

efforts in education and science and innovation.

I would hope that we would think for a minute about what we could actually do to take America's exceptional past and create a real roadmap for our Nation's future, ensuring it on a fiscal footing that will be stronger.

I have introduced this morning H.R. 1125. It is a proposal to address the Nation's debt and create a debt-free America. I invite the House to debate on it.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 112TH CONGRESS

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 147 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 147

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$12,235,047; Committee on Armed Services, \$15,050,528; Committee on the Budget, \$12,066,370; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$16,692,508; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$22,409,582; Committee on Ethics, \$5,868,311; Committee on Financial Services, \$17,399,282; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$17,904,940; Committee on Homeland Security, \$16,887,448; Committee on House Administration, \$10,516,013; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$10,307,500; Committee on the Judiciary, \$16,802,812; Committee on Natural Resources, \$15,739,532; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$21,226,108; Committee on Rules, \$6,783,970; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$13,346,273; Committee on Small Business, \$6,874,000; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$19,830,446; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$7,285,256; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$19,602,731.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2011, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2012.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$6,189,494; Committee on Armed Services, \$7,525,264; Committee on the Budget, \$6,033,185; Committee on Education and the

Workforce, \$8,346,254; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$10,980,940; Committee on Ethics, \$2,824,535; Committee on Financial Services, \$8,441,264; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$8,952,470; Committee on Homeland Security, \$8,443,724; Committee on House Administration, \$4,949,176; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$5,153,750; Committee on the Judiciary, \$8,401,406; Committee on Natural Resources, \$7,869,766; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$10,613,054; Committee on Rules, \$3,391,985; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$6,685,637; Committee on Small Business, \$3,214,891; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$9,915,223; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,602,745; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$9,801,365.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2012, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2013.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$6,045,553; Committee on Armed Services, \$7,525,264; Committee on the Budget, \$6,033,185; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$8,346,254; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$11,428,642; Committee on Ethics, \$3,043,776; Committee on Financial Services, \$8,958,018; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$8,952,470; Committee on Homeland Security, \$8,443,724; Committee on House Administration, \$5,566,837; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$5,153,750; Committee on the Judiciary, \$8,401,406; Committee on Natural Resources, \$7,869,766; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$10,613,054; Committee on Rules, \$3,391,985; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$6,660,637; Committee on Small Business, \$3,659,109; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$9,915,223; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,682,512; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$9,801,366.

(c) REVIEW OF USE OF FUNDS IN FIRST SESSION.—None of the amounts provided for in section 1 for a committee named in subsection (b) may be available for expenses of the committee after March 15, 2012, unless the chair or ranking minority member of the committee appears and presents testimony at a hearing of the Committee on House Administration held prior to such date to review the committee's use of the amounts provided for in section 1 during the first session of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress and to determine whether the amount specified in subsection (b) with respect to the committee should be updated on the basis of the review.

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1076, PROHIBITING FEDERAL FUNDING OF NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 174

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1076) to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. NUGENT. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER). During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 174 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 1076. The rule provides for ample debate on this bill and gives Members of both the minority and the majority an opportunity to participate in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. H.R. 1076 prohibits direct funding to NPR—National Public Radio. In fiscal year 2010, NPR received over \$5 million in direct Federal funding from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Department of Education, the Department of Commerce, and the National Endowment for the Arts. Moreover, hundreds of public radio stations received direct radio grants in the amount of \$67 million. Radio stations can use these grants for whatever they want. It's unrestricted. Often, stations use these funds to pay dues to NPR and pay fees for NPR programming. According to NPR's Web site, they are "an independent, self-supporting media organization." However, they also admit their revenue "comes primarily from fees paid by their member stations." In fact, membership dues and station programming fees account for 36 percent of NPR funding.

In H.R. 1, we started the process of letting NPR operate on its own, without taxpayer involvement, by defunding it for the remainder of fiscal year 2011. However, H.R. 1 only addressed appropriated funds for the rest of the current fiscal year. The bill we have before us today addresses the authorized use of funds not just for the rest of fiscal year 2011, but going forward.

Under this bill, NPR will continue to provide its programming. They just can't use taxpayer dollars to subsidize it. Moreover, our goal on H.R. 1076 is that there won't be a need for this funding going forward. This is something the Appropriations Committee can factor into their funding decisions for fiscal year 2012 and the future. Let me stress again, this bill does not fully defund NPR.

□ 0920

What this bill does do is start weaning NPR off of Federal dollars. Local radio stations are still allowed to pay membership dues, and they can still buy NPR programs. They just can't use your and my hard-earned tax dollars to pay for them.

Instead, the grants that these local stations get will be used for local needs. They can create more original programming about issues happening in their areas that are important to their communities. They can pay for their staffs and even hire more local producers and hosts for their new programs.

The Federal Government's addiction to spending has driven us to our current \$14 trillion debt. We need to refocus on what our core mission is. We should not be using tax dollars that American citizens worked hard to earn for something that could be paid for privately.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my friend from Florida for yielding me the customary time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill yesterday was brought to the Rules Committee as an emergency meeting. Now, what would be an emergency in the United States? The cost of the war? The damage of the war? Unemployment figures? The deficit? Home foreclosure? The tragedy in Japan? A no-fly zone over Libya?

No. The emergency is that they want to destroy National Public Radio.

This is the latest in a long string of misplaced priorities by the Republican Party. It does nothing to fix the long-term fiscal condition. It doesn't create a single job. In fact, it will lose some. The Congressional Budget Office has determined that the legislation does absolutely zero to reduce the deficit.

When so many Americans want our representatives to create jobs to re-

sponsibly reduce the deficit and to bring our sons and daughters home from the battlefields overseas, why are we wasting valuable floor time on an ideological battle that does nothing to achieve any of those goals?

Because the bill is a political stunt, it is being rushed through Congress under draconian rules. Violating their own promises of transparency, the Republican majority held no hearings, no committee action of any kind, listened to no expert testimony, and provided no chance for the American people to weigh in. Just by saying it is an emergency, apparently, in many minds, it does become one. By not providing a true 72 hours and because the bill, itself, omitted the fact that the bill would lay over to allow all Members to review the legislation, they violated the spirit of the transparency they promised the American people just 5 months ago.

My colleagues on the other side know that they must pass this legislation quickly before the American people, at the rate of 69 percent, are allowed to speak and tell their representatives something they don't want to hear, for the American people, unlike the far right-wing, know that NPR is not an ideological news outlet and that NPR radio bases its reporting on fact, which is really an anomaly today in the United States.

NPR doesn't try to blur the line between opinion, fact, and political agenda. Instead, it takes the time and spends the money to do in-depth reporting across the country and around the globe and to go where no other news organization will go. Unlike commercial news outlets that are driven by the need to garner ratings and sell commercial advertising, National Public Radio concerns itself, first and foremost, with informing the Nation on the complex issues that face our country.

In stark contrast to the bare bones and often sensationalist reporting found elsewhere, National Public Radio operates 17 foreign bureaus. In fact, it is one of the few news outlets to maintain a full-time bureau in Afghanistan, reporting from the front lines of a largely forgotten war. It is also in the process of opening a bureau in Turkey in order to report firsthand on the democratic uprisings throughout the Middle East.

In the United States, it has correspondents spread out from Texas to Oregon, telling the stories not covered by the cable news pundits that we see on TV every day. In rural America in particular, NPR can often be the only, best source of news. Defunding NPR will cut off this valuable source of news from the southern tier of western New York to the plains of the upper Midwest, and will put rural communities at a major disadvantage in the information age.

It is because of their valuable and unique reporting that Americans are increasingly turning to NPR in order to learn about our ever-changing

world. In fact, despite the challenges facing the news media, a new report by the Pew Foundation has shown that NPR is strong and is growing more popular every day. According to the report, NPR's audience has grown to 27.2 million weekly listeners. This is a 58 percent increase since the year 2000. In addition, the Web site is a premier online news destination, garnering 15.7 million visitors a month, which is an increase of more than 5 million people over the course of a single year—and are those people really going to be angry.

I've been a proud supporter of NPR my whole life in public service. While serving in the New York State Legislature, I fought for the launch of news programming on my local public radio station, WXXI. From that humble beginning over 30 years ago, I find myself standing on the floor of the House of Representatives, fighting for NPR again today.

I stand here because, quite simply, facts matter. This Nation wasn't built because we huffed and puffed and wished it were so. We didn't become a global leader by bloviating on 24-hour cable news, and we aren't solving the fundamental issues that face our Nation by passing this politically driven legislation to appease the far right.

Our Nation was built and will be rebuilt by the quiet efforts of millions of Americans across the country who will never make it on cable news and who will never appear on national television. It is these very Americans whom NPR dedicates its resources to finding, to covering, and to sharing the world with. Their stories aren't simple, and their efforts don't sell advertising space, but their stories matter. NPR's work to find the stories that matter is the in-depth intelligent reporting that I fight for today.

No matter what I say, some will still believe that NPR isn't worth funding because they want it to be true. Some will find it in their interests to scare Americans into believing in an NPR straw man, while others will take comfort in watching the straw man fall.

Yet, deep in our hearts, all of us know that governing through fear and divisive legislation is not a responsible way to move this country forward. It is certainly no replacement for creating jobs. With millions of Americans who are unemployed and struggling to live, we can't waste another minute on the House floor without debating a bill that will put some Americans back to work. We should not waste another minute ignoring the needs of millions of Americans while playing cheap political games.

Yesterday, I asked, Why only National Public Radio? Why not television? I think I know the answer to that.

A few years ago, that was tried. The House of Representatives actually tried to kill Big Bird, to destroy Elmo, and to get rid of Bert and Ernie, but it didn't work. I think they didn't want to try that one yet again.

The backers of this bill said to me yesterday that taxpayers shouldn't have to fund with their hard-earned money what they don't believe in. Well, that's an interesting theory, but democracies don't operate that way. If they could, my husband and I and two-thirds of the people in America would gladly be excused from paying the \$8 billion a month that we pay for a war which we profoundly do not believe in. We simply must stop this nonsense. It makes us look ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

National Public Radio is something that you could turn off if you don't want to hear it, but for the millions of Americans who depend on it, this just cannot be done. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this rule. I think the American people deserve an opportunity to have their Representatives vote on the funding of NPR.

Now, let's also make sure we keep this in context because really what this is ultimately going to do is talk about the funding of less than 5 percent of NPR. It's not as if this is going to go off the radio right away. I'm not here to debate the content or make some editorial comment about their editorial comment, but we have to deal with the fiscal reality of this country.

Every time we turn around, nobody wants to cut anything. We're going to have to figure out in this country how to do more with less. The reality is we're \$14 trillion in debt. We pay more than \$600 million a day on interest on that debt. We can't be all things to all people. We have to understand the proper role of government.

Every time we make a decision about spending, what we're talking about is, should we go into somebody's pocket, pull money out, and give it to somebody else? And in the case of our Federal Government now, we're also doing that, but we're also borrowing the money. We're borrowing the money.

And so in the case of NPR, which has been wildly successful, as the gentleman properly accounted for, Mr. Speaker—their listenership is rising—which gives a lot of us the belief that, really, they should be moving towards a model where they can sustain themselves through their donations and other funding mechanisms rather than relying upon the taxpayers to fund them, because we don't have any money. We're broke.

And so I'm proud of the fact that early in this Republican control of the House of Representatives that we're going to bring this up for a vote, let the will of this body take its course, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes"

on the rule so we can have that opportunity to vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for the time, and I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, the process in this House is awful. On this bill, H.R. 1076, there were no hearings at all; and to top it off, we had an emergency Rules Committee called last night for consideration, an emergency. Do you think it was about jobs? Do you think it was about health care? No, it was about defunding NPR. That's what this new majority thinks is an emergency, not jobs, not the economy, but de-funding the National Public Radio.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1076 is a horrible idea, and I hope everybody in this Chamber realizes that this bill doesn't cut \$1, not one dime, not one penny from the Federal deficit.

We all know what's going on here. The reason this bill is before us is that a discredited, right-wing activist recently made a selectively edited, misleading, 11-minute video of a 2-hour conversation. The target of his little sting was a fund-raising executive at NPR who no longer works there.

Mrs. BLACKBURN from the Energy and Commerce Committee made it clear in the Rules Committee last night that their justification for this bill is that the American people should not be forced to subsidize content with which they might not agree. Well, that's a lousy way to make decisions, in my view; but if my Republican friends insist on going down this road, Mr. Speaker, then we should be fair and balanced in the way we do it.

Over the past several years, it has become clear that the Fox News channel is widely biased. They continue to employ a talk show host who called President Obama a racist. They continue to employ several prospective Republican Presidential candidates as "analysts," giving them hours and hours of free air time, and their parent company has donated millions and millions of dollars to GOP-linked groups.

Yesterday, I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee to prohibit Federal funds, taxpayer dollars from being used for advertising on the partisan political platform of Fox News. If my friends on the other aisle want to strip funding from NPR because they believe wrongly, in my view, that NPR is biased, then we should be given the same opportunity. Unfortunately, my amendment was defeated on a party-line vote. Again, this is a closed rule. So much for the open process that we were promised.

I also offered an amendment to determine how and where hundreds of millions of dollars are spent on television advertising, not particularly controversial. According to a Rand study,

the Department of Defense alone spent over \$600 million in taxpayer money advertising in 2007, and I believe we should figure out whether that spending is a good use of taxpayer dollars. That amendment was also blocked on a party-line vote. Again, this is a big fat closed rule that we're dealing with here.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was rushed to the House floor again without a single hearing, without a single markup. So much for regular order.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, over the last few days, my office has been flooded with calls from constituents urging me to reject this bill and to continue to support programming on National Public Radio.

My friends talk about the will of the American people. The will of the American people want us to reject what you are doing here today, and that's exactly what I will do today. I urge my colleagues to reject this closed rule and vote "no" on the underlying bill.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Thank you very much.

I was actually not going to speak on this rule until I heard the ranking member of the Rules Committee speak, and she made our point so eloquently I wanted to underscore it. I couldn't believe that she suggested that there was somehow a parity between national defense and NPR. She said, if we're going to come here and talk about de-funding NPR, then why shouldn't she get a shot at denying the Defense Department \$8 billion or whatever it is.

That's the point we're trying to make. We have a huge deficit, \$228 billion in 1 month. In fact, it was the shortest month of the year, which just happened to be the total deficit for, I think, the entire year of 2007. You know, I don't know, I heard people on the other side of the aisle criticizing President Bush for deficits. He's a piker compared to what we're seeing right now in the White House.

But the point is, how do we do anything here on the floor with respect to trying to bring spending under control if, as the gentlelady from New York suggests, we should treat equally the question of national defense and NPR? That's what the American people are rejecting. They're saying to you, why don't you establish priorities the way we establish priorities. And to come to the floor and suggest that somehow NPR is contained in the Constitution, as is the subject of national defense, I think is, frankly, ludicrous.

So I hope the American people are listening. This is a debate on the rule to allow the bill to be brought to the floor. The gentlelady from New York has done a very good job of crystalizing the issue. If you don't believe we

ought to set priorities, if you believe NPR is as important to this Nation as national defense, then reject the rule and reject the bill because the gentlelady is correct. If they're of equal weight, this is unfair because we are talking about NPR. We're not talking about somehow gutting national defense.

But if you believe that somehow national defense has a slightly higher priority in the Constitution and in our constitutional governmental structure than does NPR, then you would reject the gentlelady's suggestion and say we came here to try and change things. We came here to try and somehow balance our books at some point in time in the future, but the way to do that is to establish priorities.

If we, in fact, believe that saving NPR or giving NPR Federal funding is the same as funding our troops, then all is lost, all is lost; but I frankly was surprised to hear the comparison of us debating on money to keep our troops in the war zone versus NPR. That is the best example I have seen on the floor, perhaps the most honest example I've seen on floor, of the difference of the two parties and the difference in, I think, what the American people want us to do and what some in the leadership on the Democratic side want us to do.

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

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am, as many are, going home hopefully this afternoon and will have town halls when I'm home, and maybe I will ask the question at my town halls: Do you believe that funding NPR is of the same importance or moment as funding our troops in the war zone? I believe that I will have an overwhelming response by the people of my district who suggest what we are doing with this rule is to allow us to deal with those kinds of issues, setting priorities that they sent us to Washington to do.

□ 0940

So I again thank the gentleman for his time. I thank the gentlelady for explicating the difference between the two parties' approaches on this and understanding the sense of priorities that either exist or don't exist on this floor.

For me, I will easily say that even though it may be a tough decision, I would vote to take Federal funding away from NPR in order to try to balance our books in the future and do what is necessary to defend this country and those other things that are contained in the Constitution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am going to yield myself 30 seconds to tell my colleague from California to calm himself. He doesn't have to worry. We are not equating war and NPR. What I had said was that the basis of this bill today was that people should not have to pay

for what they don't believe in. If that's going to be the way the majority is going to run this House, then 66 percent of Americans would like to not pay for the war.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for at least 15 million Americans, this is another day without a job, and tomorrow will be another Friday without a paycheck. What are we doing?

After 11 consecutive weeks of this majority producing not a word, not a bill, not one idea about how to create jobs, what we're doing this morning is debating whether or not to defund and get rid of National Public Radio. Now, the excuse that we've heard is that, well, this will save money. A preliminary estimate from the Congressional Budget Office says this will save zero. So what we are doing is spending the time of the country on whether to defund National Public Radio.

Here is what we should do instead: With gasoline prices approaching \$4 a gallon at the pump, why don't we cancel out \$40 billion in giveaways to the oil industry. Why don't we take most of that money and use it to reduce the deficit, and why don't we take some of that money and use it to put Americans back to work, building clean water systems, schools, roads, research facilities, and other things that we need? Why aren't we debating that bill? Now, Members of Congress can say they disagree with that bill. They could amend it. They could vote for it or against it. Why don't we debate that bill instead of whether or not to pull the plug on National Public Radio?

Eleven weeks, not one idea on jobs, not one word of debate on jobs, and abandonment of the issue Americans care most about. I am hopeful that the leader on our side of the Rules Committee will give us a chance to vote on a real bill to create jobs for the American people.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady.

There are really two questions that this bill raises. The first: Is this a way to deal with the serious problem we have in this country, which is the deficit? And the answer is: It isn't.

I salute the Republicans in this Congress for focusing attention on the need to restore fiscal balance. You are right. But the plan you are pursuing to receive it is dead wrong. You cannot, by cutting 12 percent of the budget, the non-defense discretionary budget, achieve the fiscal balance that we need. And why you have a plan where you attack Vermont Public Radio, where you attack Planned Parenthood,

where you attack home heating assistance, but you leave exempt tax expenditures for oil companies, a swollen Pentagon budget, that means that this is not going to succeed. Even if we wiped out the entire non-defense discretionary budget, we would still have a deficit of \$1 trillion. So, serious budget cutters have a serious plan that puts everything on the table.

Secondly, why have a proposal that destroys institutions? Vermont Public Radio is the link between 251 towns, cities, and villages in the State of Vermont. Farmers listen to it in their barns. Parents listen to it on their way to bringing their kids to school. People at work listen to it for the weather reports, and it welds together the political discussion in the State of Vermont which is vibrant, which is varied, which has people with different points of view having a common reference point. Public radio is an institution that allows democracy to thrive.

And why do we have to have a budget plan that, A, by its design, will fail; and, B, by its application and implementation, will destroy institutions that democracy depends on? Vermont Public Radio is an essential institution to all of the people in the State of Vermont: Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. We need to preserve it.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by extending congratulations to my very good friend, the gentleman from Spring Hill, a former sheriff, Mr. NUGENT, for his maiden voyage in managing this rule. He has done a superb job in taking on this issue.

Let me say at the outset, having listened to the debate from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, every single thing that we have been doing on the floor of the House of Representatives is focused on job creation and economic growth. Virtually everything that we have done is focused on job creation and economic growth.

Now, some say, Why is it you are talking about National Public Radio now? What does that have to do with creating jobs? Well, the fact of the matter is, if we don't take on the \$14 trillion national debt that we have in this country and the \$1.6 trillion annual deficits that we have as far as the eye can see, we are not going to be implementing pro-growth economic policies.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle might argue that bringing about some kind of reduction in funding for National Public Radio will cost jobs. The disparity is that my friends on the other side of the aisle tend to focus on government-created jobs, and we want to focus on what it is the American people desperately want and

need, which is long-term, good private sector jobs. And so everything that we do to try to reduce the size and scope and reach of government is focused on getting, as my friend from Vermont has just said, getting our fiscal house in order so that we can create jobs.

Yesterday up in the Rules Committee, my California colleague Ms. ESHOO referred to National Public Radio as a "national treasure." Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a fan of National Public Radio. I think that the term "national treasure" may just be a little bit of a stretch. I have been proud to support three local stations, two in Los Angeles, KPCC and KCRW; here in Washington, D.C., WAMU. I have been proud to participate in pledge drives for all these stations. I have done it for public television. I believe in voluntary contributions.

Now, yesterday Ms. ESHOO said that every American pays 77 cents for the benefit of National Public Radio. And while I am a proud listener of National Public Radio, I will say that I reckon that there are probably half the American people—that's just a wild guess on my part—maybe half the American people who have never even heard of, much less even listened to, National Public Radio. And the notion of taking 77 cents from them for National Public Radio is, to me, anathema to the whole concept of what it is that we are trying to do as a Nation.

Now, my friend from Rochester, the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the former chairman of the Rules Committee, referred to National Public Radio as—and this is not the exact word that was used—but sort of a paragon of virtue. Rather than bloviating on cable television, we have this great, great model of National Public Radio up there, something to which we can all bow and listen to as the one truth before us.

□ 0950

Well, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I've got to say that I've heard some inaccurate things on National Public Radio before, not just things with which I disagree, but there have been inaccuracies. And so, with all of the choices out there, I believe that National Public Radio should be one of them; but they are only one of the choices that people have.

And since National Public Radio and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting came into existence, we all know that we've experienced this explosion of information from all kinds of sources.

So that's why, Mr. Speaker, while this measure doesn't obliterate funding for National Public Radio, what it does is it puts us, as my friend from Spring Hill has said so well, on a glide path towards recognizing that since National Public Radio receives a very small amount of its funding that they utilize totally from the Federal Government, this puts them on a glide path towards something that I believe will dramati-

cally enhance the quality of coverage and the credibility of National Public Radio, and that is to have voluntary support.

And I will say right here that when we are successful, when we are successful at weaning National Public Radio and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting away from compulsory taxpayer dollars used to fund them, I personally will increase my level of contributions, my level of contributions to those local stations and to other aspects.

We need to look at ways in which this shortfall that will exist is addressed, and I believe that we can do that.

And I have to say that, procedurally, it's very interesting to listen to people talk about the characterization of this rule that has come down before us. It's simply because less than 48 hours was provided for the announcement of simply the Rules Committee meeting, not the fact that we're here on the floor. And my distinguished friend from Rochester had, on nearly 70 occasions, when she was chairman of the Rules Committee, including the several scenic river studies that were put into place, and other legislation like that called emergency meetings of the House Rules Committee. And so I think that to characterize this procedure as it's been is not quite as appropriate as it should be.

And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, I wish this could have been handled a little differently. We all know that we passed H.R. 1 as it is, that, in fact, does defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. But this measure, in and of itself, focuses on a problem that is out there. It needs to be addressed. And I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is our office is being flooded by calls from people who are saying, I thought you all were working on creating jobs for the American people, on making sure that working class families can support their families. And, instead, we're de-funding Federal funding of National Public Radio. And that seems like just a terrible distraction to the calls that we're getting.

For many people in the San Diego region, we have KPBS radio, it's an NPR station; and it's a way to connect people to local community issues and world events. Where else can you find that kind of in-depth reporting? I don't think we can point to other stations that do that.

So I'm not up here just to defend NPR, but my colleague said it's not a treasure. Well, to a lot of people that participate, yes, they will continue to fund it with their own dollars. But there is a consistency, there is a continuity, there is an expectation that this is something that is important to

our communities. And it would endanger over 9,000 jobs at local radio stations if this funding goes away.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding, and I'm pleased to serve beside him on the Rules Committee.

And I went to work on the Rules Committee because of my enthusiasm about openness in this process. One of the very first things we learned during freshman orientation was that we have a leadership team that is committed to openness the likes of which this Congress hasn't seen in decades, decades.

I didn't plan to come down and speak this morning, but I'm sitting back in my office, and I'm listening to the characterization of what's happening down here today, and it caused me to think about my 65 days here in Congress so far.

You know, the process was more open and involved more debate on the repeal of health care than it did the implementation of health care. I happen to have brought down the NPR bill today.

Now, I'm here in strong support of the rule that's bringing this bill to the floor, and I hope folks will vote their conscience on the underlying bill. That's what we all came here to do, and I hope that happens.

One, two, three, four, five, six, seven—seven pages here today that we've asked Members to read and digest in 3 days. Seven pages. Now, I wasn't here in the last Congress when thousand-page bills rolled through this body under the same closed process and the same closed length of time.

But I can tell you this: my constituents sent me to read seven pages, and I've read them; and I'll be voting my conscience on the underlying bill. But, folks, we are involved in a process here that we need to be applauding, not condemning. We're involved in a process here that we need to be nurturing, not undercutting.

Have you seen the debate on the floor of the House over the last 2 months? Have you experienced the back-and-forth on the floor of the House in the last 2 months, and do you feel the difference? Because I do. I absolutely do. I don't just feel it; I hear it when I go back home.

We are in the people's House. The chain across the front steps—must be a photo op going on out there this morning. The chain was down. It just felt different walking in this morning because you could just walk up the steps free.

Folks, the chains have come down in this House. The chains have come down in the House, and we're free to engage in this debate, and that's what we're doing. Right here today we're engaged in this debate.

Should we have extensive committee hearings on absolutely everything that comes to the floor? I believe we should. Should we have an open process for absolutely everything that comes to the floor? I think that's a laudable goal.

Do we have constraints that require the rules of the House, because there are 435 of us. It's not like that well-ordered body across the Hall where they only have 100 Members and they get along so well together. We've got 435 folks with lots of passion and lots of opinion, and we need some structure to make that happen.

But this leadership team, with this Congress, both on the left and on the right, has created the most open process with the most extensive amendment process, with the most full debate process that this body has seen in years. And I thank the leadership team for doing that. And I rise in strong support of the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. We need to go back to basic principles here. In 1934, when the Federal Communications Act was passed, people were given broadcast licenses to serve in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. The public owns the airwaves.

In a country that wasn't run by corporations, we wouldn't be having this debate because the public has the inherent right to ownership of the airwaves. Theoretically, it should all be public radio, but it's not. There's just a small segment now of the airwaves we're talking about here. And this bill would stop that from being funded.

It is absolutely unimaginable that Members of Congress are not aware of the history of how broadcast radio and TV came into being. This isn't about private ownership of the airwaves. This is about a basic public right; and if you take that right away, what you've done is totally capitulate to corporations in America.

Protect NPR.

□ 1000

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule, H. Res. 174, and the underlying bill, my legislation, H.R. 1076, to prohibit Federal funding of National Public Radio and the use of Federal funds to acquire radio content. It is time for American citizens to stop funding an organization that can stand on its own feet.

Long before any of the recent news stories on videos or the Juan Williams fiasco, I sponsored legislation in Congress to pull the plug on taxpayer funding for NPR. I enjoy some programs on NPR, but I have long believed that it can stand on its own.

The point at issue is not the quality or content of programming on NPR. The point is not the degree to which Americans support the arts, radio, news, and educational programs. The point today is whether government programs and services that can be funded privately or that are otherwise

available in the private sector should receive taxpayer funding.

Apart from constitutional concerns, as a country we no longer have this luxury anymore. With the national debt over \$13 trillion, the government simply can't continue to fund non-essential services.

Let me add that no one can really argue that these programs will disappear if Americans are no longer forced to subsidize them with Federal tax dollars. NPR can survive on its own.

This bill will accomplish three things:

One, it will prohibit direct funding of NPR. It now receives money from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Department of Education and Commerce, and the NEA, among others.

Two, it prohibits the use of Federal funds provided to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for the payment of dues by local radio stations to NPR.

And, three, it prohibits the use of Federal funds provided through Corporation for Public Broadcasting for acquiring or producing programming.

Now, local stations could use Federal funds from the corporation for their operating expenses, but they would have to produce their content or acquire it with non-Federal funds.

Unemployment is now about 9 percent. When we get Federal spending under control, the economy will be stronger and there will be more jobs. That is why we are doing this.

NPR reports that only 2 percent of its funding comes from the Federal Government; however, that is only half the story. NPR local radio stations directly received congressionally appropriated funds that reached \$64 million in 2010 alone. Plus, local stations directly receive grants from other Federal sources such as the National Endowment for the Arts. NPR stations then use these taxpayer dollars on licensing fees for NPR programming which goes back to the headquarters in Washington. Taking this indirect funding into account, Federal funds now make up, I would say, closer to 20 percent of their annual budget.

But let me be clear. This measure will not prohibit local stations from receiving any funding. It will just not allow them to use taxpayer dollars to pay NPR programming and pay NPR dues. They can do it without Federal dollars by embracing the private sector. I want NPR to grow on its own. I want to see it thrive. Just remove the taxpayer from the equation.

I thank the Rules Committee for this resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and to vote "yes" on the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and her advocacy here.

I just finished listening to my friend from Colorado, and he gets it half

right. First of all, it is ironic that the new Republican majority, having been touted on the floor for its openness, did, in fact, rush this to the floor without the 72-hour notice, not any substantive committee work. If it had been subjected to careful committee analysis, the flaws in the argument would have been revealed.

It is not going to save a single penny of taxpayer dollars, not one, even in the unlikely event that this legislation passed through Congress, which it won't. It won't defund NPR. NPR will exist. And those of us who are in Cleveland or New York or Los Angeles or Washington, D.C., will be able to enjoy it, although it will be diminished a little bit. But what it does is hammer small rural American stations, small town and rural America, where it is more expensive to broadcast and where they rely on this funding to be able to purchase the programs.

It would not just hammer NPR, but it would deny them the ability to use the funds for that subversive show "Prairie Home Companion," for "This American Life," for the car guys. It would prohibit them from purchasing locally produced content from other public broadcasting stations.

This is lunacy. It unravels a carefully crafted partnership that has delivered year after year. It is why the American public strongly supports this investment, less than one-half cent per day per American. In fact, 78 percent of the American public want it maintained or increased. And, most interestingly, that same bipartisan poll showed that two-thirds of American Republicans support keeping the funding or increasing it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. This bill would wipe "Car Talk" off the road. It would wipe "Lake Wobegone" right off the map. It would close down "Marketplace," and tell "Wait Wait . . . Don't Tell Me!" to take a hike.

GOP used to stand for "Grand Old Party." Now it stands for "Gut Our Programs."

This bill prohibits public radio stations from using Federal funds to buy these programs and others produced by National Public Radio or its competitors. As a result, this bill would silence public radio stations across the country, depriving listeners of the news and information they depend on.

Public radio stations can just raise the money from private donors, some say. Not likely. Local public radio stations need signature NPR programs like "Morning Edition" and "All Things Considered" to attract audiences. By drawing listeners to local stations, these programs and others generate strong financial support from the local listening area. Without these

prominent NPR programs, local stations won't be able to attract the audience and sufficient fundraising base to keep running.

Every month, more than 170 million Americans turn to their local public broadcasting stations for free high-quality programs that focus on the issues most important to them. This bill would pull the plug. It would snuff out stations from coast to coast, many in rural areas where the public radio station is the primary source of news and information. This makes no sense. Public radio is widely supported by large majorities of Americans regardless of party affiliation. It is increasingly relied upon while fewer Americans watch broadcast TV and read newspapers.

This bill was rushed to the floor without a single hearing, completely bypassing the committee process. It is unwise, ill-conceived.

I urge a "no" vote.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today to this bill.

Today, Republicans are trying to modify the funding structure of National Public Radio, one of the most widely used, universally supported, and efficient journalistic institutions in the country. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that no one can figure out what my Republican colleagues are trying to accomplish and what they are trying to do with this trivial and misguided legislation. Why are we wasting our time on this? Instead of creating jobs, instead of cutting spending, here we are changing the funding structure for something that fundamentally works.

Mr. Speaker, America is \$14.2 trillion in debt. Yet instead of working with Democrats to come to an agreement on reducing our expenditures and getting the economy going, Republicans have decided to use their taxpayer-funded time on symbolic legislation that doesn't address America's fiscal situation, doesn't save money, and, most importantly, won't create a single job.

Mr. Speaker, this is very transparent what is happening here. This bill is a response to a far right agenda based on a manipulative "got you" video propagated by conservative activists.

□ 1010

Don't the American people know where this Republican policy agenda comes from? I believe they do.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a distraction, not a serious piece of legislation. The Republican Caucus can't get themselves to agree on anything substantial, so instead they're bringing this frivolous measure that doesn't save any money or create jobs before us.

I urge a "no" vote.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Happy St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, today we debate the rule on whether or not to fund National Public Radio. This is an ideologically driven attempt at defunding a revered American institution, and the reason is because you don't like its content. You can't stand balanced, objective news. So let's defund it.

Regardless of whether one supports NPR or not—and I do—we can all be clear this bill does not do one thing: It does not create jobs. We have been here for 11 weeks, Mr. Speaker, and the Republican majority has yet to bring a single jobs bill to the floor of the House. That's why I introduced the Build America Bonds Now to Create Jobs Act, legislation to extend the successful Build America Bonds program—a jobs bill. Creating jobs grows the economy, encourages American innovation and positions us to remain the global economic leader. During the last 2 years, \$4.4 billion from the Recovery Act leveraged \$181 billion to construct and repair schools, bridges and roads in more than 2,270 projects in every State in the Union.

According to Moody's Analytics chief economist and Senator McCain's 2008 Presidential adviser, infrastructure investments in the Recovery Act resulted in 8 million additional or preserved jobs between 2009 and 2010. By extending the Build America Bonds program, we can do even more.

I ask my colleagues, turn away from this ideologically driven debate on National Public Radio and let's get down to basics. Let's pass a jobs bill. Let's defeat this rule and give ourselves an opportunity to address the underlying issue of the American economy.

I thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Good morning to the "fend for yourself" bill. That's the message of my friends on the other side of the aisle—with short-term CRs, \$61 billion in reckless and ludicrous cuts that don't make sense on 20 percent of the budget which is discretionary funding.

But NPR. This morning, I listened to NPR, as I usually do, and someone who designates themselves as a Republican called in and said, "I'm through. I'm a registered Republican, but I'm leaning Democrat. I've been listening to NPR for most of my life."

Biased? No. Unbiased. NPR is a voice of reason. Federal funding frivolous? No. Federal funding allows the objectivity. And no one can account for the fact that we believe in the First Amendment, but yet we want to defund NPR.

NPR, National Public Radio, speaks the truth on all of our cases. It provides the American people far and wide an opportunity to hear a fair and balanced presentation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much.

The resolution speaks nothing of fact why do you desire to cut NPR. Why do you want to put the burden of a budget or a CR on the NPR? The real issue is that no matter how much they keep doing, no one on the other side wants to address the cause of the issue of the deficit or the debt, that we have to balance, we have to bring in a number of issues that we have to address.

We can't scapegoat. I refuse to scapegoat the National Public Radio, a reasoned and responsible voice for the people, no matter who you are. It is a ridiculous legislation. In my District, KPFT and KTSU are great public communicators for many of the poor in my district—don't shut them down! I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 7 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. My inquiry is to the gentlewoman from New York, do you have any more speakers?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I do not. May I inquire if you have more?

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am prepared to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

We have had a vigorous debate here this morning, just as we had in the Rules Committee. A lot was said, I guess, because it needed to be said. A lot was said, I think, that we could argue with.

One is that we are doing this because it puts us on the road to deficit reduction. It is clear to everybody who reads, or maybe who listens to good programming, that this bill has no effect whatsoever on the deficit and saves no money. Not a dime. This is purely an ideological bill so that our Members can go home and brag about what they have done to public radio.

I want to talk a moment about what's in a New York Times editorial this morning. This bill is, says the Times, "The latest example of House Republicans pursuing a longstanding ideological goal in the false name of fiscal prudence."

The Times says, "This is not a serious bill. It will never survive the Senate or a Presidential veto."

And further, "Cutting off that flow would have no effect on the deficit, but it would allow certain House Members to pretend for the folks back home that they struck a blow for liberty."

I really don't understand this. I know that the present chair of the Rules Committee this morning said that all the legislation that we have done this

term has been on job creation. I don't believe there's enough evidence to convict on that, Mr. Speaker.

This, again, will cause jobs to be lost and does nothing for the deficit. I don't care what you want to say about it and how you want to dress it up, those are the absolute facts.

In a few moments, I will be calling for a vote on the previous question. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat that previous question, I want to do a real jobs bill here. I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts the rule, it will bring up H.R. 11, the Build America Bonds To Create Jobs Now Act.

This bill will spur job creation here at home by extending through 2012 the successful Build America Bonds program to help State and local governments finance the rebuilding of American schools, hospitals, water systems and transit projects at significantly lower costs. It has been calculated that every \$1 billion in Federal funds will create 34,800 jobs and \$6.2 billion in economic activity. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, weigh that against taking the little bit of money away from National Public Radio.

Build America Bonds are broadly supported by American business, the construction industry, and State and local governments. At a time of fiscal restraint, they are a good deal for the American taxpayer, wisely using small public investments to leverage significant private funds to rebuild America and create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so that we can debate and pass jobs legislation today, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring to your attention that the public watching this today on C-SPAN does not receive a single Federal dollar in regards to the operation of C-SPAN.

We're not closing down local radio stations. We're actually giving them the ability to liberate themselves from Federal dollars.

My good friends on the other side of the aisle continue to refuse to prioritize about what's important for America. They continue on a path of just spend, because all programs are inherently good.

While you've heard a lot of us like NPR in regard to certain programming, there's others that we do not. Mr. Speaker, I was reminded the other day of a quote by Thomas Jefferson:

"To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical."

With that in mind, I can't in good conscience support continuing to fund NPR with tax dollars.

□ 1020

A large number of Americans fundamentally disagree with the content and mission of NPR. Moreover, this is a program that can be privately funded. NPR's own officials said they don't need Federal dollars to continue.

We are not trying to harm NPR. We are actually trying to liberate them from Federal tax dollars. We need to get back to the core mission of the Federal Government. As much as any of us here, including myself, may enjoy programs like "Car Talk" and "Wait, Wait, Don't Tell Me," you can't tell me that that is a core mission of the Federal Government. Our good friends in the same sentence talked about war, national defense, and NPR. They don't equate. The Constitution is clear about our requirement to protect the American people.

H.R. 1076 is a return to the normal procedure of the House. Authorizing committees provide us with bills that set out the priorities for the House and the Appropriations Committee funds based on authorizations.

With H.R. 1076, we let the Appropriations Committee know that National Public Radio doesn't need Federal tax dollars anymore. Local stations can create their own programs. They can reorganize their financing so that grant money they might use for membership and programming fees can go elsewhere, and they can do private fund-raising they need for the dues and programming from NPR.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 174 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 11) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Build America Bonds program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole

arises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 179, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—233

Adams	Emerson	King (IA)
Aderholt	Farenthold	King (NY)
Akin	Fincher	Kingston
Alexander	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Amash	Flake	Kline
Austria	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Bachmann	Fleming	Lance
Bachus	Flores	Landry
Barletta	Forbes	Lankford
Bartlett	Fortenberry	Latham
Barton (TX)	Fox	LaTourrette
Bass (NH)	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Benish	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Berg	Galleghy	LoBiondo
Biggart	Gardner	Long
Billbray	Garrett	Lucas
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Black	Gibbs	Lummis
Bonner	Gibson	Lungren, Daniel
Bono Mack	Gingrey (GA)	E.
Boustany	Gohmert	Mack
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Brooks	Gosar	Marchant
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	Marino
Buchanan	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Buerkle	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Burgess	Griffin (AR)	McCotter
Burton (IN)	Griffith (VA)	McHenry
Calvert	Grimm	McKeon
Camp	Guinta	McKinley
Campbell	Guthrie	McMorris
Canseco	Hall	Rodgers
Cantor	Hanna	Meehan
Capito	Harper	Mica
Cassidy	Harris	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Chaffetz	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Coble	Hayworth	Mulvaney
Coffman (CO)	Heck	Murphy (PA)
Cole	Heller	Myrick
Conaway	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Cravaack	Herger	Noem
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	Nugent
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Nunes
Davis (KY)	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Denham	Hultgren	Olson
Dent	Hunter	Palazzo
DesJarlais	Hurt	Paul
Diaz-Balart	Issa	Paulsen
Dold	Jenkins	Pearce
Dreier	Johnson (IL)	Pence
Duffy	Johnson (OH)	Petri
Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Duncan (TN)	Jones	Platts
Ellmers	Kelly	Poe (TX)

Pompeo	Ryan (WI)
Posey	Scalise
Price (GA)	Schilling
Quayle	Schmidt
Reed	Schock
Rehberg	Schweikert
Reichert	Scott (SC)
Renacci	Scott, Austin
Ribble	Sensenbrenner
Rigell	Sessions
Rivera	Shimkus
Roby	Shuler
Roe (TN)	Shuster
Rogers (AL)	Simpson
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)
Rokita	Southerland
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns
Roskam	Stivers
Ross (FL)	Stutzman
Royce	Sullivan
Runyan	Terry

NAYS—179

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

NOT VOTING—20

Bilirakis	Engel	Nadler
Blackburn	Garamendi	Payne
Carney	Giffords	Rooney
Carter	Hinojosa	Stark
Clarke (NY)	Jordan	Wasserman
Cohen	Labrador	Schultz
Culberson	Maloney	Young (AK)

□ 1046

Ms. ESHOO and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. AKIN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

Stated against:

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 189, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of this bill because it violates rule XXI, clause 11, which requires a 72-hour layover of the bill and for it to be electronically noticed in order for it to be considered by this House. This bill did not lay over for 72 hours. It was noticed at 1:42 p.m. on Tuesday; therefore, it has to wait until 1:42 on Friday to be in compliance with the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order against consideration of H.R. 1076 is not timely until such time as the bill is called up.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRES

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, we are about to consider the rule. Members, if they are to vote on and understand it, need to know that they are waiving the rule. This is the statement of the Speaker of the House: "I will not bring a bill to the floor that hasn't been posted online for at least 72 hours."

Would the Speaker please clarify for the body that the 72-hour rule is either being waived or does not exist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The period of time on which the rule is predicated is not a number of hours but, rather, a number of days, specifically calendar days other than weekends or holidays when the House is not in session. For the sake of brevity, the Chair will call these "working days."

Under clause 11 of rule XXI, an unreported measure may not be considered until the third working day on which it has been available to Members.

For example, a measure that was publicly available in electronic form in consonance with clause 3 of rule XXIX as of Tuesday, March 15, 2011, would qualify on or after Thursday, March 17, 2011.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WEINER. For the clarity of the House, did this bill age for 72 hours, "yes" or "no"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not enter findings on questions not actually presented..

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 181, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

AYES—236

Adams	Gardner	McMorris
Aderholt	Garrett	Rodgers
Akin	Gerlach	Meehan
Alexander	Gibbs	Mica
Amash	Gibson	Miller (FL)
Austria	Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)
Bachmann	Gohmert	Miller, Gary
Bachus	Goodlatte	Mulvaney
Barletta	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Bartlett	Gowdy	Myrick
Barton (TX)	Granger	Neugebauer
Bass (NH)	Graves (GA)	Noem
Benishek	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Berg	Griffin (AR)	Nunes
Biggert	Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee
Bilbray	Grimm	Olson
Bilirakis	Guinta	Palazzo
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Paul
Black	Hall	Paulsen
Blackburn	Hanna	Pearce
Bonner	Harper	Pence
Bono Mack	Harris	Petri
Boustany	Hartzler	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Brooks	Hayworth	Poe (TX)
Broun (GA)	Heck	Pompeo
Buchanan	Heller	Posey
Bucshon	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Buerkle	Herger	Quayle
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Burton (IN)	Huelskamp	Rehberg
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Camp	Hultgren	Renacci
Campbell	Hunter	Ribble
Canseco	Hurt	Rigell
Cantor	Issa	Rivera
Capito	Jenkins	Roby
Carter	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)
Cassidy	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Jones	Rogers (MI)
Coble	Kelly	Rohrabacher
Coffman (CO)	King (IA)	Rokita
Cole	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Conaway	Kingston	Roskam
Cravaack	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (FL)
Crawford	Kline	Royce
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Runyan
Culberson	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Davis (KY)	Landry	Scalise
Denham	Lankford	Schilling
Dent	Latham	Schmidt
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	Shuler
Ellmers	Lummis	Shuster
Emerson	Lungren, Daniel E.	Simpson
Farenthold	Mack	Smith (NE)
Fincher	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Flake	Marino	Southerland
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns
Fleming	McCaul	Stivers
Flores	McClintock	Stutzman
Forbes	McCotter	Sullivan
Fortenberry	McHenry	Terry
Fox	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Thornberry
Frelinghuysen		Tiberi
Galeggly		Tipton

Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster

West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

NOES—181

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Ribble
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)

Fudge
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

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

NOT VOTING—15

Clarke (NY)
Cohen
Engel
Garamendi
Giffords
Gutierrez

Hinojosa
Jordan
Labrador
Maloney
Nadler
Rooney

Schock
Wasserman
Schultz
Young (AK)

□ 1057

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.

AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of March 16, 2011, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces

from Afghanistan, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 16, 2011, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 28

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM AFGHANISTAN.

Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress directs the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan—

(1) by no later than the end of the period of 30 days beginning on the day on which this concurrent resolution is adopted; or

(2) if the President determines that it is not safe to remove the United States Armed Forces before the end of that period, by no later than December 31, 2011, or such earlier date as the President determines that the Armed Forces can safely be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 2 hours, with 1 hour controlled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) or his designee and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) be allowed to control half of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) will control half the time allocated to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

□ 1100

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, as it would undermine the efforts of our military and our international partners in Afghanistan and would gravely harm our Nation's security.

Insanity has been described as doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. Three thousand people died on September 11 because we walked away once from Afghanistan, thinking that it didn't matter who controlled that country. We were wrong then. Let us not make the same mistake twice. Completing our mission in Afghanistan is essential to keeping our homeland safe.

As Under Secretary of Defense Michele Flournoy stated in testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee earlier this week, "The threat to our national security and the security of our friends and allies that emanates from the borderland of Afghanistan and Pakistan is not hypothetical.