack
Baca	Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe
Baird	Farr	Lowe
Baldwin	Fattah	Lujan
Barrow	Filner	Maffei
Bean	Foster	Maloney
Becerra	Frank (MA)	Markey (CO)
Berman	Fudge	Markey (MA)
Berry	Garamendi	Matheson
Bishop (GA)	Giffords	Matsui
Bishop (NY)	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Blumenauer	Gordon (TN)	McCollum
Boccheri	Grayson	McDermott
Boswell	Green, Al	McGovern
Boucher	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	McMahon
Braley (IA)	Gutierrez	McNerney
Brown, Corrine	Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)
Butterfield	Halvorson	Meeks (NY)
Capps	Hare	Michaud
Capuano	Harman	Miller (NC)
Cardoza	Heinrich	Miller, George
Carnahan	Higgins	Mitchell
Carney	Hill	Mollohan
Carson (IN)	Himes	Moore (KS)
Castor (FL)	Hinchey	Moore (WI)
Chu	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Clarke	Hirono	Murphy (CT)
Clay	Holden	Murphy, Patrick
Cleaver	Holt	Nadler (NY)
Clyburn	Honda	Napolitano
Cohen	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Connolly (VA)	Inslee	Nye
Conyers	Israel	Oberstar
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Costa	Jackson Lee	Oliver
Costello	(TX)	Ortiz
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Owens
Critz	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Crowley	Kagen	Pascarell
Cuellar	Kanjorski	Pastor (AZ)
Cummings	Kaptur	Payne
Dahlkemper	Kennedy	Perlmutter
Davis (AL)	Kildee	Perriello
Davis (CA)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peters
DeGette	Kilroy	Peterson
Delahunt	Kind	Pingree (ME)
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Polis (CO)
Deutch	Kissell	Pomeroy
Dicks	Klein (FL)	Price (NC)
Dingell	Kosmas	Rahall
Djou	Kratovil	Rangel
Doggett	Kucinich	Reyes
Doyle	Langevin	Richardson
Driehaus	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez
Edwards (MD)	Larson (CT)	Ross
Edwards (TX)	Lee (CA)	Rothman (NJ)

Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter

Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko

Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—174

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

NOT VOTING—29

Alexander
Barrett (SC)
Berkley
Bright
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Coffman (CO)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)

Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Tanner
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Melancon
Minnick
Myrick
Radanovich
Ruppersberger
Shadegg
Speier
Whitfield
Wu

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 589, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 101, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1741) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 172, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 589]

YEAS—236

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell

Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas

Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley

Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader

Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—172

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Djou
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)

NOT VOTING—25

Alexander
Barrett (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Cao
Davis (IL)
DeFazio

Fallin
Hastings (FL)
Hirono
Hodes
Marchant
McMorris
Rodgers
Melancon
Minnick

Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1236

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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