

today to temporarily extend the SBA's initiatives.

Small businesses across the Nation depend on a strong SBA. This is especially true now, when many unemployed individuals are turning to entrepreneurship as a source of income. By ensuring that the agency's programs do not lapse, we are providing small businesses with the foundation for future growth and, in doing so, helping move the economy forward.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1240

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, in order to close this debate, let me reiterate that small businesses are going to lead this economic recovery, but we have to provide them with some certainty first. Enacting this legislation before us is going to do just that and let entrepreneurs know that we are back on their side.

Once again I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I look forward to working with Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ and our colleagues on the Small Business Committee for a more permanent extension.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 366.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCING NON-SECURITY SPENDING TO FISCAL YEAR 2008 LEVELS OR LESS

Mr. DREIER. Pursuant to House Resolution 43, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 38) to reduce spending through a transition to non-security spending at fiscal year 2008 levels, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 43, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Rules printed in the resolution is adopted and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. RES. 38

Resolved, That, pursuant to section 3(b)(1) of House Resolution 5, the Chair of the Committee on the Budget shall include in the Congressional Record an allocation contemplated by section 302(a) for the Committee on Appropriations for the remainder of fiscal year 2011 that assumes non-security spending at fiscal year 2008 levels or less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution that is before us.

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

There was no objection.

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

One of the indelible and enduring images of 2010 was that of violent protesters on the streets of Athens following the proposal of the government to impose austerity measures. We all remember very vividly that scene.

Having come to the brink of collapse and nearly dragging the entire euro zone with it, the Greek government had no choice but to scale back its profligate ways. Thousands of public employees took to the streets in anger.

Now, Madam Speaker, I contrast that with the image of tens of thousands of peaceful demonstrators across America coming out to express their frustration with excessive government spending. Rather than demanding more Federal largesse, these taxed-enough-already demonstrators actually came together to petition their government for greater restraint and discipline. This might actually have been a first in human history.

It was a powerful illustration of the unique nature of American values. But it was also a testament to just how badly fiscal discipline is needed. This issue is no longer just the purview of budget wonks and economists.

The looming crisis of our national debt is a challenge that working Americans recognize very clearly. While the magnitude of a \$14 trillion debt is simply too massive to truly comprehend, those with a modicum of common sense can appreciate the crushing weight that will fall on future generations. If we do not immediately change course, the damage could quickly become irreversible.

Today's resolution is a clear signal that we are making that change in course. House Resolution 38 is the first step, Madam Speaker, in what will be a long and admittedly difficult process over the next 2 years as we pursue the goal of living within our means. This resolution lays down a marker to return to pre-bailout, pre-binge-spending, pre-stimulus levels. This resolution provides the framework under which we will finally dispense with the fiscal year 2011 budget which the previous Congress, unfortunately, failed to do.

Nearly halfway through the fiscal year—we are nearly halfway through the fiscal year—now the imperative is to responsibly finish the work that is really very, very urgent for us to approach and deal with at this moment.

Once we move beyond this task, we will immediately pivot to fiscal year 2012. We will craft a budget, we will

consider alternatives, with a full debate, and then this House will pass a budget.

We will then proceed with consideration of appropriations bills. We will return to the traditional, open process that always governed our appropriations bills prior to the last couple of years. This will ensure full accountability and true collaboration and restore the deliberative traditions and customs of this body.

There will be very tough choices ahead. Very tough choices need to be made. There is no doubt that we will engage in heated debate, and I suspect we will in just a few minutes right here. But we simply cannot afford to put off the hard work any longer. Madam Speaker, today we take the first step. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in very, very strong opposition to this resolution. As I said yesterday during the debate on the rule, there are numerous, serious problems with this resolution.

First, it's meaningless rhetoric. My friends on the other side of the aisle like to talk a lot about cutting government spending, but the resolution before us doesn't cut a single dollar from the Federal budget; not a single cent.

The Republican Study Committee recently proposed \$2.5 trillion in budget cuts and their chairman, Mr. JORDAN from Ohio, said the following when he introduced this plan:

"One hundred billion dollars is the number the American people heard last fall. It seems to me we should be able to find \$100 billion."

Yet even after pledging a \$100 billion cut in funding, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee couldn't come up with a number when we asked yesterday, and instead produced what is most likely the first budget resolution in history that doesn't contain any budget numbers.

That might be because the Republican majority can't seem to figure out what the numbers should be. We have heard all kinds of numbers. We have heard \$30 billion, \$50 billion, \$100 billion and beyond.

But I suspect, Madam Speaker, that's because the Republican majority is discovering that it's a lot harder to walk the walk than it is to talk the talk, and it is a lot easier to say things in a campaign than it is to do things in a legislative body. They are realizing that when you start trying to make those kinds of cuts, you start seriously affecting the American economy and the American people.

We are told that the Congressional Budget Office will produce some numbers tomorrow. I wonder why we couldn't wait until tomorrow to debate this resolution, but the answer is obvious. The President of the United States will be here this evening for the State of the Union address, and the Republican majority needs a new set of talking points.

It's that kind of politics—where message is more important than substance—that makes the American people cynical about Washington.

□ 1250

Second, the resolution continues the dangerous precedent of giving one individual, the chairman of the Budget Committee—rather than the full membership of this House—the ability to set spending levels for the Federal Government. And third, the resolution's vague and unjustified wording that only targets “non-security” spending, even though everyone from Secretary Gates to Speaker BOEHNER has recognized that waste exists in the Department of Defense and in the Department of Homeland Security and other security-related agencies. It says a great deal about the priorities of a new Republican majority that they will treat wasteful contracts and redundant weapons systems as sacred, but would put Pell Grants, medical research, food safety, FBI, ATF and DEA agents, and other vital programs on the chopping block.

Of course, when we Democrats have the audacity to talk about the need to protect those important programs, our Republican friends grow indignant and head to the fainting couch. “Oh, no,” they say, “we would never cut those things.” But Madam Speaker, the numbers just don't add up. When you start saying that popular program after popular program will be protected, you realize that it would take massive cuts in other parts of the budget.

When we talk about exempting only security programs, it means that other programs will need to be cut by 30 percent below current levels. That means the Department of Justice has to cut 4,000 FBI agents, 800 ATF agents, 1,500 DEA agents, and 900 U.S. Marshals. Federal prisons have to cut 5,700 correctional officers, and the Federal Government will lose the capacity to detain 26,000 people because of their immigration status.

Of course, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee said we're not going to cut the FBI, as he said yesterday, so I can only assume that means more ATF agents, DEA agents, and U.S. Marshals will be fired by the Republicans. I can only assume that this means more than 26,000 people in this country illegally won't be in Federal custody. That's the Republican agenda?

Madam Speaker, I think former Secretary of State Colin Powell said it best this weekend: “I'm very put off when people just say, let's go back and freeze to the level 2 years ago. Don't tell me you're going to freeze to a level. That usually is a very inefficient way of doing it. Tell me what you're going to cut.”

As I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided resolution, I ask my Republican colleagues, what's the number? And what are you going to cut?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my good friend, again, that this is the beginning of a process. We have been saddled with a situation where for the first time since the implementation of the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act, we have no budget. And so what is it we've been left to do? Nearly halfway through the fiscal year, we are faced with this challenge. We now are in a position where we are going to begin going through regular order to ensure that we have a budget, which we didn't do last year, and have an open, free-flowing debate on the amendments through the appropriations process. And I will say to my friend, the defense issues are going to be a high priority when it comes to oversight and scrutiny.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend and colleague, the distinguished chair of the Committee on the Budget from whom we are going to be hearing later this evening, the gentleman from Janesville, Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I'm enjoying sort of the hyperbolic rhetoric we are hearing here today about one person, one committee, one man dictating in all these things, as if it's an unprecedented action. Well, this move is not unprecedented. The reason this is necessary is unprecedented. It is unprecedented since the 1974 Budget Act passed that Congress didn't bother to pass or even propose a budget.

Madam Speaker, the reason we are here today is because the last majority last year didn't even bother trying. That means we have no budget in place. And with no budget in place, there's no Budget Act to enforce. That means government is going and spending unchecked. No limits. No policemen on the beat. Nothing.

Why are we giving this kind of power to the chairman of the Budget Committee to put these numbers in? Because we don't get the numbers from the Congressional Budget Office until tomorrow. And we've said all along what we aim to do: bring discretionary levels down to pre-bailout, pre-stimulus levels. And then for all the authorizing committees, it has put the CBO baseline in place. The CBO baseline doesn't exist right now. It comes tomorrow. So what we are simply trying to do, Madam Speaker, is get some sense of limits back on spending, is to get some sense of a budget process back in place. We don't think we should have a system, a spending process, without restraints, without limits, without any prioritization. That is exactly why we are doing this.

Business as usual has to come to an end, Madam Speaker, and we've got to put limits on spending. And that is why we have a Budget Act, to police the spending process to make sure that it conforms. But there is no Budget Act, there is no number to police, because they didn't do a budget last year. That

is exactly and precisely why this measure is necessary.

So all the rhetoric aside, the days are over of unlimited spending and of no prioritization. And the days of getting spending under control are just beginning. This is a first step in a long process. This is a minimal, small down payment on a necessary process to go forward so that we can leave our kids with a better generation, so we can get this debt under control, so the spending spigot can close, and so we can do right by our constituents and treat their dollars wisely.

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

I'm glad the chairman of the Budget Committee finally joined this debate. And I would say two things. One is that last year we passed the Budget Enforcement Act with real numbers in it, and we voted on it, and it was significantly less than the numbers that the President had proposed, number one. Number two, one of the things that we proposed in the Rules Committee was an amendment to allow Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, to be able to vote on the number. And that was rejected on party line as somehow a radical idea. And then the chairman of the Rules Committee talks about this free-flowing debate we are having. We are having this debate today under a closed rule, and so there's no opportunity for amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would like to point to our colleagues, Madam Speaker, H. Res. 38. It is literally a one-sentence measure, a one-sentence measure which says that our goal is to get to 2008 levels of spending or less.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman, and I reclaim my time. I appreciate the brevity of the bill, but that doesn't mean the bill doesn't have a very negative impact. And when we tried yesterday to protect the FBI and enforcement agents from cuts, that was voted down. So we are very concerned because we don't know what the number is. And I think people in this Congress on both sides of the aisle, the American people, ought to know what we're talking about. Is it \$100 billion? Or is it more? Where is it? And where are those cuts going to come from when you keep on exempting programs?

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Here we are a day later. Yesterday we asked our colleagues, what's the number going to be? What's going to be the spending ceiling for this Congress and for the United States Government? They didn't have it yesterday, and we don't yet have it today. It's a budget resolution without a budget number.

Now we've heard a lot of talk about what happened last year. What this budget resolution relates to is 2011. In fact, this body voted last year on a Budget Enforcement Act. I have it right here in my hand. And it set budget ceilings. It had a real number. Some people voted for it, some people voted against it, but this body did what it always does when it makes decisions of this magnitude. We took accountability for it.

Now you have a resolution that violates the pledge of transparency because it doesn't have a single number in it, and it violates the pledge of accountability because you're asking every other Member of this body to contract out his or her vote to one person. Now I have great respect for the chairman of the Budget Committee. And I, too, congratulate him on being selected to give the response to the State of the Union address.

This isn't about a particular individual. It's about all of us taking responsibility for a major decision. And what this resolution does is contracts out that responsibility. It doesn't have a number. We don't know if it's going to be \$100 billion. We don't know if it's going to be \$80 billion. We don't know if it's going to be \$40 billion. We don't know if it's going to be the number that the Republican Study Committee wants, which the majority leader said good things about. We don't know.

What we do know is this, that the bipartisan deficit and debt reduction commission told us two things: Number one, we need to act now to put this country on a fiscally sustainable path, and we should do that by working together. They also said another thing, that deep immediate cuts beyond what had been put in place and recommended by the fiscal commission would hurt the economy when it's in a very fragile state and risk throwing more Americans out of work. That would be a terrible mistake.

And yet our colleagues want us to make a decision to vote on this without telling us what the number is. So when we asked what the number was, they said, we're waiting for the Congressional Budget Office. When will the Congressional Budget Office have its numbers? Tomorrow, 24 hours from now. Then we can do the right thing, we can see what the cuts will be, and we can make a decision as a body taking responsibility for this decision.

Why is it we are not waiting 24 hours? Well it's pretty obvious. A little later today, the President of the United States will be here to deliver the State of the Union address, and instead of being serious about this number, they want to deliver a press release. That is what this is about without a number. Otherwise we would wait 24 hours and our friends could tell us what that number would be.

□ 1300

You are asking this body to buy a pig in a poke. And the reason it is so serious is that numbers have consequences.

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. And my friend from Massachusetts talked about this earlier, whether it is \$100 billion or \$80 billion or \$20 billion, those numbers all have consequences because on the other side of the aisle when we say, well, are you going to be cutting research to find cures and treatments for cancer or diabetes, no, we're not going to cut that. Are you going to cut the FBI agents involved in antiterrorism efforts? No, we would never want to cut that. What are you going to cut?

And the magnitude of those cuts and the negative impact on jobs and the economy will be determined by what, by the number in this bill, a number that we don't get to vote on that you are giving the chairman of the Budget Committee sole authority to pick out of a hat.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to my friend by saying a couple of things.

Unfortunately, we have begun by degenerating the debate to the sky-is-falling mentality again, that we're going to be cutting NIH funding; we're going to be gutting FBI agents. We are beginning the process of getting our fiscal house in order.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important to note that while both of my friends have used the term "press release," H. Res. 38 is going to be a statement from the United States House of Representatives that we are today, before the President, at 9 this evening, stands here in this Chamber and delivers his State of the Union message, that we are committing ourselves to reduce the level of spending.

At this point I yield 4 minutes to my very good friend and classmate, the distinguished new chair on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Somerset, Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for your great service to our country over the time we have served together here. We are classmates from 1980. We were part of the Reagan crop.

Madam Speaker, this is the first step in the effort to reduce discretionary spending to fiscal 2008 levels or below and show the American people that we are serious about reducing the out-of-control government spending that is hampering our economic growth.

Now, the gentleman on the other side of the aisle complains that he does not see a number. Well, he had a chance last year, along with his colleagues in the majority then at that time, to pass a budget resolution with specific numbers in it, and refused. And they refused until they lost control of the House. The number will be coming in due course of time.

The message from the American people was crystal clear in the last election: they want government to spend

less, stop undue interference in American lives and businesses, and take action to create jobs and get our economy moving once again.

To do this, we must dramatically cut the massive spending that has dominated discretionary budgets in past years. In order to put our economy on the fast track to recovery, we have to shorten the reach of Uncle Sam, cut up his credit cards, and allow Americans' businesses the opportunity to grow, employ people, and make the economy grow.

Starting with the continuing resolution, the CR, my committee will begin to make the largest series of spending cuts in history, Madam Speaker. Members and staff are working diligently on this as we speak, going line by line to find specific areas and programs to cut. We hope and expect this legislation will soon be brought to the floor in a fair, open and transparent manner, giving all Members from both sides of the aisle an opportunity for amendments.

Let there be no mistake: the cuts that are coming will not be easy to make. They will not represent low-hanging fruit. These cuts will go deep and wide and will hit virtually every agency and every congressional district in the country, including my own. Every dollar that we cut will have a constituency, an industry, an association, and individual citizens who will disagree. And every dollar that we don't cut will also be put into question.

But the fact remains that we are in a national fiscal crisis. We must get our budgets—both discretionary and mandatory—under control. To this end, my committee will put forward appropriations bills this year that will fulfill our pledge to cut spending to the pre-stimulus, pre-bailout levels of 2008. And this will be the beginning—not the end—of the effort.

I have issued instructions to all 12 of our subcommittees to conduct strenuous oversight, including investigations and hundreds of hearings to weed out duplicative, wasteful and unnecessary spending, and prioritize Federal programs so we can make the most out of every precious tax dollar.

Madam Speaker, it is clear that cutting spending will require toughness and resolve. This will not be easy, it will not be quick, and it won't be without pain, but the success of our economy and our future prosperity depend on it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I have great respect for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I appreciate the fact that we are going to have to make tough choices; but he as well failed to tell us what the number is or what those tough choices are going to be. Are we going to cut medical research, Pell Grants, food safety, small business loans, job training programs, LIHEAP, summer food programs for the hungry? What are we going to cut?

I think that Members on both sides of the aisle deserve to know what the

number is so we can figure out what the pain is going to be. For the life of me, I can't understand, and I don't think the American people can understand, why Members of this House will not be given an opportunity to vote on that number. We ought to have that right.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, we just heard from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that there was no ceiling for 2011 in place. I am going to make a copy and ask the pages to distribute this. This is the Budget Enforcement Act for last year, for fiscal year 2011, and there you have the budget ceilings, whereas what you are proposing is a piece of paper that doesn't set the budget ceilings and doesn't contain any of the numbers in it.

I would just ask the chairman of the Rules Committee this: During the hearing, you said we're going to wait for CBO; CBO's numbers are coming tomorrow. Tomorrow are you going to have a number for us?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. For an answer to that question, I would be happy to yield.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. My time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield to me to respond?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 10 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and let me just say that clearly the budget that we have right now expired at the end of the Congress. We know that very well. And we look forward to numbers which will be coming out from both your new committee, the Budget Committee, and the Appropriations Committee as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Twenty-four hours, Mr. Chairman. Will you have a number tomorrow?

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, with that I am very happy to yield 1 minute to my good friend from the Harrison Township of Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

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

Madam Speaker, this past election was certainly a historic pivot for our Nation. The American people demanded that both the President of the United States, as well as the Congress, chart a new course because they understand that the growth of Federal spending that we have seen for the last several years is completely unsustainable. They understand that this crushing burden of debt that we are selfishly placing on our children and our grandchildren is limiting their opportunities. And they also understand very clearly that this irresponsible, out-of-control Federal spending

is limiting our ability for job creation and economic growth.

Today, this resolution clearly speaks to the House Republicans' Pledge to America by demonstrating our commitment to reduce spending to pre-stimulus, pre-bailout levels, to a level of spending of 2008.

Many would say, Madam Speaker, that this doesn't even go far enough, and that debate will continue this year as we debate the CR, the budget resolution, and the vote for raising the debt ceiling. Today, Madam Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution and let the American people know that we heard them loud and clear in November.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I think what the American people are interested in is serious legislating and serious discussion on how to get this budget under control and not political posturing.

At this point I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

□ 1310

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

All those who care for and think about the 15 million unemployed people in this country, on both sides of the aisle, want the Congress to work together to help small businesses and entrepreneurs create jobs for Americans, but the new majority, right out of the gate, has ignored that obligation.

The first week, they ignored the deficit and passed a set of rules that says they can pretend it doesn't exist when they want to do something. Then they increased the deficit by repealing the health care bill. The Congressional Budget Office says that adds \$230 billion to the deficit over 10 years and more than \$1 trillion over 20 years. This week, they are hiding the deficit. They brought to the floor a bill that wants the American people to guess what the numbers will be under which we will live in the future.

This is not the way to create jobs, either generally or specifically. Here is one fact the Members ought to take into consideration. Last year, the departments that would be subject to up to a 25 percent spending cut under this bill made a million contracts with small businesses that gave \$60 billion worth of work to caterers, electricians, other small businesses.

What will happen to the jobs created by those small businesses if this 25 percent cut goes through?

Now, I say a "25 percent cut" advisedly, because I do think we want to take one more attempt at finding out, and I would yield to the chairman of the Rules Committee, will the spending bill that eventually gets here cut by 25 percent to 2006 levels or by 22 percent to 2008 levels? I would yield to anyone on the other side who could answer that question for us.

What will the number be in the bill that eventually gets here?

Mr. DREIER. I'm sorry. I was talking to my new colleague, Mr. MULVANEY, here. If the gentleman was yielding to me, I apologize, but he will have to repeat the question.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. The question that I asked was:

Will the bill that eventually gets here that has numbers in it have a 25 percent cut by going back to 2006 or a 22 percent cut by going back to 2008?

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would yield, I am happy to answer my friend by saying that the House will work its will. It is one of the things that Speaker BOEHNER has made very clear.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, I would ask what the bill that the leadership brings to the floor will ask for. Will it be a 25 percent cut that goes back to 2006 or a 22 percent cut that goes back to 2008?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me say, Madam Speaker, that Speaker BOEHNER, who is the leader of this House, of both Democrats and Republicans alike, and who is obviously the leader of Republicans, said this morning in a meeting, as he has said repeatedly, the House is going to work its will. We are going to do something that hasn't been done, especially in the appropriations process in the last 2 years. We are going to have a debate that will allow a majority of this institution to determine what those numbers are.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, that sounds awfully familiar. We were promised an open process, but it was a closed process on health care. We were promised an open process, but it was a closed process on this bill. That sounds to me like a promise we have heard before that really hasn't been honored thus far in this Congress.

I would urge a "no" vote.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my friend, as we talk about an open process, my Rules Committee colleagues know that just a few minutes ago, for the first time in 4 long years, the Rules Committee reported out a modified open rule that will allow a free-flowing debate tomorrow right here on this House floor.

I should say, Madam Speaker, that H. Res. 38 is literally one sentence, which says that this institution is committed to getting our level of spending to 2008 levels or less—or less, Madam Speaker—and I think it's important for us to note that.

We have the chairman of the Budget Committee, as I started to say in response to my friend, we have the Appropriations Committee chairman, and we are determined to begin a process.

With that, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my great new friend from Indian Hills, South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in favor of the resolution.

I am just happy to be able to have this debate this year. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that we were campaigning last year during 2010. As freshmen, we never expected to have the ability to come into this Chamber this year and talk about the FY 2011 spending. We thought that that would be long before we had gotten here, and I thank my colleagues from across the way for failing to pass a budget last year so that we have the opportunity to have this debate with this new Congress.

For me—and I know, Madam Speaker, for many of my colleagues—the key language in this resolution is 2008 levels or less. It's that “or less” that, I think, has a lot of the attention of the freshmen.

In a world where discretionary spending is up 88 percent in the last 2 years, in a world where we have borrowed \$3 trillion in just the last 2 years, in a world, Madam Speaker, where we borrowed more money in one day—we borrowed more money on June 30, 2010, than we borrowed in all of 2006—in that world, those two words “or less” are what speak to me and so many Members of the freshman class.

I thank the Rules Committee, and especially the chairman, for making sure that language is in there, and I am looking forward to exploring that when this bill comes to the floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I enjoyed the previous speaker.

I would just simply ask: What is the problem with telling us what the number is and what you're going to cut?

The number is important because that does determine what you are going to cut. It determines what the allocations are going to be to the various appropriations committees, and they have real consequences. The notion that we are doing something bold here by coming up with this arbitrary, you know, statement that it's 2008 or less levels we're going to go to without any detail, without any numbers, without anything of anything, is political posturing at its worse.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided and misdirected and destructive resolution.

The American people have charged us with creating jobs and strengthening our economy. My colleagues in the majority appear more focused on getting

in a good sound bite before tonight's State of the Union.

Procedurally, this resolution empowers a single person to decree the entire Nation's budget for the rest of the year—no hearings, no markups, no vote. And this plan is nothing more than a gimmick that will destroy jobs.

For example, reverting to 2008 budget levels will cut more than \$17 million from the National Health Service Corp. This program trains and employs health care providers, all while caring for millions of Americans. Moreover, it will cut both nurse faculty loan programs and nurse training programs by nearly 70 percent. These cuts will decimate our health care workforce now and long into the future.

Madam Speaker, in 2008, over 27,000 qualified applicants to our Nation's nursing schools were turned away because we didn't have enough faculty to train them. Countless others couldn't even afford to go. This budgetless resolution will do nothing more than exacerbate a real growing problem.

Members from both sides of the aisle know that we desperately need to increase our health care workforce, not cut it. Instead of cutting jobs, we should be creating them, so I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this budgetless resolution.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my very good friend from Santa Barbara that creating jobs and getting our economy back on track is exactly what this resolution is all about.

We all know that, on the sidelines all across this country and around the world, there is capital, there are resources that are waiting to be invested. And once we get our fiscal house in order, the signal that that sends to job creators out there is a very important one.

With that, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to my very good friend from Richmond, Virginia, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, November 2 marked the culmination of a long, arduous and ultimately clarifying debate over the kind of role government should play in the economy. By overwhelming margins, voters rejected an approach that spends money we don't have and concentrates too much control and power in Washington.

Instead, they voted for a better way.

Republicans are determined to deliver results by instilling a culture of opportunity, responsibility, and success. Our majority is dedicated to cut and grow: cut spending and job-destroying regulations, grow private sector jobs and the economy.

□ 1320

Today, we have the opportunity to take a significant step towards repairing America's deteriorating fiscal condition. This resolution directs the

Budget Committee chairman to set spending levels so we return non-defense discretionary spending to 2008 levels or below.

If you think the government didn't spend enough money in 2008, then oppose this resolution; go on record for more spending, more borrowing, and more debt. But, Madam Speaker, if you believe we are spending too much money, then I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. It represents a clean break with the past and an end to the unchecked growth of Federal spending and government, and it is worthy of our support.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I'm still waiting to hear the number and how much we're going to cut. I am waiting to see this transparency and accountability.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKs).

Mr. DICKs. While the Democratic Caucus in the House remains committed to fiscal responsibility, we have two major concerns at this point that should be stated as we consider this resolution at the outset of the 112th Congress.

First, we must recognize that the highest priority at this point is to get our economy moving again, supporting initiatives that help create jobs and that continue to bring us out of the recession. Our economy is still fragile, and although unemployment is heading downward, it remains too high. In this regard, I believe we must be concerned about a precipitous and substantial drop in spending if it is going to result in increasing unemployment and increasing the deficit. It is going to have exactly the opposite effect of what is intended on the Republican side. It would truly be counterproductive if we added to the ranks of the unemployed workers in America, reducing revenues coming into the Treasury and requiring additional expenditures for unemployment insurance and welfare.

And second, the resolution we are considering today specifically exempts defense—the largest element of our Federal budget—from any reductions. Even though I have always supported a strong national defense, I cannot imagine why we would hold the Pentagon harmless in the attempt to achieve greater fiscal accountability. Even the Republican majority leader this week agreed that defense spending should be on the table, and Secretary Gates himself has proposed a series of reasonable reductions that could be accomplished in his department's budget.

In the FY 2011 bill the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, which I chaired with Mr. YOUNG of Florida, adopted last July, included a reduction of \$7 billion from the Obama budget request, and the Senate Appropriations Committee had a similar number. I think we can even do more than that. I was glad to see that Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CANTOR, and others have all said that defense should be part of the solution. I think we can cut up to \$13 billion out

of the defense budget without doing any damage to national security.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my very good friend from Seattle that I am in complete agreement with the notion of ensuring that we focus time, energy, and effort on paring back waste, fraud, and abuse, especially within the Pentagon. We all know that it's there. And I'm glad that my friend from Worcester raised that issue in his opening remarks. He somehow was arguing that we have left it as sacrosanct. We don't.

The focus today is obviously on non-security discretionary spending, and that's exactly what we are trying to do with this first try.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield my friend 15 seconds, Madam Speaker.

Mr. DICKS. I would just say we ought to do it now; it will make it easier. This gives us a bargaining chip with the President and with the Senate. We can make some reductions in defense.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, I would say to my friend, he knows very well that we have gone without a budget so far. We are going to go through the standard budget process.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds to say that I would like to see complete reform of the 1974 Budget Act. I want a joint, bicameral, bipartisan committee to do just that. But then, with the structure we have today, we are going to proceed with the appropriations process so we will be able to do exactly what my friend said.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the bill makes defense spending sacrosanct and says nothing about going after fraud and waste in defense contracts.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to oppose the budgetless resolution. It ignores job creation, has no numbers, no specifics, and it gives no serious plan to reduce the deficit.

The Republicans say they want to decrease the deficit and that they will try to cut non-defense discretionary spending back to 2008 levels. They say this will save \$100 billion in discretionary spending.

I am giving them a chance to put their money where their mouths are. Today, I introduced H.R. 413, legislation that would reduce defense spending to 2008 levels. We can't be serious about getting our house in order if we are exempting 60 percent of discretionary spending from cuts. My legislation will save \$182 billion over the next 5 years. That's \$182 billion from a sec-

tor riddled with extra planes and engines the Pentagon doesn't even want. We spend more than any other country. The next closest is China; we spend seven times what they do. How about just cutting back to maybe only spending five or six times as much as China does.

I urge support of H.R. 413.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today as someone willing to work towards reforms that will create jobs, strengthen our middle class, and pay down our debt. I am in favor of comprehensive tax reform with lower rates. I'm in favor of removing regulations that hurt competitiveness. I'm ready to make the hard cuts we need to pay down our deficit. I think we can all agree on those principles. We might have to change some of the policies, but we agree on the principles. But what we have here today contains no policies, no ideas, and very few principles.

This is a budgetless resolution. It calls for a reduction in spending to pre-2008 levels but provides no specifics. What family in America would sit down at the kitchen table and set up a budget without a bottom line?

We could be here discussing Mr. RYAN's idea to replace Medicaid with vouchers. We could be here discussing the plan to cut public education spending 50 percent and to eliminate Amtrak and public broadcasting. Let's discuss those things. Or we could be debating the plan Majority Leader CANTOR hailed, which would result in the absence of 4,000 FBI agents and 1,500 DEA agents. We may disagree with those policies, but I am here to work to solve problems. And to say we will drop spending levels up to 30 percent but provide no specifics is being less than genuine.

Colin Powell recently said this: "I am very put off when people just say let's go back and freeze to the level 2 years ago. Tell me what you're going to cut, and nobody up there yet is being very, very candid about what they are going to cut to fix the problem."

The public has been very clear; job creation should be our top priority. So far we have abandoned the principles of pay-as-you-go and added \$230 billion to the deficit by repealing—you voted for it—health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Before us is yet another piece of legislation being used as a political gimmick instead of an honest conversation to seek out compromise with the purpose of aiding the economy. As a new

member of the Budget Committee, I am willing and eager to work hard to find comprehensive, bipartisan solutions to strengthening our economy. Please let me know when you're ready to sit down and talk and work.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my friend how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. HOYER and then myself at this moment.

Mr. DREIER. I am going to sit on the edge of my seat in anticipation of Mr. HOYER's very thoughtful remarks that I look forward to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the minority whip, Mr. HOYER.

□ 1330

Mr. HOYER. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DREIER has put additional pressure on me with his thoughtful remarks.

Let me say that there is nobody on this floor who doesn't believe that the deficit is a very, very substantial problem that confronts us; and I would hope that there is nobody on the floor who believes that it's going to be accomplished in a simple fashion to bring this deficit under control. But I fear that there is too much simplistic—not simple—simplistic rhetoric with reference to this deficit.

After borrowing trillions of dollars to finance tax cuts, a new entitlement, and two wars, our friends on the Republican side tell us they are now taking the deficit seriously. All of you have heard my comments about how under the Clinton administration the budget was balanced and how under the Reagan and Bush I and Bush II administrations it was not.

If our Republican friends mean it, if they were interested in the deficit as anything other than a political issue, if they actually use their House majority to back up their words with action, then no one, in my opinion, would be happier than me and our party, the Democratic Party.

Our deficit I think all of us should agree is too big for partisan politics. It cripples our children's opportunities. It makes it harder for them to pay for college education, buy a home, start a business, or plan a future.

I want my Republican friends to take the deficit seriously. I want my Democratic friends to take the budget deficit seriously—to join President Obama in making the hard choices it will take to get out of debt.

But, frankly, so far the opportunity to finally back up their words of fiscal discipline have been a record of disappointment.

A rules package, and I tell my friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the rules package provides for \$5 trillion in additional deficit spending over the next 10 years—\$5 trillion; a vote to repeal health care reform is another \$230 billion of deficit; a pledge to cut

spending by a hundred billion, which it has taken them less than a month to break; and, today, a one-page resolution with no numbers and no specifics.

I think this resolution is unprecedented, certainly in the 30 years that I've been here, which gives to one person out of the 435 the opportunity and the authority to set a number that we will consider in this House. I don't think that's precedent. I don't think it's democratic. It's not transparent. And it's not an open process.

Colin Powell has already been quoted, but we're still waiting for the answer of what is going to be cut. At a time when getting out of debt, growing the economy, and creating jobs are our country's defining bipartisan challenges, we need hard choices—not more political theater.

Now, we passed a budget enforcement resolution which was criticized by the other side because we didn't pass a full budget. I think that's, perhaps, correct.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding the additional 1 minute.

We were criticized; but in that budget enforcement resolution, we had a number, and when you voted on the rule, you knew the number you were voting on as a House of Representatives. Here you have no idea what you're voting on. You could be voting for 2008 numbers or anything less than that under this resolution.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield? And I will yield my friend additional time.

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say to my friend, Mr. Speaker, that this is the beginning of a process. This is a one-sentence resolution that will allow this House to go on record making a strong commitment to reducing the level of spending. And my friend was absolutely right in his opening remarks when he said that everyone wants us to reduce the deficit. And he's right.

This may be unprecedented, but we're in unprecedented times.

I would yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his generosity.

But let me say to the gentleman, it may be unprecedented times; but it does not warrant this unprecedented abdication of democracy in this House in setting what is probably the most critical question that confronts government: How much are you going to pay for it? I think we all agree on that. That's what is at issue here.

And this resolution does not allow Members of Congress to engage on that. It simply gives to one person the ability to set that number. It's not only unprecedented; it, in my opinion, is undemocratic—with a small "d." It

does not provide the transparency and the openness of which the gentleman has correctly spoken and I hope we pursue.

And I hope that we oppose this resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

I consider the gentleman from California a colleague that I've known for a good while, and I know that there are certainly good intentions; but I always believe that when you're elected to this powerful body that represents over 300 million Americans, as the census has given us new numbers of how many Americans we have the privilege of representing, you do have to speak about the future.

When you begin to talk about generic numbers going back to 2008 levels, you are speaking generally without substance because it is our commitment to be able to move America forward. And I hope the President will stay in the blue column because you can see the red column in the past administration: there was no job creation.

So when you talk about reducing the deficit, it must be with a plan; it must be with substance. Because you can repeal with no substance.

And I would just raise the question: Do we want a Nation that does not invest in education? Do we want a Nation that does not help our businesses invest to create jobs? And do we want a Nation that says that security, the FBI, the DEA—someone called in today and talked about how important it was to ensure that we had the right kind of law enforcement. Or do we want to tell those who are on Social Security who have worked, literally worked, or are disabled, that there are no more dollars for them because we have just without any guidance gone back to 2008 levels?

I would just ask that we move this country forward, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that we invest in America.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 1¾ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with this resolution, as has been stated over and over and over again, is that it is a press release. It contains no number. People on the other side talk about tough choices. It doesn't talk about any of the tough choices. It exempts defense spending from any cuts, so fraudulent defense contracts are somehow okay, that it's better than waste and abuse in domestic spending programs. Everything should be on the table when we're talking about getting this budget deficit under control.

The reason why the number is so important is because that number determines how much we're going to allocate to the various appropriations committees; and that in turn determines

really the severity of a lot of the cuts that are going to have to be made: cuts in medical research—research to try to find a cure to cancer; cuts in programs to help feed hungry children; cuts in programs to provide emergency fuel assistance to low-income people during the winter months; cuts in small business loans that can help small businesses get the capital they need to grow and create jobs.

We should be talking about jobs in the opening of the session. Instead, what we have talked about are the old ideological battles of the past. Last week we repealed the entire health care bill. This week, we're passing a budget resolution that has no number in it. I mean, this is a first. This is unprecedented. And I think the American people who are watching are wondering why in the world can't you tell us what the number is; why in the world can't you give us a sense of what you're going to cut.

□ 1340

Why in the world can't you even vote on it? There are 435 Members of this House. Only one Member is going to be able to determine what that budget number is.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in political theater today. We know the CBO will come out with numbers tomorrow, but the Republicans feel it's important to do this today because somehow they think the press will pay attention to this and they'll be able to have a countermessage to the President's State of the Union address. They are blowing a major opportunity.

There is bipartisan concern about the budget. There is a bipartisan consensus that we need to find cuts. And rather than working in a bipartisan way, we have a bill that comes to the floor under a closed rule. We are told that the chairman of the Budget Committee can unilaterally come up with a number; the rest of us are irrelevant to this process. That's not the way it's supposed to be. And I think that the Republican majority owes it not only to the Members of this Congress, but they owe it to the American people to tell us what the number is and where they're going to cut, how deeply they're going to cut, who's going to be impacted. Because I will tell you this: Who's going to be impacted are real people, and they're going to feel the real pain of some of these cuts.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided resolution, this press release.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have bipartisan consensus around here. We need to get our

economy back on track, and we need to do everything that we can to cut Federal spending. The distinguished minority whip just said as much. So there is a consensus, and I think that's wonderful.

In a few hours, 9 o'clock this evening, Democrats are going to be sitting with Republicans; Republicans are going to be sitting with Democrats. It's going to be unprecedented. And I will say that Mr. HOYER referred to this simple one-sentence resolution as unprecedented. And I believe that it probably is unprecedented.

What it says—I mean, I have almost memorized the one sentence, Mr. Speaker. It says that we need to make sure that the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee work to get us to 2008 spending levels or less. I personally believe that we should be substantially below 2008 levels. I believe that we need to take that kind of action.

And it's true, before the President stands right over my shoulder at 9 o'clock this evening and delivers his State of the Union message, we want this institution to have a chance to go on record saying that we are committed to doing everything that we can to get the spending levels to 2008 or less.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are in the position we are, and that itself is unprecedented, and that's why unprecedented action is necessary.

Now, I began my remarks by talking about the fact that probably one of the most enduring and powerful memories of 2010 was what took place in Athens, Greece. We saw the riots take place in the streets from public service employees in the wake of the government facing the responsibility of imposing austerity standards on the people of Greece. And what happened? We saw this huge outcry come because they were arguing that they couldn't, in fact, bring about cuts in spending.

I juxtapose that to what we saw in the last year here. We saw tens of thousands of Americans taking to the streets carrying this message: Taxed Enough Already. They came together to petition their government to bring about spending reductions. Not complaining that the government was making cuts; complaining that the government wasn't making enough cuts. And that's exactly what we're doing.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this may be the first time in human history that we have witnessed what it was that we saw take place last year and led to the outcome in the November 2 election. We know that the greatest change in three-quarters of a century took place in this institution. Sixty-three members of the Democratic Party were defeated. We now have 87 new Republicans and nine new Democrats who have joined with us, and they have carried this message to us that we need to rein in spending.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to note that our real goal is above

that. It is job creation and economic growth, getting our economy back on track so that people out there who are trying to get onto the first rung of the economic ladder are able to do just that. We have a painfully high unemployment rate, and people across this country are hurting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what steps can we take to create jobs? I personally believe that we need to—and I look forward to having the President talk about this tonight—open up new markets around the world so that union and nonunion workers in the United States of America can have the opportunity to sell goods and provide services into countries like Colombia and Panama and South Korea, where these pending agreements exist.

I believe that since Japan has brought about a reduction in its top corporate rate, the rate of those job creators, we can reduce the top corporate rate—it's the highest rate of any country in the world now—from 35 to 25 percent. I understand the President may be proposing that this evening. That will go a long way towards creating jobs.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we're doing with H. Res. 38 is we are getting ourselves on a path towards fiscal responsibility, and I believe that that is one of the most important things that we can do as we seek this shared goal of job creation and economic growth. So if we can let this institution go on record in support of getting to 2008 levels or less, I am convinced that that will be a strong step towards our goal, our shared goal of creating jobs and establishing economic growth.

This is the beginning of a process, Mr. Speaker, the beginning of a process; again, a one-sentence resolution that this House will be voting on in just a few minutes. But the process, itself, is one that is broken. It's broken because, for the first time since the 1974 Budget Act was put into place, we've not had a budget. We've not had a budget. We're almost 5 months into the new fiscal year, and we are in the process of cleaning up the mess that was handed to us.

So how is it we plan to do it? Well, Speaker BOEHNER has made it very clear. And that is that we need to make sure that we have an open, free-flowing debate as we proceed with a budget. And I'm convinced that our Rules Committee will make alternatives in order when we proceed with the work that the Budget Committee will have done. And I'm convinced that we will get back to the kind of regular order that I think today Democrats and Republicans alike would want to see, and that is a chance for Democrats and Republicans to stand up and offer amendments to the appropriations bills.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will say again that it's a simple one-sentence resolution. Are we going to let this institution get onto a path towards reducing the size, scope, reach, and control of the Federal

Government or are we not? And so, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this very, very important resolution.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I was pleased to cast a vote that would reduce the legislative appropriation as a symbol that no part of the budget should be off limits as we attempt to deal with the issues of government efficiency and deficit reduction. The resolution before Congress today directs the Budget Committee Chairman to reduce non-security spending to FY 2008 levels or less for the remainder of FY 2011. I would hope that having demonstrated that even the legislature itself is not exempt, that the Republican leadership would reconsider its decision to declare off limits the major areas of government spending, particularly the Department of Defense.

If we are truly to improve our fiscal condition, no part of the budget should be off limits. The Pentagon cannot be left out. We can no longer separate national security from fiscal responsibility. Speaker BOEHNER has himself said that there is room to find savings in the defense budget.

Even without including the costs for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, U.S. defense spending is the highest it has been at any time since the end of World War II. It is greater than at the peak of the Cold War. Yet we continue to spend billions to protect West Germany from the Soviet Union even though both ceased to exist decades ago.

Our defense budget accounts for half of global military spending and consumes more than 50 cents of every dollar of federal government discretionary spending. Even under the laudable plan announced by Secretary Gates to cut the Pentagon's budget by \$78 billion, defense spending will continue to increase in the near term.

There are many thoughtful ways to rein in defense spending. More than \$350 billion has been spent by the U.S. in Afghanistan since 2001, a monthly bill for our taxpayers exceeding \$8 billion. The U.S. military is the single largest consumer of energy in the world, using as much power in one year as the entire country of Nigeria, and spending \$17 billion each year on petrol and another \$23 billion annually on refueling our bases and units in Afghanistan. Integrating renewable and energy efficient practices into our armed services have already saved lives and money. Finally, we should eliminate unnecessary weapons programs, such as the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle. Despite the Marine Corps commandant calling the program unworkable and unaffordable, some lawmakers continue to insist on funding it.

While today's resolution fails to address this problem, it is my hope that we'll be able to work in a bipartisan fashion to "right-size" all areas of government spending, including the Pentagon.

Unfortunately, the proposal put forth by the Republican Study Committee earlier this week has lessened the chance of finding a bipartisan solution. Their proposal would result in cuts of more than 40 percent in education, environmental protection, law enforcement, medical research, food safety, and many other key services. In practical terms, this would include the elimination of nearly 3,000 food safety inspectors—endangering our food supply, dramatic increases in wait times at Social Security centers by slashing that agencies budget,

and dumping 389,000 children from Head Start—destroying opportunities for those children while weakening America's competitiveness.

The Republican Study Committee's proposal would also destroy thousands of jobs renewing and rebuilding America's eroding infrastructure. For instance, cutting \$2 billion from the New Starts program would destroy nearly 46,000 jobs and cutting Amtrak funding by \$1.6 billion would destroy 36,000. Eliminating these programs makes it harder for those Americans with work to get to work or to find new work.

There are many more examples just like these that hit every community in our country. While we strive to better match our revenues with the cost of services to our constituents, it is important not to destroy the very programs that make our country strong and economically competitive and on which our citizens depend.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken loud and clear—they want Congress to stop the out-of-control spending that is bankrupting our Nation.

During the campaign last year, Republicans called for reducing non-security, discretionary spending in Fiscal Year 2011 by \$100 billion as a down payment toward the cuts needed to get America's finances back on track.

Now that the campaign is over, and the American people have given us one more chance to make things right, they want to see us do what we said we would do.

H. Res. 38 is a good first step—and I'm going to support it—but it does not get us the full \$100 billion.

Mr. Speaker, we need to keep the \$100 billion promise we made to the American people!

I filed an amendment last night that would keep the \$100 billion promise. We would be debating that amendment right now, had this resolution come to the floor under an open rule.

The good news is . . . and I applaud our leadership for taking this position . . . sometime over the next few weeks, we will have another chance to keep this promise as we debate the continuing resolution under an open rule.

Though some say keeping the \$100 billion promise would be too difficult, the folks I get the privilege to represent back home say "This is the least we can do!"

They understand that \$100 billion is only about one-thirteenth of the deficit. They understand that cutting \$100 billion only gets us one-thirteenth of the way to a balanced budget.

Rebuilding the trust of the people means keeping our word. We need to keep our promise.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 38, which imposes dramatic cuts to our budget without any regard to its effects on our Nation's economic recovery or Rhode Island families struggling to stay afloat.

Our Nation faces a serious budget deficit, but we also face a jobs deficit and a fragile economic recovery. Rhode Island currently has the fifth highest unemployment rate in the country at 11.5 percent. The Republican proposal to cut non-security programs by 21 percent goes too far too fast, resulting in additional potential job losses and reductions to critical services that could threaten our eco-

nomically recovery and countless families who are barely getting by as it is. It makes drastic cuts to our school systems and student aid for college, slashes housing assistance in the wake of record foreclosures, and reduces lending support for small businesses.

This proposal also contradicts the recommendations of the Bipartisan Fiscal Commission, of which some of our Republican leaders were participants. In its final report released on December 1, 2010—less than eight weeks ago—the commission stated in its second guiding principle that "budget cuts should start gradually so they don't interfere with the ongoing economic recovery. Growth is essential to restoring fiscal strength." The Commission then stated in its first recommendation that we should not return to pre-recession 2008 levels until 2013. This proposal contained a lot of controversial ideas to be sure, but the general consensus regardless of party affiliation highlighted the need for caution in crafting an effective deficit reduction plan.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree that we need to get our fiscal house in order, but we must do it thoughtfully and responsibly. This proposal rushes to judgment before the process has even begun. I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution and begin a serious discussion of deficit reduction that will address our fiscal challenges without imperiling our economic recovery.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 38, a vague and reckless "budget-less" budget resolution. H. Res. 38 claims to reduce non-security spending to fiscal year 2008 levels or less, but this one-page bill has not one final budget number, nor does it actually make any specific cuts. Instead, this resolution grants all authority to the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget to set the budget allocations for the Committee on Appropriations. This entitles the Chairman to merely have the allocations printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So much for an open and transparent process. So much for allowing the Committees of jurisdiction to do their work. Mr. Speaker, we declared our independence from Great Britain precisely because we didn't want a king and here we are making one out of the Chairman of the House Committee on the Budget.

By allowing only one hour of debate on the resolution and no amendments, Republican leadership seeks to bypass the deliberation and debate by Members of Congress. Republican leadership also struck down a motion that would have required a vote by the full House before any allocation could become effective, once again limiting input by the Members of this body. It is clear that the Grand Old Party remains committed to deciding our Nation's budgetary policies in smoke-filled backrooms.

It is clear that the one-page resolution brought to the floor today is not a serious plan to reduce the deficit. Indeed, the new Republican plan offers the same empty rhetoric as the last: all smoke and mirrors. It is fiscally irresponsible, both procedurally and substantively, and it puts too much power in the hands of one individual—the Chairman of the Budget Committee.

Furthermore, the arbitrary decision to reduce spending to non-security—a clear definition of which we have yet to see—funding levels in fiscal year 2008 jeopardizes the progress our country has made in recovering

from the economic downturn. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not governing for fiscal year 2008, we are governing for the remainder of fiscal year 2011. Rather than driving our economic progress forward, the Republican leadership has chosen to throw the car into reverse, threatening to destroy the recovery this economy has made.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they can't provide specifics, as they are awaiting information from the Congressional Budget Office. The same Congressional Budget Office they recently accused of cooking the books. I am glad Republicans now see the value of the non-partisan organization. It is my understanding that CBO will come out with baseline numbers within the next week. Would it not be a better course of action to wait for those numbers and show us all exactly which programs are to be cut—to lay the specifics on the table? Or is today's resolution modeled after the Republican repeal bill—meant for political showmanship only?

I am ready to work in a bipartisan way to reduce deficits, as well as promote economic growth and protect the strength of American middle-class families. During this current economic downturn, we must not jeopardize our Nation's ability to create jobs. Unfortunately, the GOP has made it clear they are not interested in taking real action for the American people. Republicans have already voted in their rules package, paving the way to add nearly \$5 trillion to the deficit, and have voted to increase the deficit by \$230 billion by repealing the health care law. I will NOT stand idly by and let the GOP advance its record of doubling the national debt and shirking away from fiscal responsibility. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DREIER. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 43, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Indeed, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bishop of New York moves to recommit the resolution H. Res. 38 to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 2, line 1, insert "(1)" after "that".

Page 2, line 2, insert the following before the period: ", and (2) no spending for any contract entered into by the United States Government with a company that has been determined by the Secretary of Labor to have offshored or outsourced American jobs overseas".

□ 1350

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. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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 adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules with regard to House Resolution 49.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 242, answered “present” 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]
YEAS—184

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

NAYS—242

Adams	Bartlett	Black
Aderholt	Barton (TX)	Blackburn
Akin	Bass (NH)	Bonner
Alexander	Benishek	Bono Mack
Amash	Berg	Boustany
Austria	Biggart	Brady (TX)
Bachmann	Bilbray	Brooks
Bachus	Bilirakis	Broun (GA)
Barletta	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan

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

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Sherman

NOT VOTING—7

Emerson
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Hinchev
Payne
Rokita

□ 1413

Messrs. GOSAR, HIMES, and SCHOCK changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Messrs. FARR, ALTMIRE, BRALEY of Iowa, LANGEVIN, and LEWIS 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.

Stated against:

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 19, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 256, nays 165, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]
YEAS—256

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

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman

Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—165

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi

Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Oliver
Owens

Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Vislosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bralley (IA)
Emerson
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Green, Gene

Hinchev
Honda
Kaptur
Neal
Payne

Ros-Lehtinen
Schakowsky
Waters

□ 1422

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A resolution reducing non-security spending to fiscal year 2008 levels or less.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 20, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I regret missing a floor vote on Tuesday, January 25, 2011. Had I registered my vote, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote No. 20, on agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 38—To reduce spending through a transition to non-security spending at fiscal year 2008 levels.

STAFF SERGEANT SALVATORE A. GIUNTA MEDAL OF HONOR FLAG RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 49) providing Capitol-flown flags for recipients of the Medal of Honor, 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 motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—424

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Grijalva
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards

Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Grijalva
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards

Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller

Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslie
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern

McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Oliver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush

Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Vislosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Black
Cicilline
Emerson
Frank (MA)

Giffords
Harman
Hinchev
Keating

Payne
Ros-Lehtinen

□ 1430

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.