

□ 1301

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: adoption of House Resolution 167, by the yeas and nays; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 48, ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENTS, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 167) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 48) 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 181, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—241

Adams Cassidy Gerlach
 Aderholt Chabot Gibbs
 Akin Chaffetz Gibson
 Alexander Coble Gingrey (GA)
 Amash Coffman (CO) Gohmert
 Austria Cole Goodlatte
 Bachmann Conaway Gosar
 Bachus Costa Gowdy
 Barletta Cravaack Granger
 Bartlett Crawford Graves (GA)
 Barton (TX) Crenshaw Graves (MO)
 Bass (NH) Culberson Griffin (AR)
 Benishek Davis (KY) Griffith (VA)
 Berg Denham Grimm
 Biggert Dent Guinta
 Bilbray DesJarlais Guthrie
 Bilirakis Diaz-Balart Hall
 Bishop (UT) Dold Hanna
 Black Dreier Harper
 Blackburn Duffy Harris
 Bonner Duncan (SC) Hartzler
 Bono Mack Duncan (TN) Hastings (WA)
 Boustany Ellmers Hayworth
 Brady (TX) Emerson Heck
 Brooks Farenthold Heller
 Broun (GA) Fincher Hensarling
 Buchanan Fitzpatrick Herger
 Buechhon Flake Herrera Beutler
 Buerkle Fleischmann Huelskamp
 Burgess Fleming Hultgren
 Burton (IN) Flores Hunter
 Calvert Forbes Hurt
 Camp Fortenberry Issa
 Campbell Foxx Jenkins
 Canseco Franks (AZ) Johnson (IL)
 Cantor Frelinghuysen Johnson (OH)
 Capito Gallegly Johnson, Sam
 Cardoza Gardner Jones
 Carter Garrett Jordan

Kelly Murphy (PA)
 King (IA) Myrick
 King (NY) Neugebauer
 Kingston Nunes
 Kinzinger (IL) Nunnelee
 Kissell Olson
 Kline Palazzo
 Labrador Paulsen
 Lamborn Pearce
 Lance Pence
 Landry Peters
 Lankford Petri
 Latham Pitts
 LaTourette Platts
 Latta Poe (TX)
 Lewis (CA) Pompeo
 LoBiondo Posey
 Long Price (GA)
 Lucas Quayle
 Luetkemeyer Reed
 Lummis Rehberg
 Lungren, Daniel E. Reichert
 Mack Renacci
 Manzullo Ribble
 Marchant Rigell
 Marino Rivera
 McCarthy (CA) Roe (TN)
 McCaul Rogers (AL)
 McClintock Rogers (KY)
 McCotter Rogers (MI)
 McHenry Rohrabacher
 McKeon Rokita
 McKinley Rooney
 McMorris Ros-Lehtinen
 Rodgers Roskam
 Meehan Ross (FL)
 Mica Royce
 Miller (FL) Runyan
 Miller (MI) Ryan (WI)
 Miller, Gary Scallise
 Mulvaney Schilling

NAYS—181

Ackerman Eshoo McGovern
 Altmire Farr McIntyre
 Andrews Fattah McNeerney
 Baca Filner Meeks
 Baldwin Frank (MA) Michaud
 Barrow Fudge Miller (NC)
 Bass (CA) Garamendi Miller, George
 Becerra Gonzalez Moore
 Berkley Green, Al Moran
 Berman Green, Gene Murphy (CT)
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva Nadler
 Bishop (NY) Gutierrez Napolitano
 Blumenauer Hanabusa Neal
 Boren Hastings (FL) Oliver
 Boswell Heinrich Owens
 Brady (PA) Higgins Pallone
 Braley (IA) Himes Pascrell
 Brown (FL) Hinchey Pastor (AZ)
 Butterfield Hinojosa Payne
 Capps Hirono Pelosi
 Capuano Holden Perlmutter
 Carnahan Holt Peterson
 Carney Honda Pingree (ME)
 Carson (IN) Hoyer Poliss
 Castor (FL) Inslee Price (NC)
 Chandler Israel Quigley
 Chu Jackson (IL) Rahall
 Cicilline Jackson Lee Reyes
 Clarke (MI) (TX) Richardson
 Clarke (NY) Johnson (GA) Richmond
 Clay Johnson, E. B. Ross (AR)
 Cleaver Kaptur Rothman (NJ)
 Clyburn Keating Roybal-Allard
 Cohen Kildee Ruppertsberger
 Connolly (VA) Kind Rush
 Conyers Kucinich Ryan (OH)
 Cooper Langevin Sánchez, Linda
 Costello Larsen (WA) T.
 Courtney Larson (CT) Sarbanes
 Critz Lee (CA) Schakowsky
 Crowley Levin Schiff
 Cuellar Lewis (GA) Schrader
 Cummings Lipinski Schwartz
 Davis (CA) Loebbeck Scott (VA)
 DeFazio Lofgren, Zoe Scott, David
 DeGette Lowey Serrano
 DeLauro Luján Sewell
 Deutch Lynch Sherman
 Dicks Maloney Sires
 Dingell Markey Slaughter
 Doggett Matheson Smith (WA)
 Donnelly (IN) Matsui Speier
 Doyle McCarthy (NY) Stark
 Edwards McCollum Sutton
 Ellison McDermott Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS) Walz (MN) Welch
 Tonko Wasserman Wilson (FL)
 Towns Schultz Woolsey
 Tsongas Waters Wu
 Van Hollen Watt Yarmuth
 Velázquez Waxman
 Visclosky Weiner

NOT VOTING—10

Davis (IL) Noem Sanchez, Loretta
 Engel Nugent Tierney
 Giffords Paul
 Huizenga (MI) Rangel

□ 1325

Ms. RICHARDSON, Messrs. KILDEE, MEEKS, GUTIERREZ, and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for: Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 177, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENTS, 2011

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 48) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 48

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

(1) by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting “April 8, 2011”; and

(2) by adding after section 226, as added by the Further Continuing Appropriations Amendments, 2011 (Public Law 112-4), the following new sections:

“SEC. 227. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Agricultural Programs—Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses’ at a rate for operations of \$1,135,501,000.

“SEC. 228. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Agricultural Programs—Agricultural Research Service—Buildings and Facilities’ at a rate for operations of \$0.

“SEC. 229. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ‘Agricultural Programs—National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Research and Education Activities’ at a rate for operations of \$665,345,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such

heading in Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$89,029,000' and '\$11,253,000' for '\$45,122,000'.

"SEC. 230. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Agricultural Programs—National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Extension Activities' at a rate for operations of \$483,092,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$8,565,000' for '\$20,396,000'.

"SEC. 231. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Agricultural Programs—Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service—Salaries and Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$880,543,000.

"SEC. 232. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Conservation Programs—Natural Resources Conservation Service—Conservation Operations' at a rate for operations of \$850,247,000.

"SEC. 233. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Conservation Programs—Natural Resources Conservation Service—Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations' at a rate for operations of \$0: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$12,000,000'.

"SEC. 234. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Rural Development Programs—Rural Housing Service—Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account' for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, at a rate for operations of \$70,200,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$70,200,000' for '\$40,710,000' in the case of direct loans and '\$0' for '\$172,800,000' in the case of unsubsidized guaranteed loans.

"SEC. 235. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Rural Development Programs—Rural Business-Cooperative Service—Rural Cooperative Development Grants' at a rate for operations of \$31,754,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$300,000' and '\$0' for '\$2,800,000'.

"SEC. 236. Sections 718, 723, 727, 728, and 738 of Public Law 111-80 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for each of the dollar amounts specified in those sections.

"SEC. 237. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—International Trade Administration—Operations and Administration' at a rate for operations of \$450,989,000: *Provided*, That the sixth proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 238. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—Minority Business Development Agency—Minority Business Development' at a rate for operations of \$30,400,000: *Provided*, That the first proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 239. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—National Institute of Standards and Technology—Scientific and Technical Research and Services' at a rate for operations of \$504,500,000: *Provided*, That the second proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 240. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—National Institute of Standards

and Technology—Construction of Research Facilities' at a rate for operations of \$100,000,000: *Provided*, That the first proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 241. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Operations, Research, and Facilities' at a rate for operations of \$3,205,883,000: *Provided*, That the sixth proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 242. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction' at a rate for operations of \$1,340,353,000: *Provided*, That the sixth proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 243. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Justice—Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance' at a rate for operations of \$1,349,500,000: *Provided*, That the amount included in paragraph (4) under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$185,268,000'.

"SEC. 244. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Justice—Office of Justice Programs—Juvenile Justice Programs' at a rate for operations of \$332,500,000: *Provided*, That the amount included in paragraph (2) under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$91,095,000'.

"SEC. 245. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Justice—Community Oriented Policing Services' at a rate for operations of \$597,500,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act as follows: in paragraph (2), by substituting '\$15,000,000' for '\$40,385,000' and by substituting '\$0' for '\$25,385,000'; and in paragraph (3), by substituting '\$1,500,000' for '\$170,223,000' and by substituting '\$0' for '\$168,723,000'.

"SEC. 246. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'National Aeronautics and Space Administration—Cross Agency Support' at a rate for operations of \$3,131,000,000: *Provided*, That the third proviso under such heading in division B of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 247. Of the funds made available for 'Department of Commerce—Bureau of the Census—Periodic Censuses and Programs' in division B of Public Law 111-117, \$1,740,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 248. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Commerce—National Telecommunications and Information Administration—Public Telecommunications Facilities, Planning and Construction' at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 249. Of the unobligated balances available for 'Emergency Steel, Oil, and Gas Guaranteed Loan Program Account', \$48,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 250. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Treasury—Community Development Financial Institutions Fund Program Account' at a rate for operations of \$243,600,000, and the funding designation of \$3,150,000 for an additional pilot project grant under such heading in division C of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 251. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President—Office of National Drug Control Policy—Other Federal Drug Control Programs' at a rate for operations of \$152,150,000, and the matter under such heading in division C of Public Law 111-117 relating to the National Drug Court Institute and the National Alliance for Model State Drug Laws shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 252. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'District of Columbia—Federal Funds—Federal Payment to the Office of the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia' at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 253. Notwithstanding section 101, the aggregate amount of new obligational authority provided under the heading 'General Services Administration—Real Property Activities—Federal Buildings Fund—Limitations on Availability of Revenue' for Federal buildings and courthouses and other purposes of the Fund shall be available at a rate for operations of \$7,519,772,000, of which: (1) \$0 is for 'Construction and Acquisition'; and (2) \$284,000,000 is for 'Repairs and Alterations' for Special Emphasis Programs and Basic Repairs and Alterations.

"SEC. 254. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'General Services Administration—General Activities—Operating Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$71,881,000, and the matter relating to the amount of \$1,000,000 under such heading in division C of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 255. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'National Archives and Records Administration—Repairs and Restoration' at a rate for operations of \$11,848,000.

"SEC. 256. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for section 523 of division C of Public Law 111-117 at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 257. Of the unobligated balances available for 'Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Construction and Facilities Management' for construction projects, \$106,556,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That the amounts rescinded under this section shall be limited to amounts available for Border Patrol projects and facilities: *Provided further*, That no amounts in this section may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

"SEC. 258. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management—Management of Lands and Resources' at a rate for operations of \$957,971,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting "\$957,951,000" for "\$959,571,000" the second place it appears.

"SEC. 259. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management—Construction' at a rate for operations of \$6,626,000.

"SEC. 260. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management—Land Acquisition' at a rate for operations of \$26,650,000: *Provided*, That the proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 261. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the

Interior—United States Fish and Wildlife Service—Resource Management' at a rate for operations of \$1,257,356,000.

"SEC. 262. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—United States Fish and Wildlife Service—Construction' at a rate for operations of \$27,139,000.

"SEC. 263. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—United States Fish and Wildlife Service—Land Acquisition' at a rate for operations of \$63,890,000.

"SEC. 264. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—National Park Service—National Recreation and Preservation' at a rate for operations of \$57,986,000, of which \$0 shall be for projects authorized by section 7302 of Public Law 111-11.

"SEC. 265. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—National Park Service—Historic Preservation Fund' at a rate for operations of \$54,500,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting "\$0" for "\$25,000,000": *Provided further*, That the proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 266. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—National Park Service—Construction' at a rate for operations of \$185,066,000: *Provided*, That the last proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 and prior appropriation Acts, \$25,000,000 is rescinded, including \$1,000,000 from amounts made available for the (now completed) project at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina, and \$1,000,000 from amounts made available for the (now completed) project at Blue Ridge Parkway, North Carolina.

"SEC. 267. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—National Park Service—Land Acquisition and State Assistance' at a rate for operations of \$108,846,000.

"SEC. 268. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—United States Geological Survey—Surveys, Investigations, and Research' at a rate for operations of \$1,094,344,000.

"SEC. 269. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—Bureau of Indian Affairs—Operation of Indian Programs' at a rate for operations of \$2,334,515,000.

"SEC. 270. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of the Interior—Departmental Offices—Insular Affairs—Assistance to Territories' at a rate for operations of \$84,295,000.

"SEC. 271. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Environmental Protection Agency—Science and Technology' at a rate for operations of \$840,349,000, of which \$0 shall be for the purposes specified in 'Research/National Priorities' under the heading 'Science and Technology' in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accompanying Public Law 111-88.

"SEC. 272. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Environmental Protection Agency—Environmental Programs and Management' at a rate for operations of \$2,963,263,000: *Provided*, That of the amounts provided by this Act for such account, amounts are provided for the Geographic Programs specified in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accom-

panying Public Law 111-88 at a rate for operations of \$599,875,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided by this Act for such account, \$0 shall be for cap and trade technical assistance and \$0 shall be for the program specified in 'Environmental Protection/National Priorities' under the heading 'Environmental Programs and Management' in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accompanying Public Law 111-88.

"SEC. 273. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Environmental Protection Agency—Buildings and Facilities' at a rate for operations of \$36,501,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$500,000'.

"SEC. 274. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Environmental Protection Agency—State and Tribal Assistance Grants' at a rate for operations of \$4,777,946,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act as follows: by substituting '\$14,500,000' for '\$17,000,000'; by substituting '\$10,000,000' for '\$13,000,000'; by substituting '\$0' for '\$156,777,000'; by substituting '\$0' for '\$20,000,000'; and by substituting '\$1,106,446,000' for '\$1,116,446,000'.

"SEC. 275. The matter pertaining to competitive grants to communities to develop plans and demonstrate and implement projects which reduce greenhouse gas emissions under the heading 'Environmental Protection Agency—State and Tribal Assistance Grants' in division A of Public Law 111-88 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 276. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Forest and Rangeland Research' at a rate for operations of \$311,612,000.

"SEC. 277. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—State and Private Forestry' at a rate for operations of \$301,611,000.

"SEC. 278. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—National Forest System' at a rate for operations of \$1,550,089,000.

"SEC. 279. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Capital Improvement and Maintenance' at a rate for operations of \$548,962,000.

"SEC. 280. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Land Acquisition' at a rate for operations of \$33,184,000.

"SEC. 281. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management' at a rate for operations of \$2,097,387,000: *Provided*, That of the unobligated balances available under such heading in division A of Public Law 111-88 and prior appropriation Acts, \$200,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 282. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for section 415 of division A of Public Law 111-88 at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 283. Notwithstanding section 101 and section 200, amounts are provided for 'Department of Labor—Employment and Training Administration—Training and Employment Services' at a rate for operations of \$3,654,641,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included in paragraph (3)(E) under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$125,000,000' and by substituting '\$0' for '\$65,000,000'.

"SEC. 284. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of

Labor—Employment and Training Administration—Community Service Employment for Older Americans' at a rate for operations of \$600,425,000: *Provided*, That for purposes of funds appropriated by this Act, the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied by substituting '\$0' for '\$225,000,000' in the first place it appears, and the first and second provisos under such heading in such division shall not apply.

"SEC. 285. Notwithstanding sections 101 and 203, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Health Resources and Services Administration—Health Resources and Services' at a rate for operations of \$7,001,520,000: *Provided*, That the eighteenth, nineteenth, twenty-second, and twenty-fifth provisos under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall not apply to funds appropriated by this Act.

"SEC. 286. Notwithstanding section 101, in addition to amounts otherwise made available by section 130, amounts are provided for 'Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund' at a rate for operations of \$731,109,000, of which \$65,578,000 shall be for expenses necessary to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic (none of which shall be available past September 30, 2011) and \$35,000,000 shall be for expenses necessary for fit-out and other costs related to a competitive lease procurement to renovate or replace the existing headquarters building for Public Health Service agencies and other components of the Department of Health and Human Services.

"SEC. 287. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Corporation for Public Broadcasting' at a rate for operations of \$36,000,000: *Provided*, That the amounts included under such heading in division D of Public Law 111-117 shall be applied to funds appropriated by this Act by substituting '\$0' for '\$25,000,000' each place it appears.

"SEC. 288. Of the funds appropriated for 'Social Security Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses' for fiscal years 2010 and prior years (other than funds appropriated in Public Law 111-5) for investment in information technology and telecommunications hardware and software infrastructure, \$200,000,000 is rescinded.

"SEC. 289. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'House of Representatives—Salaries and Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$1,367,525,000.

"SEC. 290. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'House of Representatives—Salaries, Officers and Employees' at a rate for operations of \$196,801,000, of which \$129,282,000 shall be for the operations of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

"SEC. 291. Notwithstanding section 101 and section 221, amounts are provided for 'Library of Congress—Salaries and Expenses' at a rate for operations of \$445,201,000, of which \$0 shall be for the operations described in the fifth and seventh provisos under such heading in Public Law 111-68.

"SEC. 292. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Bilateral Economic Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—International Fund for Ireland' at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 293. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Brownfields Redevelopment' at a rate for operations of \$0.

"SEC. 294. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for 'Department of Transportation—Federal Railroad Administration—Railroad Safety Technology Program' at a rate for operations of \$0."

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Additional Continuing Appropriations Amendments, 2011".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Pursuant to House Resolution 167, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1330

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 48, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today to support H.J. Res. 48, the fiscal year 2011 further continuing appropriations resolution. This temporary CR will allow us to avoid a government shutdown that could otherwise occur on March 18, while cutting spending by \$6 billion to control our Nation's staggering deficits and to facilitate the continued recovery of our Nation's economy.

We've made it clear that a government shutdown is not an option, period. We will not allow this to happen on our watch.

This bill funds the government for an additional 3 weeks, until April 8, maintaining the critical support the government provides to the American people and allowing for the necessary time to complete negotiations on a final long-term agreement for the remainder of this year.

While funding the essential government agencies and programs, this CR makes \$6 billion in spending cuts, trimming \$2 billion for every week, to continue our efforts to rein in spending and put a dent in our massive and unsustainable deficit. Together with the \$4 billion that we cut 2 weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, along with the \$6 billion we cut in this bill, we will have cut \$10 billion from current year spending. That makes it the largest rescission in American history, and so it is working.

H.J. Res. 48 reduces or terminates a total of 25 programs for a savings of \$3.5 billion. These cuts include funding rescissions, reductions, and program terminations. It also eliminates earmark accounts within the Agriculture; Commerce, Justice and Science; Financial Services; General Government; and Interior subcommittee jurisdictions, saving the American taxpayers \$2.6 billion in earmark spending, which the President and both Houses of Congress have agreed they do not support.

These cuts are the tough, but necessary, legwork required to help bal-

ance our budgets and halt the dangerous downward spiral of skyrocketing deficits. While short-term funding measures such as this are not the preferable way to fund the government, at this point, it's vital.

The budget for fiscal 2011, which was passed to us by the previous Congress, is long, long overdue. I agree with many of my colleagues that we must get down to business and come to a final agreement as quickly as possible. Our economy must not be threatened by perpetual government shutdowns, which create uncertainty and a loss of confidence for job creators across the country.

This continuing resolution provides us with an appropriate length of time for negotiations, makes good on our promise to the American people to cut spending, provides certainty and stability, and allows essential Federal programs to continue while these negotiations ensue.

I'm hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this continuing resolution can be passed swiftly so we can turn our attention to the realities of our debt and deficit crisis and begin to put the Nation on the right path for the next fiscal year, 2012.

Our constituents have asked us to whip our spending into shape, to provide solutions that help our economy grow, and to help our citizens get jobs. This CR addresses their expectations responsibly over the short term and is just one of the set of bills that we intend to produce over the next year that will continue to put the Nation's budget back into balance and help our economy continue on the road to recovery.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, the House is considering the fifth continuing resolution for FY 2011 to keep the Federal Government running. Here we are, in the middle of March, considering yet another short-term bill that is supposed to buy us time to negotiate funding for the remainder of the fiscal year, and I hope that proves to be true. We need to bring this to a conclusion.

The extension reduces spending in FY 2011 by \$45 billion below the President's request. It adds another \$6 billion in "common ground" spending reductions. In total, the measure cuts \$51 billion below the President's request.

The idea behind the 3-week extension is to provide an opportunity for the House, Senate, and White House to settle all outstanding issues on fiscal year 2011 appropriations. I remain hopeful that negotiations will succeed and we will be able to give our agencies some amount of certainty for what little remains of fiscal year 2011.

Today, in The New York Times, there was a long article showing what kind of disruption occurs in Federal agencies, including Defense and Social Security and others, Head Start for example, because we haven't gotten these bills enacted, but I must remind my colleagues that if this CR is extended

for the remainder of the year, we would be cutting spending at historic levels, \$51 billion below the President's request. I am worried that cutting deeper will threaten a fragile economic recovery. Most economists see cuts in H.R. 1 as a drag on economic growth leading to the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs, as Fed Chairman Bernanke projects. Moody's Mark Zandi estimates 400,000 jobs lost for the remainder of this year and 700,000 more next year if H.R. 1 is enacted. Goldman Sachs think it would be as high as 2.4 million jobs lost. In yesterday's ABC News-Washington Post poll, the American people believe that the Republican proposed cuts in H.R. 1 will hurt the economic recovery.

I am relieved that Chairman ROGERS crafted a bill that relies on previously identified reductions, a significant portion of which were old earmarks. And while I know my colleagues will not agree with, and may not be able to support, some of the specific program cuts included in this package, I appreciate that there was a genuine attempt to engage the Senate and White House before they were chosen.

Most importantly, I am tremendously relieved the chairman has stayed away from controversial riders in this stopgap measure. He knows, as I do, that these riders would almost guarantee a veto by the administration, which would almost guarantee a government shutdown. An appropriations bill is not the place to decide enormously complex and controversial policy issues.

I am not pleased to be here today with yet another short-term bill. I sincerely hope that we will use this 3-week period of time judiciously so the next time we consider a bill for fiscal year 2011 it will be the last and for the remaining 6 months of this year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, a new member of our committee, Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things that are really not debatable. I think the American people understand, and I think everybody understands, that we are on an unsustainable path. We're on an unsustainable path as far as unemployment. The unemployment numbers are still frighteningly high. We are on an unsustainable path as far as borrowing and as far as spending.

So, frankly, we have a couple of options here. We can continue that unsustainable path, which is borrowing more and spending more, or we could change the way we're doing and try to get our fiscal act and our fiscal house in order.

□ 1340

I commend the chairman, Chairman ROGERS, for bringing forward a CR, an

extension, that does just that, that brings some sanity to this process, that reduces the size, the scope, and the amount of spending, that does so responsibly after reviewing programs and reviewing funding and reviewing what the Federal Government is doing. And that's exactly what we have in front of us today.

Yes, we wish that we could have not just an extension but that we could go through the entire year. The reason, by the way, that we are even talking about this right now is because the Democrats failed to pass it. So now we are forced to do so. We already passed a CR for the remaining part of the year; but, unfortunately, the Senate has not been able or has not been willing to do their part. So we are forced, once again, to do an extension. This is a real extension that reduces cost, that reduces expenses, that does so responsibly, and takes us off this unsustainable path. This does so by borrowing less, by spending less. And, yes, it will have the effect, Mr. Speaker, of getting our fiscal house in order and once again allowing this country to start creating jobs in a real way, not just in a piecemeal way.

So I urge our colleagues to support this responsible CR.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, BARBARA LEE, a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to oppose this continuing resolution. Once again, the majority is reading from a very familiar script that imposes budgetary pain on vulnerable communities that can least endure these budget cuts. For a third consecutive time now, the majority is presenting a temporary spending bill totaling \$6 billion in spending cuts and \$2.6 billion in earmark cuts to very meaningful programs. And once again, this CR does nothing to promote job creation. The majority pledged to develop jobs when they regained control of the House, but they continue to renege on their promise.

It is important to emphasize that the proposed cuts will hit communities that can least afford these hits. The loss of \$185 million in State and local law enforcement assistance provided by Byrne grants will further squeeze tight police budgets. With these cuts, communities will be struggling to find funding to support vital police functions. At a time when methamphetamine drug use and drug trafficking is on the rise, this CR includes cuts to COPS to combat the spread of meth use and distribution.

Rather than continue to fund vital programs at the community level that work, we are witnessing budgeting through biweekly CRs. And these cuts will further harm highly vulnerable communities that rely greatly on COPS policing services and technology grants.

Now, also, my constituents regularly call my office asking what source of

funding is going to replace the earmarks that historically have supported jobs, small businesses, schools, nonprofits. Also, I continue to press administration witnesses in budget justification hearings regarding the impact of the elimination of earmarks and what alternative resources will replace them.

I hope we vote "no" on the CR.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), the chairman of the Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of this joint resolution. It's not because I want to, but because it is necessary to support it today. It is necessary because we are stuck in a situation that results from the previous majority's lack of completing its work last year. I think we need to step back and just look at the situation that we were handed this year.

For the first time since the Budget Act of 1974, Mr. Speaker, the House failed to pass a budget last year. The House also failed—except for two occasions—to pass appropriation bills. The Senate did nothing. So what we are left with today is this mess that we are in with no fiscal year 2011 budget, no appropriation bills passed last year, nothing done. So we are given this mess today to clean up. And what we need is a little more time.

But in the meantime, we are going to cut spending, \$6 billion of cuts, \$2 billion a week for the 3 weeks that this bill will be in place. It's not enough. We have got to look at the overall problem that we have in this country: \$14.3 trillion of debt, an annual 1-year deficit of \$1.65 trillion.

Now, while this just scratches the surface, we have got to address long-term spending here in Washington, DC. We have got to look at not just the discretionary side, which this bill does, but look at all the entitlements. We are only addressing about 15 percent of the whole budget in this bill. We have got to make sure that we look at the other 85 percent which is mandatory, which is the other spending that is out there that has caused this explosion of debt that we have. This is a very good first step of going forward to really get a handle on the spending.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the White House finally get involved and show some leadership as far as trying to get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who is the ranking member on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee and is also the former chairman of that committee.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the very distinguished Member from Washington and thank him for his leadership. But he knows, as well as I trust all of the

Members do, that this is no way to run a government, lurching back and forth like a drunken sailor, the agencies not knowing when or whether they are going to get their money. Actually, I should take that back because the Navy would never conduct operations like this. And the distinguished chairman from Kentucky well knows that this is not the way we want to be doing business; yet here we are with another CR for 3 short weeks this time.

We just had a hearing this week with the Forest Service. As the Members know, they hire hundreds, sometimes thousands, of temporary seasonal workers to fight fires in our Nation's forests. They can't do that. They don't know how much money they are going to have. And the folks that they would hire seasonally as a result can't take those jobs, don't know what they are going to do. This unconscionable delay in funding disrupts people's lives, hundreds of thousands of people's lives, directly; millions of people's lives indirectly.

As I say, this is no way to run a government. But why are we doing it? Because we can't agree on H.R. 1, and we shouldn't agree to H.R. 1, as passed by the House.

So many riders that should have gone through legislative committees were put in the bill with 10 minutes of debate in the wee hours of the morning, stripping language from the authorizing legislation that had been subject to months, if not years, of careful deliberation. That's no way to run a government.

And beyond those riders, there are thousands of programs that are being cut willy nilly. One such program, for example, is the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. They provided the early warning to people on the west coast and Hawaii when they detected the recent tsunami.

□ 1350

And yet, we are told by NOAA, that the 30 percent cut in this bill, excuse me, 28 percent, cut in this bill for NOAA would dismantle our early warning system to save a few million dollars. That's just wrong.

There was just an article in the Washington Post that people are beginning to realize other essential things that are cut in this program to save a few dollars. Now, \$285 million is not a few dollars, but consider what happens when you cut \$285 million out of the program integrity section of the Internal Revenue Service. They collect \$10 for every dollar we spend. And so you cut out \$285 million, and it costs you about \$3 billion in revenue that should be collected.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. The point that I started by suggesting, and I'm sure it's not in contention, is that this is no way to

run a government. We have a responsibility on the Appropriations Committee to fund these agencies, to determine our priorities, to reflect the interests and the will of the American people. This process does not do that. The bill, H.R. 1, does not do that.

The American people deserve better. They deserve careful deliberation. We need to cut, but we need to cut responsibly, using a scalpel, not a sledgehammer.

This bill will pass, but this should be the last CR. Let's get a full-year appropriations bill passed as soon as possible.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. There is an article today in the Washington Post how House GOP spending cuts would add up to more spending later. This is what we worry about here.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield an additional minute.

And one of the things that I'm most concerned about is the women and infant care program, WIC, which provides nutrition to an expectant mother, who's probably on Medicaid, and help her and the baby to be born in a more healthy way. And we find out that the hospitals in this country provide \$26 billion of health care for these same babies who are born premature. So it's pay me now or pay me later. And in this case, it would be a lot more.

The IRS is another example. NOAA weather satellites is another example. In the middle of this tsunami and earthquake, we need to be doing more in these areas. And the American people understand this. They want us to make reasonable judgments. And I hope we can make reasonable judgments.

I happen to be the ranking on Defense. We can cut some money out of defense. We cut \$15 billion. We can do a little bit more in that area. But I think we've got to be careful. And when this final package comes together, we've got to talk out the ones that would be revenue raisers.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman from Virginia says that the public deserves that we pass appropriations bills, and I could not agree with him more. His majority last year failed to enact a single bill out of the 12 that we were supposed to pass. That's why we're here. We're trying to clean up the mess that the gentleman from Virginia's party left us when we took office in January.

Yes, it's a terrible way to do business. And this should be the last CR extension that we pass before we have an agreement with the other body and the White House on the rest of this year. However, Mr. Speaker, again, the gentleman's party in the Senate refuses to

pass a bill and lay something on the table. We are going to the conference table to negotiate, and we're sitting there by ourselves. The other body will not come forward with a proposition. Until that time, I don't know what we do.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is another necessary step in addressing the national imperative of reducing our debt while also keeping the government operating. Essential funds like homeland security are sustained under this bill and sustained in a fiscally responsible way.

Within the more than \$6 billion of spending reductions contained in this bill is a rescission of \$107 million to Customs and Border Protection, a rescission of unobligated balances requested by the administration for FY11, supported by a minority, passed by this body as part of H.R. 1, and also included in the Senate Appropriations Committee's recently reported bill.

But this bill also sends a very clear signal to the White House and to the Senate. As the Speaker and Chairman ROGERS have clearly stated, no one wants a government shutdown. The only people that are talking about a shutdown of the government are those who are avoiding the tough decisions and seeking to shift blame from their own failure to act.

Instead of excuses, the American people want results: less spending and a leaner, more effective government. And that's exactly what this temporary stopgap bill delivers.

I couldn't agree more with what the chairman just stated just a couple of minutes ago. Congress didn't get its work done, and the Senate has yet to provide a viable alternative to the House-passed H.R. 1, a bill that stands as the only year-long spending measure for FY11 passed by either Chamber of Congress. So complaints about a short-term stopgap bill like this CR ring hollow when the House-passed solution has been on the negotiating table for almost a month.

The President's proposed spending level for FY11 is no longer a viable option, a fact acknowledged by not only the administration itself, but also by both parties in both Chambers of Congress. So the time to get to work and fulfill our duty to the American people is long overdue.

Congress needs to deliver what the American people have so resoundingly demanded. I can only hope that the administration and the Senate will also acknowledge the reality of our Nation's fiscal crisis, demonstrate the resolve to reduce spending significantly below the current FY10 level, and come to the table with a viable budget for the remainder of this year.

The American people demand no less.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. You know, it was stated a moment ago by a gentleman on the other side that this CR cuts NOAA and the tsunami prediction monies. That is not so. The only thing in this bill that cuts money from NOAA are the earmarks, and, yes, we cut the earmarks, but they had nothing to do with tsunami warning.

Mr. DICKS. I yield myself 15 seconds.

I want to correct the record. I was referring to H.R. 1, not to the CR.

The gentleman from Kentucky is absolutely correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. H.R. 1 doesn't cut tsunami warning monies nor weather service monies.

Mr. DICKS. There are some things that I think NOAA thinks would have an effect on their weather forecasting.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Well, NOAA's wrong.

Mr. DICKS. Okay. Well, we'll check that out.

I yield 2 minutes to the Delegate from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Look, the majority has chosen to run the government, the Federal Government, from CR to CR. But the majority has no right to inflict this operational outrage on the local funds of a local jurisdiction, the District of Columbia.

The majority may want to incur for the Federal Government the operational difficulties. After all, the District of Columbia delivers services to Federal officials, including the President, Federal buildings, foreign embassies, and the like. But does the majority really want to risk, to put the District and its operations at risk or to place, what Wall Street almost surely will do, a risk premium on the District due to the uncertainty that we are at bay from CR to CR?

This is a fragile economy for every big city, but D.C.'s local budget was approved a year ago in the city and last summer by the Appropriations Committees. Yet the District of Columbia is being held hostage to a Federal fight, although the District of Columbia can do nothing to free itself from this Federal fight.

I have tried to get the District on successive CRs so that we could spend our own money all year. There is no disapproval of that here. I wager that very few Members even know that the District would close down if the Federal Government closed down; would be perplexed by it; would have no objection to our spending our own local money all year long.

We raise and manage \$8 billion. We have a right to spend our local funds without being dragged into a Federal fight.

□ 1400

You can't run a big city from CR to CR. I ask you to find a way between

now and 3 weeks to free D.C. to run its own city for the rest of the fiscal year.

Let my people go.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a new member of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I rise in support of H.J. Res. 48.

As has been stated, this legislation cuts \$6 billion in funding. They are responsible cuts. This is \$2 billion per week. It should be noted, too, there is broad bipartisanship agreement to nearly all the cuts contained in this legislation. Basically everything that is in this legislation was also contained in H.R. 1.

We should also note, too, that if this legislation is enacted, this legislation would represent the largest spending cut in domestic discretionary programs in history, when you combine this with what was cut 2 weeks ago, the \$4 billion. Again, if enacted, this will represent the largest spending cut in domestic discretionary programs in American history, should we enact this legislation.

Now, I know that some people around here think that this bill really doesn't go far enough, but it certainly does represent a very big step forward.

The cuts that are contained in here, we are eliminating \$2.6 billion in earmark funding from Agriculture, CJS, Financial Services, and Interior. The cuts include rescissions, reductions, and program terminations.

I think we all understand, too, that if we pass this, this will prevent a government shutdown, and we need to prevent that while these negotiations can continue. We need to come to some type of agreement for the balance of this fiscal year. But in the meantime, this represents responsible cuts and broad bipartisan agreement.

I say, let's cut spending, let's cut it now, and let's cut it today. Take yes for an answer. Don't snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. This is the right thing to do, and the American people will appreciate it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am not sure whether I rise for or against this, very frankly, because I think this process is not the process that we ought to be pursuing. I think in that context I speak for the chairman and for the ranking member and for most Members in this body.

I was going to wait a while, but then I heard Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania speak and I want to reiterate this point that he made, because I made it last week in my colloquy with the majority leader.

I made the point that we are about to make the largest single reduction in discretionary spending that we have made, the gentleman said in history; I was more modest and said in the 30

years that I have been here. But in any event, this is not an insubstantial cut.

The problem those of us have on this side of the aisle is it is not enough for a large number of your folks, and they have said so, and the Heritage Foundation has said so, and the Family Research Council has said so, and some of your Members have said so.

Now, the fact of the matter is this is a lousy way to run a railroad. We are trying to run the largest enterprise in the world in 2-week segments. It is costly to the private sector, it is extraordinarily inefficient for the public sector, and it is demoralizing for the private sector who deals with the government and for the public employees we have asked to perform the services that we have set forth as policy. And so I say at this juncture, this ought to be the last of this type. We need to reach agreement.

Now I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, because it is the largest cut, we think we've come a long way. You said you wanted to cut \$100 billion. Now, you're not cutting the \$41 billion that we cut. You were using the 2011 baseline. That's how you got your \$100 billion. \$41 billion, we have all agreed, is gone. We're going to freeze at 2010 and go below that. So we have come \$41 billion away, and we agree on that.

Now, you used the 2011. That wasn't our figure first. You used it September; we used it in December. So my view is we have agreed on \$41 billion. You don't say that. You say we're between zero and 60. I understand your rationale. But it's your figure, it's your baseline that you used in September in your Pledge to America.

If we have gone 41 and we are now going to go another 10 or 15, what I ask of you is, in light of the fact, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania points out, we've already done the deepest cut under Republicans, under Democrats, under any of us, it is time to hear from you, what is your alternative to make a deal?

Now, "compromise" is a prettier word, but we need to come to agreement. If we're going to serve our country, and those who serve our country, then we need to come to agreement, because they elected all of us. None of us has any greater superiority. We're all the same. And we need to come to agreement.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Would the gentleman talk to his colleagues over in the other body and tell them to pass something we can begin to negotiate on?

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, 435 of us have tried to talk to the people in the other body. But I will tell you, under the Constitution of the United States, we have the responsibility of initiating bills. Read the Constitution.

We sent H.R. 1 over there, as my good friend, the former Speaker of Idaho,

says to me, and they didn't pass it. It's not their responsibility to initiate. That didn't go anywhere.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I will say to you, we can wring our hands and say that the Senate's not doing its job. We're not in the Senate. We're here. Let us come to agreement. And we know the agreement is going to be someplace in between where you are and where we are. We know that. But what we don't know is what you can pass. What you don't know is what you can pass. You don't know what your caucus will do. I understand that. You are deeply divided, in my opinion, and we need to know, because it is not just us here that are adversely affected.

Let us come to agreement. Let us stop this process of funding government in very short cycles. It is not good for our country, it is not good for the people who work for our country, and it is not good for the people who are doing work around the world.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, could you tell the chairman and myself what our time remaining is?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 12¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Of which I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriation, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the gentleman that just spoke, the minority whip, a good friend of mine, what we can pass in this House and what our conference will agree to, and that is the \$61 million in cuts or \$100 million overall that we have already agreed to and already passed. We can pass that in this House.

I have heard that this is no way to run a railroad. My good friend from Virginia said this is no way to run a government. I have heard this is operational outrage. I will tell you the outrage here is that we are having to do this because the former majority, when they had the majority in the House, the majority in the Senate and the White House, failed to pass an appropriation bill. They left the American people in this country with this pile of crap. They should not complain about how we try to clean this up.

Mr. Speaker, by the end of this week, the appropriations subcommittee which I am privileged to chair, the Interior and Environment Subcommittee, will have had 12 budget oversight hearings over the past 3 weeks. That is 12 hearings addressing the fiscal 2012 budget that we will soon be writing.

It is worth noting that we are now 5½ months into the fiscal year 2011, and we still don't have a budget to fund the

government through the end of the current fiscal year. The CR we are considering today keeps the government operating for another 3 weeks. And you're right: We need to solve this within this next 3 weeks. The problem is you cannot negotiate with a body across the Rotunda that fails to act. We can't be the only ones at the table. We have to have something to negotiate with. We don't have that.

This CR saves taxpayers \$6 billion, including \$650 million in spending cuts from the Interior Subcommittee accounts that Republicans, Democrats, and the administration agree are reasonable and supportable on a bipartisan basis. The overall savings achieved through this CR, at a rate of \$2 billion per week, is the 3-week equivalent to the \$100 billion in cuts achieved in the long-term CR passed by House Republicans several weeks ago.

□ 1410

In the Interior budget alone, we have cut \$380 million out of earmarks. We have cut the National Park Service Preserve America Program, eliminated it, and other programs, Save America's Treasures in the National Park Service, programs that the administration did not request funding for in their 2012 budget. So these are things that are agreed on by both Republicans and Democrats.

Now that the Senate has voted down two versions of the year-long CR, the Republican version, H.R. 1, that cut spending by \$100 billion and the Democratic version that cut substantially less, it is time for both sides to come together on a funding bill for the rest of this year. The truth is that we really need to get the fiscal year 2011 budget written, passed, and signed into law so that we can turn our attention to next year's budget.

In the midst of the back and forth debate on spending, it is important to remember that these funding bills don't write themselves. Our Appropriations Committee staff have been working day and night, 7 days a week, for months now writing one CR after another, even as they prepare for hearings and study budget proposals for next year.

I encourage my colleagues to support this CR to keep the government open while both parties work to identify an acceptable level of spending cuts for the rest of the year. We can and should cut more from the spending budget, and I encourage my colleagues to support this CR.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Hawaii, MAZIE HIRONO, who is going to correct the record on the NOAA issue.

Ms. HIRONO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, the cuts to NOAA and our Weather Service are contained in H.R. 1, and we have not reached agreement on H.R. 1, which is why we are doing yet another CR. And, believe me, those kinds of cut to NOAA and our

Weather Service will have an impact on our ability to implement early warning systems.

Some of you may not know that Hawaii has already suffered millions and millions of dollars of damages as a result of the tsunami. And, yes, it does not compare at all to the tragedy that the Japanese people are facing, but nonetheless, thank goodness, our early warning systems were in place.

Now, as to this CR, I rise in opposition to this CR, which continues the Republican strategy of cutting \$2 billion every week from programs that support jobs and our families.

I want to focus on just one program being cut, out of many, by the way, that affect real people in real ways that is particularly troubling to me in this CR. This is the elimination of all funding for the Watershed and Flood Prevention Operation Program, popularly known as PL 566.

This \$30 million program means a lot to small rural communities nationwide. For Hawaii, the decline of the sugar and pineapple industries has forced us to transition from large scale plantation agriculture to small scale farming. PL 566 has been the only Federal program that has really worked to deal with our agricultural water issues, and it is the single most important Federal agriculture program for Hawaii.

Hawaii is the most food import-dependent State in the entire country, so agricultural self-sufficiency is a priority for us, which is one reason why continued funding for Hawaii's PL 566 project is so critical.

In addition, PL 566 provides flood prevention for small communities that the Army Corps does not serve. Hawaii projects include the Lower Hamakua Ditch Watershed Project to rehabilitate a 26-mile-long irrigation ditch that provides water to hundreds, hundreds of small farmers on Hawaii Island.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield the gentlelady another 30 seconds.

Ms. HIRONO. Another project is the Upcountry Maui Watershed Project, providing water to 170 farmers and ranchers on Maui, and also the Wailuku-Alenaio Watershed and Lahaina Watershed Projects that prevent flooding on Hawaii and Maui.

These long-term projects help to build our local economies and create jobs, and stopping these projects in midstream is irresponsible, unsafe, and makes no economic sense at all. Most of these projects are well under way. We need to continue funding these programs to support our communities and support jobs.

This program has long had bipartisan support. In fact, last year, I signed a joint letter, led by Agriculture Committee Chairman LUCAS, urging funding for this program.

Mr. DICKS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

In going back and looking, NOAA operations, research, and facilities in

H.R. 1 is cut by \$454.3 million. And one of the officials there said what would happen in the continuing resolution, there will be a dismantling of our Nation's early warning system, Dan Sobien, president of the National Weather Service Employees Organization, said in a telephone interview. It will result in a roughly 30 percent cut in the budget of the National Weather Service. Sobien said the current plan called for the Weather Service to close individual offices for about a month at a time on a rolling basis.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this continuing resolution, for two reasons.

Number one, it keeps us on the path to put the brakes on this runaway spending that has gone around this place too long. It continues us to get to the place where we start a culture of savings instead of this culture of spending.

The second reason to vote for this, of course, is to make sure that we don't shut down the government, to give us a little more time to try to have a final negotiation on the spending levels for next year.

Somebody asked the question, is this the best way to fund the government? Of course it is not. There is no way. It would have been a whole lot better if last year under the Democratic leadership in this House we had a budget before this House that would pass. But that didn't happen.

It would have been better last year during the session if the Democratic leadership had gone through regular order. We would have passed the appropriations bill, and then the government would be funded for 2011. But they didn't do that.

It would have been a whole lot better after this House got together and made some tough choices, set some priorities, made difficult decisions, and passed a spending bill that cut \$100 billion out of this year's spending and sent it down to the Senate. It would have been better if they would have taken that up and passed it, or at least done something. But they didn't do that.

So here we are. We find ourselves with another CR, 3 more weeks. But let me tell you, these are difficult times, and in difficult times leaders have to lead. We have got to sit down together and establish the priorities we have for spending. We have to make tough choices. That is what every American family does, that is what every American business does. If we are going to get this economy moving again, we need to settle this once and for all.

So I just hope that we will pass this continuing resolution and that this

will indeed be the last time we do this; that in 3 weeks we sit down, have that other body sit down and negotiate with us. It takes two to tango, as they say.

We sent the whole ball of wax down there and they didn't like it, so now we are sending them a little at a time. But we are honoring that pledge to cut \$100 billion. When you cut \$2 billion every week, that all adds up to \$100 billion. So this is \$6 billion more we are cutting on top of the \$4 billion we cut. But, again, that is no way to settle the year.

Let's settle it once and for all. Let's pass this, move ahead, and get this thing done.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR, who is a very senior member of the Appropriations Committee and, I think, the longest serving woman in the House of Representatives.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank my dear colleague for his great leadership and for yielding me this time.

Let me just say that I urge my colleagues to vote no on this continuing resolution. It cuts money for jobs to people that give social services to our senior citizens at a time when gas prices are going up and food prices are going up; it cuts jobs to clean up our brownfield sites across this country, and if you don't know what those are, you are lucky; it cuts jobs that affect our public broadcasting, the only decent broadcasting left in this country with the garbage that's on the airwaves today; and it cuts jobs dealing with construction and repair of our Save America's Treasures Program, some of the oldest buildings in America that our children and grandchildren have a right to enjoy, as we have.

So people say, where are you going to get the money? Let me tell you where the money is, and what is not on the table in trying to balance the Federal budget. How about the profits of the Wall Street "Big Six": Goldman Sachs, J.P. Morgan Chase, Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Morgan Stanley, and Citigroup. They scooped up just last year \$51 billion in profits; \$51 billion at the expense of the American people hit hard in this great recession that we're enduring. Wall Street titans are happy as clams.

□ 1420

Their top executives alone took \$26 million in compensation, not counting all their stock options. We didn't touch a penny of their bonuses. Oh, we can't do that! Wall Street banks are paying at an effective 11 percent tax rate when businesses in my district have to pay at 35 percent. What's fair about that? We could have \$13 billion, \$14 billion, \$15 billion, \$16 billion if Wall Street just paid at the same rate as other honest businesses do—just for last year.

And oil prices? The American people are being gouged all across this country. But Exxon made \$9 billion in the third quarter of last year—the largest

profit of a company in U.S. history. Guess how much they paid in taxes? A big goose egg. Zero. Zero. And British Petroleum, \$5 billion in one quarter. How much did oil companies pay in taxes? Where's that on the deficit cutting table?

So, we say to the American people, you can't balance a trillion-dollar deficit on 14 percent of the budget. All you do is hurt people. Wall Street and Big Oil have already hurt the American people.

Let's pay the bills by expecting those who have much and give nothing to pay their fair share. That's how you seriously balance the budget—everything has to be on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a very hardworking member of our committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of H.J. Res. 48 for the continuing appropriations for this fiscal year. It seems to me that we've got three questions we ought to address in the course of this debate. First, and very elementally, why are we here? Second, what does the bill do? And third, what are the consequences if the bill isn't passed?

We're here for the simple reason that the last Congress, that my good friends on the other side ran, never passed a budget and never passed a single appropriations bill. We're here because the Democratic majority failed to do its work. We're also here because the current Democratic majority in the other body has so far failed to do its work.

I remind my colleagues, we actually passed legislation and sent it over. I also remind my colleagues that the one proposal in the Senate that actually got the most votes was actually the Republican H.R. 1. But nevertheless, they failed to give us something to negotiate against. It's their obligation in the Senate at some point to have a common negotiating position. I don't know how we can sit down and negotiate otherwise.

So we're here, I think, because of a Democratic failure both in the last Congress and this one.

Second, what does this bill do? Well, it's pretty commonsensical. It cuts and reduces 25 programs, saving \$3.5 billion. Most of those programs the President and the majority say they don't want to continue. It eliminates \$2.6 billion in earmarks and, by itself, is one of the largest cuts any CR has ever administered. As has been pointed out earlier, if you combine it with the previous CR, it is a very substantial cut indeed. It buys time, but it also keeps the government running and it keeps us on course to reduce spending at \$2 billion a week, something that my colleagues and I are committed to.

Finally, what happens if we don't pass this bill? I know there's some that want to spend more, some that want to

spend less. The first thing that happens is we shut down the government, something all of us know is not a wise thing to do. The second thing that happens is that we probably create financial panic in the country and harm a fragile economy. Finally, the last thing that happens, and I think actually the most important, is we raise fundamental doubts amongst the American people as to whether or not this institution and we, as elected officials, have the capacity to actually address and solve our problems.

So I think we need to pass this bill. We need to give our friends on the other side of the aisle, particularly in the Senate, another 3 weeks to see if they can possibly come up with a negotiating position. And I'm confident once those negotiations begin, our Speaker will keep the government running, will bargain in good faith, but will cut spending, as we're committed to do.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment to congratulate and thank two long-time committee staff members who both are leaving us this month after many years of service.

Beverly Pheto spent 10 years on the committee, serving as clerk on both the Transportation Subcommittee and the Homeland Security Subcommittee before becoming the first woman staff director of the full committee under former Chairman David Obey. Bev was the top Democratic staff person during 9/11, the creation of the Transportation Security Administration, and the Department of Homeland Security, and during Hurricane Katrina. And in the last Congress, as majority clerk, Beverly helped craft the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act—the Recovery Act that saved tens of thousands of American jobs and kept this country from slipping into another Great Depression.

We thank Bev for agreeing to stay on with us and help with the committee's transition and congratulate her on her many years of service, both in the executive branch as well as for us. She will be missed, but we wish her well in her new endeavors.

I also want to extend my deep appreciation to Chris Topik, who has served on the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee since 1995, most recently as the minority clerk. Chris began his career with the U.S. Forest Service before coming to the committee as a detailee. During his time on the Interior Subcommittee, Chris found himself in the middle of some of the most contentious environmental policy disputes but always remained the consummate professional. While I chaired the Interior Subcommittee, I relied heavily on his solid judgment and wise counsel. I wish Chris the very best as he leaves the committee and thank him again for his service.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Let me join, on behalf of us on this side, in thanking those two wonderful individuals for their dedicated public service. They have worked hard on behalf of the public, and they deserve our utmost thanks, which I offer at this time.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

On behalf of the majority, I would like to echo the comments of my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Chris Topik came to the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations as a detailee from the Forest Service in the mid-1990s and, since that time, has worked on a nonpartisan basis to address many of the most critical issues facing our land management agencies. Chris is one of the most professional and widely respected individuals on the Appropriations Committee staff. His dry wit and friendly disposition will be greatly missed, and his institutional knowledge of Forest Service issues will be impossible to replace.

Chris, we appreciate your dedication and commitment over your many years of public service and wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining on our side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a very hardworking member of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER).

Mr. BONNER. I thank the chairman, and I urge my colleagues to support this continuing resolution, as unpleasant as it is.

Our Democrat colleagues, our Republican colleagues, we agree; we don't like being in the situation that we're in, but we're in the situation nevertheless. Our colleagues remember that for the first time since 1974, we didn't pass a budget last year. We didn't pass a single appropriation bill, as the chairman of the committee has noted. We don't like being in this situation, but we're in this situation. And yet I think there's a real disconnect between Washington and the American people.

I was listening to the television news that Sunday when Senator KYL put the budget debate in perspective. While rarely do House Members quote Senators, I think it's worth it. We talk about trillions and billions and millions, but if you had a \$10,000 budget, which most Americans can more easily

identify with, and 40 percent of that is actually borrowed money, then what we're talking about with H.R. 1, which is the basis upon which this CR is going forward, we'd be shaving off \$28 from a \$10,000 budget.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, the reason that Congress has continued to draw such unpopular respect with the American people is that there is a disconnect. Last year, we had a \$223 billion deficit; the largest in the history. We're talking about shaving \$6 billion until we can get a resolution between the House and the Senate and encourage the White House to join the mix.

I thank the chairman for allowing me to speak out, and I encourage our colleagues to support this CR.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished leader of the Democratic Party in the House, NANCY PELOSI of California.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his hard work to help keep the government open.

While many of us will not agree on the legislation before us today, we know it is necessary for us to proceed. So I don't rise to support or oppose the legislation but, instead, to comment on the situation that we are in.

□ 1430

Again, today, we are in a situation. We are debating a short-term bill to keep the government open on a week-by-week basis. This is not any way to run a government or a business. It certainly is not the way, as the military leadership has told us, to protect the national security of our country—on a week-to-week basis.

Democrats will work with Republicans on legislation that will create jobs, that will strengthen the middle class, and that will reduce the deficit. On all three of these scores, this Republican spending bill fails.

Democrats have long fought for fiscal responsibility as a top priority of this Congress. We won't go into the history right now, but it's well known that President Clinton took us out of a period of deficit—his last five budgets being in surplus, or in balance. President Bush turned that around immediately when he became President, and now we have to dig ourselves out of the deficit that he has taken us into. Last December, Democrats passed a \$41 billion cut in the President's budget. We did so with only one Republican vote, \$41 billion. Democrats are in the lead on fiscal soundness.

On the subject of jobs, we are in the 11th week of the Republican majority in the Congress, and we have not seen one bill that will create jobs. In fact, the only bill coming from the Republicans, the only legislation that has come to the floor to create jobs, would be the Democratic initiatives.

One is Build America Bonds: to build the infrastructure of America to keep ahead of the game in terms of innova-

tion. Build America Bonds. Republicans overwhelmingly rejected that. The other bill was a bill to keep our jobs from going overseas by rewarding businesses that sent jobs overseas. Democrats said "no" to that idea. Republicans said "no" to our legislation. Zero jobs bills in 11 weeks.

It is quite different from the record of President Obama, who came into office 2 years ago with a Democratic Congress. President Obama was a job creator from day one, one week and one day after the President's inaugural address, calling for swift bold action now to create jobs. The House of Representatives passed the recovery bill, which was then passed by the Senate and signed into law in a matter of weeks. That legislation created or saved 3.6 million jobs. This is important in terms of the deficit because it produced jobs. It produced revenue into the Treasury that helped reduce the deficit.

Tax cuts for the wealthy, which has been the job creator that the Republicans put forth in the Bush administration and have put forth since, do not create jobs but increase the deficit.

So we are at the place, again, of 11 weeks. Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke said the Republican spending bill would cost not a trivial amount of jobs; Mark Zandi, the Republican economist, said the Republican spending bill would destroy 700,000 jobs. Goldman Sachs said the Republican spending bill would reduce U.S. economic growth by 1.5 to 2 percent; 320 economists sent a letter, calling Republican cuts a threat to our economy's long-term economic competitiveness and to the strength of our current economic recovery.

They all agree, to one extent or another, that the Republican agenda is taking us in the wrong direction, and that agenda is manifested in the continuing resolution, H.R. 1, and in the budget approach that they are taking. In fact, in addition to not creating jobs, the Republican initiative is making matters worse.

Many of us have come to the floor to talk about budgets year in and year out. We all say that our national budget should be a statement of our national values. What is important to our country should be reflected in the allocation of our resources. We want to have that debate on values rather than just on cuts.

Again, we all agree we have to get rid of waste, fraud, abuse, duplication, obsolescence, and the rest. The GAO has given us a blueprint for that, and we subscribe to that. We all agree that we must reduce the deficit, and the fiscal commission has given us a road map for that. We can agree or disagree with some of it; but the fact is it gives us a blueprint for how to go forward, and we should take heed of that. That blueprint says that we should not be making cuts right now that will be harmful to our recovery. Yet that's exactly what the Republican initiatives do.

So as to this statement of value, when we have this debate, it's not a debate about are we going to cut 6 million or 3 million seniors off of Meals on Wheels. It's about who we are as a country, how do we protect the American people both in our national security and our neighborhoods. It's how we educate our children to make them happy and also how to keep us competitive as innovators internationally. It's how we maintain a healthy America. It's not just about their health care but about their good health: the air they breathe, the water they drink, the safety of the food they eat.

It is about the creation of jobs. I believe we have an obligation as a government to be job creators. Jobs give people the means to find their own happiness and also to bring revenue into the Treasury, if we're just speaking pragmatically and not in terms of values.

I don't believe it's just about the dollars. It's because of the values that we have to have this debate. Unfortunately, the bills that we are being presented with, like H.R. 1, are like a balloon. You squeeze it here and it pops out there. It doesn't change anything for the better. In fact, as has been indicated, it makes matters worse.

So as we consider our budgetary decisions as a discussion, as a statement of our national values, we have to remember that the greatness of our country depends on the strengthening of our middle class. We have to do that by creating jobs, and we certainly must reduce the deficit.

Now we are waiting at the negotiating table for the Republicans to show that they are willing to work together—we cut \$41 billion with one Republican vote—and that they are willing to work together to reach an agreement that is a statement of our values. I think we can do that. Many of us have worked together on the Appropriations Committee over the years.

I urge our Republican colleagues to join us in our efforts to create jobs, to strengthen the middle class, and to reduce the deficit—and to do so in the interest of the American people.

That's why I think, on this vote today, people will vote however they view their own statements about it. The big vote that is coming up is the vote on the continuing resolution, on the long-term basis to keep the government open and functioning for people—again, in a way that is a statement of values for our great country.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a new member of our committee, a hard-working member, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership on the Appropriations Committee and for yielding me some time here this morning.

Mr. Speaker, yes, it's true. I came here on January 5. Just a few weeks ago, I put my hand up and took the

oath of office. As I did, I was reminded of the fact that, at that precise time in my life, I was taking the oath of office already 3 months into the fiscal year. Now, you show me what business or what governmental jurisdiction anywhere in America is effectively and efficiently managed when you're operating without a budget already 3 months into the budget year.

I was a mayor of a very dynamic city in northwest Arkansas. We never did that. We couldn't survive by passing our budget sometime during the course of the ongoing year. So our conference, in particular, is leading by example. We are providing a leadership example for the spending cuts that so many people around America have said over and over again we have to achieve.

Look, America gets it. We are at a \$1.5 trillion deficit in this FY, and we are \$14-plus trillion in debt. We have to do something about spending. It's all about the end game, which is where this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle can come to an agreement because we know that the end game is about the creation of jobs. The ideological difference about how we get there, I think, is what divides us; but I am a firm believer and will tell you—as will any businessman, any mayor, any county judge, any government official—that your balance sheet drives a lot of things.

□ 1440

I think fundamental to that balance sheet is how much you're in debt, because how much you are in debt in business is tied to your assets. In government, it's tied to your capacity to tax; and right now, one of the fundamental problems about growing jobs in this economy is the uncertainty that hangs over the job creators in America.

Let me just finish by saying that I urge support of H.J. Res. 48.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 4 minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. HURT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of this temporary continuing resolution to urge my colleagues to do the same.

As we debate this measure, let's remember why we are here. Let's remember that on November 2, the people of Virginia's Fifth District and the people across this country sent a message to Washington, a message to Republicans and to Democrats. The message was urgent, it was clear, and it was loud. The message sent was that now is the time to stop the government spending, stop the government borrowing, and stop the raid on our children's future.

So what have we found since we got here? We find that our President and the last Congress, despite enjoying great majorities in each Chamber, completely and totally failed nearly 6 months ago to live up to its fundamental responsibility to adopt a budget for fiscal year 2011. Because of their failure to lead, the American people still 6 months later do not have a budget.

After the House worked into the early morning hours nearly a month ago and sent H.R. 1 down the Hall to the opposite Chamber, what has the Senate done? They left town, and they failed to adopt any proposal to fund the government for the rest of the fiscal year.

And what has the President done? While continuing to fail to lead on the 2011 budget, he has now proposed a budget for fiscal year 2012 that does not decrease spending and borrowing but instead increases government spending and nearly doubles government borrowing in the next 10 years. After it is all said and done, the Senate and the White House have not heard the message from the people in the last election and are continuing to fail to lead.

Now is the time for this Congress to listen. Now is the time for this Congress to act. I believe that the majority in this House is listening and this temporary continuing resolution gets us one step closer to fulfilling the purpose given us by the American people: cut government spending and reduce government borrowing for the sake of future generations.

Simply put, by voting in favor of this measure today, we are putting a \$6 billion deposit on the account for our children and our grandchildren who for far too long have been forgotten here in Washington.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise to review the bidding here. We are down to the end of this debate on this continuing resolution, and I hope—and as I know Chairman ROGERS hopes—that this will be the last continuing resolution and that working together we can come together on a solution to the FY11 budget.

Now, I've heard repeatedly, repeatedly, and I've even mentioned this in my last statement, and the next thing I knew it was on CANTOR's Web site, but back in 2007, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky will remember that when we took over power and won the election in 2006, most of the nine, I think, or 10 of the appropriations bills were not enacted, and the Democrats had to pass a bill in February enacting all of these things. So maybe we learned that lesson from you-all over there, and I hope you will remember it because you seem to act like this has never happened before. Well, that's number one.

Number two, the American people in a Washington Post-ABC poll yesterday over the weekend said that they are

worried that the cuts in H.R. 1 will hurt the economy. It was narrow. It was 45–41, but 71 percent of the people said the problem was that your side isn't engaging and that they blame the Republicans for not getting this deal.

Now, why would they think that? I think the reason for it is when the first Rogers amendment proposal came out, that was kind of a reasonable approach, but that was rejected; and then they doubled the amount of these cuts, and the cuts became very severe and very questionable.

There was a story in *The Washington Post* today that lays out if you cut food inspectors, you're going to pay for it; if you cut WIC funding, you're going to pay for it, billions, in these children.

So I just point these things out. Cutting Head Start, this was perceived by the American people as too extreme, and that is why the Senate rejected H.R. 1, the President rejected H.R. 1. We need to have reasonable people sit down and work out a compromise and not let the government be shut down.

I believe that this should be the last CR and that we all should agree here today that this is going to be the last CR and that we are committed to getting this resolved. And that's what the American people also said in this ABC-Washington Post poll, not that I follow the polls much; but they also said they wanted us to come to an agreement.

So, again, I pledge to our chairman that we're not going to let this happen again; that this year we will pass all 12 appropriation bills by August, and we've done that before; and that we will end this process that started back in 2007 and which got continued in 2011. It is not the way to do the government's business. So let's make a pledge today that after this CR, we're going to work together to solve this problem and move on to FY12.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to a hardworking member of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I listened with great interest to the distinguished minority leader and her remarks, and I always like listening to her. I never cast my ballot for her to become the Speaker of the House in the last two Congresses, but as an American we all celebrated the historic accomplishment when she became the first woman to preside over this Chamber since the founding of the Republic. And a lot of wonderful things will be said and written about her tenure as Speaker of the House.

One thing that will not be said or written is that she presided over two Congresses that will be known for fiscal responsibility—that Congress passed a bank bailout bill costing \$700 billion which may bankrupt the Nation; passed an \$800 billion stimulus bill that created no jobs that may bankrupt the Nation; passed a cap-and-

tax piece of legislation that would gut jobs in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and would have bankrupted the Nation; and, finally, a health care bill that took over one-sixth of the Nation's economy, did not bend the cost curve and, if not checked, will, in fact, bankrupt the Nation.

The distinguished minority leader's speech reminds me of that old adage that everybody wants to go to heaven but nobody wants to die. We hear continuously we have to cut, we have to cut, we have to cut, but not these cuts, not those cuts, not this program, not my program. The time is now. The time is serious. We have laid an offer upon the table, and we wait with great expectation.

Now, I know what all those people in St. Peters Square must feel like when they are waiting for the white smoke to come out of the top of the dome for the election of a Pope. We would like very much for the other side of this Capitol to give us a proposal to negotiate with. We would like very much for the Vice President of the United States to return to this Nation to talk to us. It's not happening. We need to pass the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, today's legislation is designed to allow the federal government to continue operating through April 8, 2011. Additionally, this three-week CR does not contain the kind of truly reckless cuts and extreme policy riders contained in H.R. 1.

While this measure is clearly preferable to a government shutdown, we simply can't continue running the government on a series of short term extensions. The time has come to negotiate a long term CR that makes responsible reductions in federal spending while keeping job creation and our ongoing economic recovery on track.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 48, another short-term Continuing Resolution.

This is enabling bad Congressional behavior.

Continuing to cut specific environmental programs that have meant so much to communities across the country without at least putting it in the context of the broader budget request is irresponsible. It does not make sense to chip away at the Environmental Protection Agency by cutting local climate change and targeted airshed grants or the Department of Interior by cutting the Save America's Treasures program without looking at the rest of the budget to ensure that community needs are still being met.

This CR continues to target public broadcasting. It aims to eliminate all funding for the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program, PTFP. This program—started before the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967—is the only source of federal revenue for the replacement of aging or damaged equipment. Public broadcasting's programming can't be enjoyed if there's no way to maintain the infrastructure that delivers it to our homes.

PTFP is needed because by statute, station funds from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, CPB, are to be used for the production or acquisition of programming, not upkeep. Unfortunately, infrastructure needs far outpace recent funding. In FY 2009, stations

received nearly \$38 million from the PTFP and the CPB Digital Program. However, in that same time period, stations spent nearly \$191 million in equipment and infrastructure—reflecting the fact that both programs together have only been able to help stations address roughly 20% of their needs. We should be supporting these infrastructure investments and public broadcasting, not defunding them.

On the first CR, I was willing to vote yes in hopes we'd get serious. The problem with multiple short term CRs is more short-term spending authority that cripples the ability of the federal government to manage important functions while it drives up costs. It is expensive to make decisions on a week-to-week basis.

I am disappointed that this bill avoids the tough decisions that must be made, unsettles the business climate, and makes the job of our state and local partners harder.

Mr. WEST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to take a stand, a stand that may not be popular with the Leadership of the House of Representatives, but a stand I must take because I believe we cannot kick the can down the road for even another 3 weeks. The American people recognize that we must no longer take these small calculated measures. Today I will vote against another short-term Continuing Resolution.

In the shortest month of the year, February, the Federal Government had the largest deficit of \$223 billion in our nation's entire history. The American people know that we are in a fiscal crisis and have sent me to address out-of-control spending.

The majority in the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1 which reduced spending by \$61 billion for the remainder of this fiscal year. Even though H.R. 1 only cut spending by approximately 1.5 percent of the entire requested budget for fiscal year 2011, H.R. 1 reversed the trend of the Democrat Majority which increased overall discretionary funding by 24% over the last 2 years. The United States Senate rejected this amount as too much. They believe that, after President Barack Obama and the Democrat Congress presented trillion dollar deficit budgets, a freeze is the only viable approach.

I am not a supporter of big government. However, the Federal Government does perform certain important functions. Many essential Federal agencies cannot move forward with planning and using resources if every several weeks they are faced with the threat that they will need to close their doors until we resolve this impasse. Could any business in America function this way? Can a family household function this way?

Madam Speaker, President Obama and the United States Congresses of the past have created the Nanny States of America. Vast segments of the American people are now dependent on our Federal Government and not dependent on their own ability, skills and entrepreneurial spirit to succeed in this Nation.

We are in this position today because the Democrats in the last Congress failed to pass a budget. Further, the President appoints Vice President Biden as the Administration point person on the negotiations while he flies off to Europe. The Democrats failed to show leadership last year and the President is showing a lack of leadership today. I will show what I consider appropriate leadership now and vote against this Continuing Resolution.

Madam Speaker, the American people are watching us closely. Today, with information so readily available on the Internet they know the truth of our desperate economic situation. The days of Washington, D.C. double-talk no longer works.

The American people know that the Federal Government is collecting \$2.2 trillion and spending \$3.7 trillion this year. The American people know forty cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends is borrowed, much of it from China. The American people also know our nation is piling up new debt at the rate of \$4 billion a day. So, what does \$6 billion of spending cuts really buy the American people?

Further, the General Accountability Office released a 345-page report detailing the redundancies of Federal programs and the \$100 to \$200 billion of savings that could be achieved if these programs were consolidated or eliminated.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to argue that these cuts in spending will weaken an already slow economy and contribute to an increase in the loss of jobs. I believe this is a disingenuous argument. The truth is, the spending over the last 2 years has not reduced the loss of jobs, but instead has contributed to the largest debt in American history which will be passed on to my children and my grandchildren.

In Wisconsin, we have seen what the unionized entitlement class can do and the pressure they can place on their elected officials. Wisconsin State Legislators running to a neighboring state to hide from making a hard vote and protestors storming the Wisconsin State Capitol are not in concert with the principles of a representative democracy.

Madam Speaker, Madison, Wisconsin is only 700 miles from the United States Capitol.

The Founders of our nation wrote in the Declaration of Independence "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." The "Pursuit" of Happiness, not the Federal Government's "Guarantee" of Happiness!

Finally, Madam Speaker, we can continue to rehash the past of how we have gotten into this situation, but I would rather focus on the future. The future is now and the place is here for us to get our Nation back on track. I support the cuts in the Continuing Resolution. I support the elimination of these projects.

However, my "No" vote should not be construed as my willingness for a "government shutdown." My "No" vote is based on a simple principle that we need to complete the Federal budget for 2011. It is time to have this debate on Federal spending and get our nation back on track by cutting spending for the long term economic restoration of our Republic.

Alexander the Great once stated, "Fortune favors the bold." The American people are looking for principled and bold leadership. I understand "political maneuvering" but the time has come to engage in the battle for the fiscal responsible future of America. I take my position on the frontlines.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 167, the joint resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

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

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

□ 1450

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. CRITZ. Yes, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Critz moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 48 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 20, line 2, strike the final period and the preceding quotation marks.

Page 20, after line 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 295. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop or implement a system that cuts Social Security benefits, or that privatizes Social Security.

"SEC. 296. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop or implement a system that cuts Medicare benefits, eliminates guaranteed health coverage for seniors, or establishes a Medicare voucher plan that limits payments to beneficiaries in order to purchase health care in the private sector."

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

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, as I listen to the debate on the current CR and where this debate has been taking us throughout this year, I have some reasons for alarm. I think the best way to start it off is to at least start to let you know a little bit about myself.

For most of my life, I have worked in the private sector. I have worked all my life and paid into Social Security. And the folks that I live with and live around and the people of my district have come to rely on Social Security, as it provides for, actually, generations at this point.

As I have been sitting here listening to this current CR, which I am opposed to, you know, all 435 of us are sent here to lead. Unfortunately, what we have heard time and time again is finger-pointing as, "It's your fault," "It's our fault," "It's their fault," instead of us sitting down, talking to one another and figuring out where we can compromise and how we can come to a final solution to what our problems are. And it's really very disheartening.

I can understand that the folks who watch this at home are trying to figure out, well, whose side are we on? Are we on their side? Or are we on our particular party's side or on our particular stance's side? And I think it's very unfortunate because, at the end of the day, we all have very strong opinions on what the best way forward is in this country. Unfortunately, it's about

compromise. Because even though we all have strong opinions, we all have differing opinions; and if we don't work it out, we are not going to get anywhere.

As I stand in opposition to this CR, it is something that is disheartening.

Now, I am on the Armed Services Committee and have been hearing from industry time and time again at how difficult it is for them in the long term. So as we talk about cutting, we are going to cut \$2 billion a week for these next 3 weeks. Well, by doing these short-term CRs, we are actually costing our country money. And no one talks about that, of what the impact is going to be from this temporary solution. The Republicans have talked about, well, the Democrats didn't complete their work last year. That's true. But now the Republicans are in charge. You are in charge. You were given a charge to lead this country. And here we are going around again doing a 2-week, a 3-week. This isn't leading. This is playing games, and it's time to stand up and do the right thing for this country.

But my MTR, motion to recommit, involves Social Security, because the debate that has been happening has been trying to frame Social Security as a problem and the reason for the deficits that this country is experiencing. I brought a chart with me, and I want to read to you the net increase in assets in the Social Security Trust Fund for the last 6 years.

In 2005, the Social Security Trust Fund increased \$172 billion. In 2006, it increased by \$189.5 billion. These are increases. This means that the money that comes in to Social Security via your taxes and interest is more than what is going out, being paid in benefits. So when people start talking about, well, Social Security is causing our deficit problem and we have to address entitlement programs, they're not giving you the whole picture. They are trying to tell you that down the road we may have an issue. Well, no.

In 2007, the Social Security Trust Fund increased \$190.4 billion. In 2008, it increased \$180 billion. In 2009, it increased \$122 billion. So the trust fund is going up. And it actually has \$2.6 trillion in it right now. So the people that are receiving Social Security now shouldn't be worried about what it's doing to the deficit, because that increase in the trust fund is actually money that's coming in to the government in excess of what Social Security is spending.

But I brought up a chart here because I want to show people that when you start talking about Social Security—now, if you look at the 12th District of Pennsylvania, I have an elderly population. I am one of the districts that has a lot of senior citizens in it. A lot of people are on Social Security. And if you look at this chart, 77 percent of people say, Leave Social Security alone. Don't touch the retirement age. Don't touch the benefits. They say,

Come to a solution. Figure out a way to move forward.

And there are compromises that can be had to help solve the Social Security issue because we do have an issue long term. Baby boomers are retiring. Less people are paying in. So there are some issues that we have to address. But don't be buying into this crisis legislation that, if we don't do something immediately, Social Security is going to be in trouble. You are hearing all kinds of scenarios.

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

Mr. CRITZ. I urge support of this amendment. It does not recommit the bill. It is an amendment and will just be added to the bill.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, this provision doesn't do anything. Nothing in the CR would cut Social Security or Medicare benefits, nor would it privatize Social Security. We are totally committed in this bill to saving Social Security.

Let me be honest. This is a procedural motion that is simply a fog screen, trying to hide us from our real task at hand, but I don't think we'll be fooled at that. The debate should not be about procedure or fog screens or things unrelated to the bill. It should be about doing our job.

We are here this afternoon to provide the necessary resources to keep the government's doors open while we lock in important budget savings totaling \$6 billion. That is \$2 billion in spending reductions, or savings, to the taxpayer, \$2 billion a week, the path this body has set with the passage of H.R. 1 a couple of weeks ago.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that, with the passage of this CR today, we will have cut over \$10 billion in the span of 2 weeks. That sets a record. That has never been done before in this body. The closest was 1995 at \$9 billion. This is more than double the \$4.7 billion that Senator REID and the Senate Democrats proposed in their CR last week to fund the government for the remaining 6 months. We do in 2 weeks what they would take 6 months to do.

The American people sent us here with a clear message last November. They want us to end the partisan bickering and get our work done. Instead of picking political fights, they want us united in cutting the budget. This motion moves us further away from that goal. It would send us backwards, not forwards. It's a smokescreen, a procedural motion.

Let's get on with it. Vote "no," and then vote "yes" on final.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.J. Res. 48, if ordered; and adoption of H. Con. Res. 30, by the yeas and the nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 239, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—190

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

NAYS—239

Adams	Bachmann	Benishek
Aderholt	Bachus	Berg
Akin	Barletta	Biggert
Alexander	Bartlett	Bilbray
Amash	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis
Austria	Bass (NH)	Bishop (UT)

Black	Hanna	Pence
Blackburn	Harper	Petri
Bonner	Harris	Pitts
Bono Mack	Hartzler	Platts
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Hayworth	Pompeo
Brooks	Heck	Posey
Broun (GA)	Heller	Price (GA)
Buchanan	Hensarling	Quayle
Bucshon	Herger	Reed
Buerkle	Herrera Beutler	Rehberg
Burgess	Huelskamp	Reichert
Burton (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Calvert	Hultgren	Ribble
Camp	Hunter	Rigell
Campbell	Hurt	Rivera
Canseco	Issa	Roby
Cantor	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Capito	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Chabot	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Kelly	Rokita
Coble	King (IA)	Rooney
Coffman (CO)	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	Kingston	Roskam
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (FL)
Cravaack	Kline	Royce
Crawford	Labrador	Runyan
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Curberson	Lance	Scalise
Davis (KY)	Landry	Schilling
Denham	Lankford	Schmidt
Dent	Latham	Schock
DesJarlais	LaTourette	Schweikert
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Scott (SC)
Dold	Lewis (CA)	Scott, Austin
Dreier	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Long	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Shimkus
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Ellmers	Lummis	Simpson
Emerson	Lungren, Daniel	E.
Farenthold		Smith (NE)
Fincher	Mack	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Flake	Marchant	Southerland
Fleischmann	Marino	Stearns
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Stivers
Flores	McCauley	Stutzman
Forbes	McClintock	Sullivan
Fortenberry	McCotter	Terry
Fox	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Thornberry
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Tiberi
Gallely	McMorris	Tipton
Gallegly	Rodgers	Turner
Gardner	Garrett	Upton
Garrett	Meehan	Mica
Gerlach	Mica	Miller (FL)
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Miller (MI)
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Miller, Gary
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary	Mulvaney
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Murphy (PA)
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Myrick
Gosar	Myrick	Neugebauer
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Noem
Granger	Noem	Nugent
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Nunes
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Nunnelee
Griffin (AR)	Nunnelee	Olson
Griffith (VA)	Olson	Palazzo
Grimm	Palazzo	Paul
Guinta	Paul	Paulsen
Guthrie	Paulsen	Pearce
Hall	Pearce	

NOT VOTING—3

Giffords Moore Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1523

Messrs. WITTMAN and SULLIVAN and Ms. GRANGER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 271, noes 158, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

AYES—271

Adams	Engel	McCarthy (NY)
Aderholt	Farenthold	McCaul
Alexander	Fattah	McClintock
Altmire	Fincher	McHenry
Austria	Fitzpatrick	McKeon
Baca	Fleischmann	McKinley
Bachus	Flores	McMorris
Barletta	Forbes	Rodgers
Barrow	Fortenberry	Meehan
Bass (NH)	Fox	Mica
Berg	Frelinghuysen	Michaud
Berkley	Gallely	Miller (FL)
Biggert	Gardner	Miller (MI)
Bilbray	Gerlach	Miller (NC)
Bilirakis	Gibbs	Miller, Gary
Bishop (GA)	Gibson	Moran
Bishop (NY)	Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)
Black	Gosar	Myrick
Blackburn	Granger	Neugebauer
Bonner	Graves (MO)	Noem
Bono Mack	Griffin (AR)	Nugent
Boren	Griffith (VA)	Nunes
Boswell	Grimm	Nunnelee
Boustany	Guthrie	Olson
Brady (PA)	Hanna	Owens
Brady (TX)	Harper	Palazzo
Braley (IA)	Hartzler	Pascarell
Brooks	Hastings (WA)	Paulsen
Broun (GA)	Hayworth	Perlmutter
Buchanan	Heck	Peters
Bucshon	Heinrich	Peterson
Buerkle	Hensarling	Petri
Burgess	Herger	Pingree (ME)
Butterfield	Herrera Beutler	Polis
Calvert	Higgins	Pompeo
Camp	Himes	Posey
Canseco	Holden	Price (GA)
Cantor	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capito	Hultgren	Quayle
Capps	Hunter	Quigley
Cardoza	Hurt	Rahall
Carney	Inslee	Reed
Carson (IN)	Israel	Reichert
Carter	Issa	Renacci
Cassidy	Jenkins	Ribble
Castor (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Rivera
Chandler	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Coble	Keating	Roe (TN)
Coffman (CO)	Kelly	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Kind	Rogers (MI)
Cooper	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Costa	Kingston	Rokita
Courtney	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney
Cravaack	Kissell	Ros-Lehtinen
Crawford	Kline	Roskam
Crenshaw	Lance	Ross (AR)
Crenshaw	Langevin	Rothman (NJ)
Cuellar	Lankford	Royce
Culberson	Latham	Runyan
Davis (CA)	LaTourette	Ruppersberger
Davis (KY)	Latta	Ryan (WI)
DeFazio	Lewis (CA)	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lipinski	Scalise
Denham	LoBiondo	Schiff
Dent	Loeb	Schilling
DesJarlais	Lowey	Schock
Deutch	Lucas	Schrader
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Schwartz
Dicks	Lujan	Schweikert
Dingell	Lummis	Schwartz
Doggett	Lungren, Daniel	Scott (SC)
Dold	E.	Scott (SC)
Donnelly (IN)	Manzullo	Scott, Austin
Doyle	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Marino	Sessions
Duffy	Matheson	Sherman
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Shimkus
Ellmers		Shuler
Emerson		Shuster

Simpson	Tiberi	Whitfield
Sires	Turner	Wittman
Smith (NE)	Upton	Wolf
Smith (TX)	Van Hollen	Womack
Smith (WA)	Visclosky	Woodall
Speier	Walden	Wu
Stark	Walz (MN)	Yoder
Stivers	Wasserman	Young (AK)
Terry	Schultz	Young (FL)
Thompson (CA)	Webster	Young (IN)
Thompson (PA)	Welch	
Thornberry	Westmoreland	

NOES—158

Ackerman	Grijalva
Akin	Gutierrez
Amash	Hall
Andrews	Hanabusa
Bachmann	Harris
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)
Bartlett	Heller
Barton (TX)	Hinchee
Bass (CA)	Hinojosa
Becerra	Hirono
Benishek	Holt
Berman	Honda
Blumenauer	Huelskamp
Brown (FL)	Huizenga (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jackson (IL)
Campbell	Jackson Lee
Capuano	(TX)
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)
Chabot	Johnson (IL)
Chaffetz	Johnson, E. B.
Chu	Jones
Cicilline	Jordan
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur
Clarke (NY)	King (IA)
Clay	Kucinich
Cleaver	Labrador
Clyburn	Lamborn
Cohen	Landry
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)
Costello	Larson (CT)
Critz	Lee (CA)
Crowley	Levin
Cummings	Lewis (GA)
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe
DeLauro	Long
Duncan (SC)	Lynch
Edwards	Mack
Ellison	Maloney
Eshoo	Markey
Farr	Matsui
Filner	McColum
Flake	McCotter
Fleming	McDermott
Frank (MA)	McGovern
Franks (AZ)	McIntyre
Fudge	McNerney
Garamendi	Meeks
Garrett	Miller, George
Gingrey (GA)	Moore
Gohmert	Mulvaney
Govdy	Nadler
Graves (GA)	Napolitano
Green, Al	Neal
Green, Gene	Oliver

NOT VOTING—3

Conyers	Giffords	Sanchez, Loretta
---------	----------	------------------

□ 1532

Mr. CICILLINE changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. INSLEE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of H. Con. Res. 30, 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 concurrent resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 197, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—232

Adams	Goodlatte	Noem
Aderholt	Gosar	Nugent
Akin	Gowdy	Nunes
Alexander	Granger	Nunnelee
Altmire	Graves (GA)	Olson
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Palazzo
Austria	Griffith (VA)	Paul
Bachus	Grimm	Paulsen
Barletta	Guinta	Pearce
Bartlett	Guthrie	Pence
Barton (TX)	Hall	Petri
Bass (NH)	Hanna	Pitts
Benishek	Harper	Pompeo
Berg	Hartzler	Posey
Berkley	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Biggert	Hayworth	Quayle
Bilbray	Heck	Reed
Bilirakis	Heinrich	Rehberg
Bishop (UT)	Heller	Reichert
Black	Hensarling	Renacci
Blackburn	Herger	Ribble
Bonner	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Bono Mack	Huelskamp	Rivera
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brooks	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Buerkle	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Butterfield	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jones	Roskam
Camp	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Canseco	Kelly	Royce
Cantor	Kind	Runyan
Capito	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	King (NY)	Scalise
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Schilling
Chabot	Kline	Schock
Chaffetz	Labrador	Schweikert
Coble	Lamborn	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Lance	Scott, Austin
Cole	Landry	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lankford	Sessions
Cooper	Latham	Shimkus
Cravaack	LaTourette	Shuster
Crawford	Latta	Simpson
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA)	Long	Smith (TX)
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Southerland
DeFazio	Luetkemeyer	Stearns
DeGette	Lummis	Stivers
Denham	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Dent	E.	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	Duffy	Thornberry
Deutch	Duncan (SC)	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	Duncan (TN)	Tipton
Dicks	Ellmers	Turner
Dingell	Farenthold	Upton
Doggett	Fincher	Walberg
Dold	Flake	Walden
Donnelly (IN)	Fleischmann	Walsh (IL)
Doyle	Fleming	Waxman
Dreier	Flores	Webster
Duffy	Forbes	West
Duncan (TN)	Fortenberry	Westmoreland
Ellmers	Franks (AZ)	Whitfield
Emerson	Frelinghuysen	Wilson (SC)
	Gallely	Wolf
	Gardner	Womack
	Garrett	Woodall
	Gibbs	Yoder
	Gibson	Young (AK)
	Gingrey (GA)	Young (FL)
		Young (IN)

NAYS—197

Ackerman	Becerra	Brady (PA)
Andrews	Berman	Braley (IA)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Bachmann	Bishop (NY)	Burgess
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Barrow	Boren	Capps
Bass (CA)	Boswell	Capuano