

wake up from the malaise of this debate about the deficit and raising the debt ceiling. You have lost your way. Let me just ask you to raise your voices against the issue of a broken government and the potential of a shutdown on the question of, what do you want for your children.

As we go back to our districts and our school districts and our States, parents are standing in lines at school board meetings crying about 60-seat classrooms and teachers being laid off. Don't you understand that it starts right here in Washington? You need to be speaking to our friends on the other side of the aisle. It is time to invest and grow the economy. It is time to recognize that consumer spending has increased, that jobs have been created, and that it is important to invest in this economy.

If you don't get in the way and get in the mix, I can tell you that the rise that we have of 192,000 jobs being created, the unemployment going down, economists saying we should invest now, you are going to lose it, tied up with those who have views that are only self-centered, our friends that are in the tea party. It is time for people to put education first and realize that if you let us fall on the spear here in Washington on the grounds of mislabeled politics and not worry about your children, you are going to lose.

Wake up, America. It is time to get in the fight. Fight for your children. Invest and grow the economy now.

CONTINUE FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

(Ms. HIRONO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HIRONO. Last week, when most of us were in our respective districts, representatives from community health centers around the country came to Capitol Hill to remind us of the essential role they play in our communities. I hope that the staff of Members who voted for H.R. 1, which drastically cuts funding for these very health centers, listen to the stories they heard last week.

I have long supported community health centers because in my district, spread over seven inhabited islands, access to care is a challenge. Although their principal focus has been to provide health care for the underserved, these centers serve people at all income levels.

Hawaii's network of community health centers serve nearly 127,000 patients, and only one-third of them are Medicaid eligible. On the island of Lanai, 40 percent of the residents receive care through their community health center. This population, 25 percent of which are over 65 years of age, can't afford to fly to another island for care.

Funding for community health centers is an investment because prevention is more cost effective than treat-

ment. I urge my colleagues to reject cuts to community health centers.

□ 1220

WAKE-UP CALLS; ARE WE LISTENING?

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, wake-up calls; are we listening? Yes, there are wake-up calls. Can we hear them?

This majority in the House has not heeded a wake-up call. They have ignored the investments that we need in the clean energy economy to grow jobs.

What are those wake-up calls? Well, there is, first, the hard-earned American energy consumer dollars, \$400 billion plus, that go to unfriendly nations that will take those dollars and invest in fighting the American troops while they supply us fossil-based fuels. Then there is the oil spill in the gulf that reeked damage on our ecosystem and wrecked the regional economy. Then there was the sticker shock at the pump, at the gas pump, that is driving down the American economy. And no one is listening.

Now maybe we will pay attention to the sad announcement today. Last year, we dropped to number three in clean energy investment after China and Germany. When will we wake up?

I say today, as the President talks to us about energy security in our economy, that we need to reduce oil imports and innovate into a clean energy future. We need to heed that clarion call. It is a wake-up call that's necessary.

The America I know and love is number one. It should never be three on the list of clean energy investment.

WASHINGTON DOESN'T UNDER- STAND CALIFORNIA'S WATER PROBLEMS

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, California's Governor will soon declare an end to the drought that devastated the San Joaquin Valley. Our cities are flooding and our rivers are raging and the snowpack in the Sierras is deeper than it has been in any 15-year period. It is clear that the drought is over. Somehow, though, Washington has not gotten the news.

With unemployment still in double digits in seven counties in the valley and unemployment continuing to be very problematic, the folks in Washington think that communities can recover from the Great Recession with just over half the water our farmers need. They don't understand the valley. They don't understand us.

Do you hear me, Commerce Department? Do you hear me, Secretary

Locke? Water is the lifeblood of the San Joaquin Valley. It puts food on our table. It sustains our economy, and it creates good jobs. That is why I am introducing legislation that will allow the needed flexibility for California's water policy.

As we work to find short-term and long-term solutions to California's broken water system, passing common-sense legislation will bring over half a million acre-feet of water to valley farmers and farm communities. It is time to put aside our political differences. It is time to reach a compromise, and it is time to end this regulatory drought.

FISCAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH SAFETY AND SANITY PREVAILING

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, a few hours ago, fiscal and public health safety and sanity prevailed when the Food and Drug Administration clarified an order on February 3 approving the drug Makena, which is an injectable medication for women at risk of preterm birth, one of the biggest health care challenges that our country faces. There are a half million premature births in this country. They cost the health care system \$29 billion. They are the leading cause of infant mortality.

This new medication which the FDA approved on February 3 is promising, but it costs \$1,500 per injection, \$30,000 per pregnancy. At the same time, OB-GYNs in this country have been prescribing a compound alternative that costs only \$20 per treatment per medication. And yet the order on February 3 indicated that there would only be exclusive treatments under the \$1,500 medication.

The order this morning clarifies that there will be no exclusivity, that OB-GYNs will continue to be able to prescribe the cheaper alternative, but FDA retains its power to still require exclusivity.

For the sake of taxpayers and patients, Congress must keep a close eye on the FDA to not take away this option to OB-GYNs all across America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 471, SCHOLARSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND RESULTS ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 186 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 186

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 471) to reauthorize the DC opportunity scholarship program,

and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, 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 Oversight and Government Reform; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Delegate Norton of the District of Columbia or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS). During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 471, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, sometimes called the SOAR Act, with 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Further, this proposed rule will make in order all of the amendments filed at the Rules Committee for H.R. 471. Admittedly, it was only one amendment, but it is made in order, and it is offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON). This is an amendment that was presented in the committee and defeated on a 12-21 vote, but which will be reoffered here today as a substitute measure. In short, this rule is about as fair as they potentially get.

Madam Speaker, this is a very open, straightforward rule that we will be considering today, and I am pleased to stand before the House in support of this rule as well as the underlying legislation, H.R. 471. I commend the sponsor of this legislation, the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), who

has previously served as chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, and he understands education issues very, very well.

Madam Speaker, when the Cubs in the 1960s hired Leo Durocher to be their manager, he was hired 2 years after they finished the season 49 games out of first place. In his short period of time there, he would take them to the top, in which case, in 1969, a year that still hurts, the Cubs were atop the National League for 155 days. Unfortunately, 7 of those days they were not on top included the last day of the season.

□ 1230

But Durocher always said for his team that "I make a great effort to argue for the issues, but there are two things that are working against me: the umpires and the rules."

There will be a lot of people—some people—who will speak against this motion, perhaps even this rule, and there are two things against them: One is the unique constitutional relationship between Congress and the District of Columbia that is not there, vis-a-vis the States; and, number two, the underprivileged kids who benefit from this underlying bill.

If I were to predict a preview of what will be taking place in the debate, not only on the rule but also on the bill itself, I would predict four themes will be appearing time after time after time.

One will be the concept of the constitutional mandate that is here. When this Republic was established, the Constitution gave unique jurisdictional responsibility to Congress over the District of Columbia. That is not going to be a violation of their home rule concept, but it is a responsibility of Congress. And there is great precedent for this particular kind of provision.

In 1996, it is Congress that insisted upon a charter school program in the District of Columbia. You will hear from both sides of the aisle recognition of the great value that that program has, and justifiably so. There is a waiting list in the District of Columbia for those charter schools. This underlying bill increases the percentage of funding going to charter schools in the District.

In 2003, an Opportunity Scholarship was instituted, at the insistence of Congress. Again, there was a waiting list of people wanting the opportunity; disadvantaged kids who wanted the opportunity that this scholarship afforded them. In the appropriation bill for 2010, unfortunately, Congress intervened again in a negative way and cut out this Opportunity Scholarship program. There were a lot of upset students and parents who couldn't believe how special interest politics got in the way of their son's or daughter's dreams and was snatched from their very hands. Their opportunity to make what they believe were better educational choices was basically taken away from them.

H.R. 471 remedies this inequity. There were 216 kids at the time scheduled to enter the program who were not allowed because of the action of that particular appropriation bill. Those 216 kids, by this particular legislation, will be given priority in once again being able to apply for this Opportunity Scholarship.

A second discussion point that will be coming up repeatedly deals with the efficacy of these programs. There will be conflicting data that will be thrown from both sides as to the effectiveness. But I think the one piece of information that can be clearly stated is that 91 percent of the kids enrolled in this Opportunity Scholarship complete their coursework. That is 21 percent higher than a control group of kids who were interested but were not allowed the opportunity to complete this particular program. That completion rate is almost 32 percent higher than the regular completion rate of kids in the public education system in Washington, D.C.

To quote Dr. Patrick Wolf, who was the lead investigator of the evaluation mandated by Congress of this program, he concluded by stating: "The research evidence and the testimonials of parents confirm that the District of Columbia is a better place because of the Opportunity Scholarship program."

The third issue that you will be hearing deals with the support of this particular program. There will be dueling statistics that will be coming at you during the course of the debate. Those in favor of the bill will give lists of groups who are in favor of this particular program. Those against the bill will give lists of groups and unions who are opposed to it. Each side will give a list of political leaders both within Washington, D.C., and outside who are in favor; and those opposed will give lists of political leaders who do not support this program.

There will be poll results that will be given from both sides, the most recent of which will be given by advocates, a Lester & Associates poll, which simply says 74 percent of the D.C. residents polled supported this program and wanted it restored and made available to all D.C. students for all their abilities to participate. You will hear polling data to the contrary. You will hear anecdotal stories to the contrary.

Perhaps the most telling, though, issue of support deals with parents and the kids in Washington, D.C., who lined up for this program; who went on waiting lists for the opportunity to become involved in this program; who cried and pled with Congresses past when this program was eliminated. They clearly do not want this program to totally be destroyed because it takes away from them their chance, their option, their opportunity to individualize and upgrade their educational opportunities.

This program probably has a philosophical basis, a kinship, if you would, with the Pell Grant, the GI Bill of

Rights, in which, once again, government tried to empower with choices with few strings attached individual adult students or parents so they could choose their own personal education future. That's what this bill still tries to do.

The final concept that will probably be presented during debate on the rule as well as the bill deals with the concept of liberty. We have a Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. The Revolutionary War was supposedly fought for the purpose of preserving personal liberty.

I have to admit, though, as I was teaching school that it was difficult for my kids there to really comprehend what liberty meant. It was an abstract noun, to say the least. The Founders clearly understood what that concept meant as they looked upon a government that was far, far away from them. And in the Declaration of Independence we're willing to write that the government far away has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eke out their stance. Indeed, they had waged war against them. Those of us who live in the West today have the Department of the Interior to remind us of those same circumstances.

But the kids, mainly in urban and rural settings and suburban settings, still have a problem understanding what it means really to have liberty until you try and talk about liberty in terms of choices. Options, opportunity, without the heavy hand of a government official defining what those options and opportunities may or may not be.

The entrepreneurial world gets it. They realize if they want a market share, they have to give people choices in their lives. So if I want a mobile phone, there are all sorts of plans from which I may choose. Even in the smallest corner market in Washington there are still a whole row of breakfast cereals from which I may choose. I may want Pringles potato chips, but they still give me 16 varieties. If indeed Omaha Steaks sends me an invitation every week to try and come up with one of their products, I will choose this week to order one that fits for me.

Only in Washington in this government do you still have people that truly believe in a one-size-fits-all approach and that mandates can actually be worked, that believe and go back to the concepts of Henry Ford when the automobile was so unique he could with a straight face look at a consumer and say, You can have a car in any color you want as long as it is black.

Unfortunately, many of the ideas and philosophies still in government today, indeed some of the programs still in government today, were born in that era in which the idea of an elite sitting in some darkened office would decide what I wanted and what was indeed best for me. That's liberty.

The icons who face us in this Chamber, all of them were related in some

way of moving the concept of law forward, which led to the concept of liberty. This bill is based on that concept of choice, opportunity, and options for people. It deserves our support because it is an opportunity. Call it an education app for Americans living in the District of Columbia. The most needy and deserving can actually have their choice of how they want their education to take place and it is done under the sphere of responsibility given to Congress by the Constitution.

This bill is worthy of our heritage. It is a symbol of our legacy. One can only assume that the Founders, indeed the icons that are looking down from the perch above us, are smiling now, saying, Congress doesn't always do it correctly, but this time with this bill they got it right.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased today to rise in strong opposition to H.R. 471, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, also known as the SOAR Act. I also am very pleased that my friend from Utah has, in the tradition of this committee, granted the time to our side. This legislation revives the District of Columbia's school voucher program, a program that was allowed to expire after 5 years of failing to improve student achievement.

My colleague said that there will be statistics on both sides. Doubtless that is true. I also have great respect that the presenter of the rule today is a school teacher. At least if somebody is going to meddle in somebody else's business, they ought to at least know a little bit about what they're talking about. Too many times in our States, too many times in this place, many of us who are not educators, nor have we been involved, are making decisions about the education of children when we should be being a lot more careful.

□ 1240

For example, I'm sure that my colleague, who knows his State well, as I know mine and as we know ours—all of us in this institution—is mindful that in the last 41 years voters have rejected private school vouchers every time they have been proposed—interestingly enough, two times in Utah, I would urge my good friend. As late as 2007, Utah voted 62 percent to 38 percent not to have vouchers. Before that, it was sort of like the District of Columbia. Incidentally, in 1981, 89 percent of the people in a referendum in the District of Columbia voted against vouchers—but in 1988, in Utah, 67 percent. It didn't change very much from that time to 2007, which isn't very much time from now.

So how dare we come here to tell these people that we are going to thrust upon them something they don't want without a single bit of consultation with a single member of the public officials in this community being consulted. I might ask why we are here de-

bating such a misguided, narrowly focused measure when violence is raging in the Middle East, when earthquakes and tsunamis have ravaged Japan, and when our own Nation's economy is kind of sputtering along. I suppose, when it is one of the leadership of the Republican Party's pet issues, the people's work can always be put on hold. This matter is nothing more than a shallow attempt to, once again, appease the right-wing of the Republican Party.

Well, Madam Speaker, Congress' oversight of the District is not an excuse for political pandering to the Republicans' special interest of the day du jour. My colleague used Leo Durocher. He played with and against Yogi Berra. Yogi Berra reminds me, if I were to use an analogy, that this is *deja vu* all over again.

He and Leo would be proud that we are talking about them, Mr. BISHOP.

Whether it is gun rights, a woman's right to choose or education policy, the District is not and should not be the dumping grounds for Republicans' ideological whims. My colleagues have already stripped the District of its limited vote in Congress. The least they could do is allow them to control their education system just as every other jurisdiction in this country is able to do.

The people of the District of Columbia did not ask for or want this program, nor were they or their elected officials consulted, as I have pointed out. If they had been, I'm sure the committee would have been told what many of us already know: that this program is simply a waste of money. According to legislatively mandated evaluations, the D.C. voucher program failed to show any statistically significant impact on student achievement. This is in contrast to reading and math scores across the District, which did improve over the same period. Though my colleagues claim that this program serves students who would otherwise be stuck in failing schools without the resources to adequately meet their needs, only about a quarter of the students using vouchers came from schools in need of improvement.

Additionally, the Department of Education found that students participating in the D.C. voucher program were significantly less likely to attend a school with ESL programs, learning support and special needs programs, tutors, and counselors.

Further, private schools are not required to hold the same level of transparency or accountability as public schools. Rather than directing these funds toward improving all of the District's public and charter schools, as Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON has proposed, this program only serves 1.3 percent of the 70,000 students enrolled in the D.C. public schools.

Though my colleagues may claim to have a newfound commitment to education—my friend from the Rules Committee being an exception—albeit for

only a few select students they have found this commitment. Let's not forget that, just a few weeks ago, some in this body and most in the Republican Party were content to cut—and my friend just used the kinship of Pell Grants with this proposal—Federal funding for 9.4 million students, to eliminate over 200,000 Head Start placements, to do away with supplementary education services for 957,000 underprivileged students, and to reduce or get rid of, they said, after-school programs for 139,000 students across this Nation.

I was just with the CEO of the Urban League's Broward and Palm Beach Counties—my constituency—and they were talking about how drastic this is going to affect the constituency in that area of underprivileged students and who they are seeing and what the juvenile justice system is now reaping from this ill harvest that we have thrust upon these people.

On the one hand, the Republicans go on about the need for fiscal discipline. They refuse to negotiate on legislation to keep the government operating, and they propose billions of dollars in cuts to our Nation's students. Yet they are perfectly willing to throw millions of dollars at a program that has proven year after year to be unpopular, inefficient, and downright ineffective.

If my colleagues truly wanted to improve the District's schools, along with the schools across the Nation, they would be bringing forth a serious measure to reform the No Child Left Behind provision. But no. Instead, we are debating a measure that has no hope of becoming law. It is simply to appease the political whims of a few in the Republican Party. The American people, in my view, are tired of the majority's using this institution to do nothing but spew ideological rhetoric.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule it will bring up H.R. 639, the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, and I am mindful that there will be speakers regarding the same. The amendment will provide our government the tools to rein in unfair currency policies by the Chinese.

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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am going to at this time reserve any further comments that I have after the following statement:

It has been 13 weeks and still no jobs bill and no substantive plan to improve our Nation's economy. When my friends in the majority are ready to get down to the serious business of improving the lives of all American people, we will be waiting.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of being here, and I also appreciate being here with my good friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who is one of the true delights with whom I have such an opportunity to work here in Washington.

I guess, if he is saying that we have the group du jour from whom we are presenting bills, today's group du jour would be those who are financially disadvantaged and still want a better opportunity for education.

As I said, there would be four issues that would be discussed. We can check off three of the four already. Only the concept of "liberty" has yet to be addressed here. Some of them may be non sequiturs, but they were still there nonetheless. I guess the last statistic that still can be put out there as to whether this program works or not deals with the parents who, when the free market of ideas was opened up to them, they chose this program. They wanted this program. They wanted to maintain this program, and they will flock back to it.

Since my good friend Mr. HASTINGS also used a baseball reference to tie me, I have to one-up him one more time. In the words of the great Satchel Paige, who was consulting a struggling pitcher who was failing to get it over on the corners, he just said, Throw the pitch. Just throw strikes. Home plate don't move.

This program is one of those strikes. All we need to do is throw it. Home plate don't move.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Before yielding, I'll one-up the one-upper: Satchel Paige also said, Don't look back.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished friend and colleague from the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

□ 1250

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

This bill, the SOAR Act, reestablishes a program to send D.C. students to private elementary and secondary schools. The main issue that I struggle with, that this body needs to struggle with, with regard to this measure is the justification for pushing Federal will onto Washington, D.C., which is counter to local control over education, a concept that has broad bipartisan support.

One of my top priorities in this body is to improve our education system—ensure that every child has an effective teacher in a classroom, improve accountability for all schools, and provide a pathway to college and careers for lifelong success. To be clear, the overall state of the schools in Washington, D.C., is a disgrace. A recent Education Week study showed a 48.8 percent on-time graduation rate. Frankly, we as Americans should be

ashamed. We need to do better, the Americans who live here in Washington, D.C.

Yet it's absurd, Madam Speaker, that we as elected officials from 50 States are executing a right to determine how schools are funded in a jurisdiction that doesn't even have a vote in this body. I'm a Representative of part of one State, Colorado, and yet here I am in a position to make school funding decisions on behalf of Washington, D.C., students. We wouldn't do this to Colorado, Ohio, or any other State.

A district near mine in the State of Colorado, Douglas County School District, recently enacted a district-wide voucher program. The residents of D.C. are no less American than the residents of Douglas County, and yet in Douglas County, Colorado, there will be candidates that run for school board for the program, candidates that run for school board against the program, and the future of whether or not vouchers can continue in Douglas County, Colorado, will be decided where it should be, by the residents of Douglas County, Colorado.

This vote underscores the need for Washington, D.C., to control its own public school system as the State does. In fact, Madam Speaker, I think Washington should be a State. Until that day, Congress should respect the wishes of D.C. elected officials with regard to the administration of their education system.

I would point out that there is a Federal interest with regard to what the States do and what Washington, D.C., does with regard to education. States and the District of Columbia should have the discretion to make the changes they need to improve education but not the discretion to stand back and do nothing. In fact, I worry considerably about a recent announcement by Mayor Gray that they would fund capital for charter schools at only \$2,800 per pupil as opposed to the \$5,800 that the conventional public schools get.

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

Mr. POLIS. I would ask for an additional 45 seconds, Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 45 seconds.

Mr. POLIS. If the elected officials and people of Washington, D.C., wanted a system of school vouchers, they would have created it and not relied on the Federal Government.

The important moral imperative of education reform can occur with or without vouchers, and at this point in time, I think it's critical to give education reformers that are hard at work in the District of Columbia a chance to succeed on a route that they have laid out, which apparently does not include vouchers at this time.

I will continue to push for D.C. statehood and for a Federal role that encourages transparency and accountability, improves and builds upon our

successes in public education, and makes sure that we change what doesn't work, with the tools and discretion at the local level to make those tough decisions.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Again, Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to be here and also be joined my good friend from Colorado, whom I should probably publicly apologize to for saying disparaging things last night. I screwed up and I apologize for that.

However, he presents to us an unusual conundrum that is here on who gets to decide what will or will not be allowed. Whatever we do in this unique situation, the decision will be made. If we pass the underlying bill, we empower parents in Washington, D.C., to make a choice. If we don't pass the underlying bill, we prohibit parents in Washington, D.C., from making that kind of choice. Once again, when they were allowed to make that choice, they had a waiting list for those wishing to participate. It's a conundrum whatever we do, yes or no. It makes a decision on behalf of the people of Washington, D.C.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, would you be so kind as to inform us as to the remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 16¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Utah has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, my good friend, Ms. HOLMES NORTON, who knows more about this issue than all of us combined.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much, and I certainly thank my good friend from Florida for his work on not only this bill, H.R. 471, but for his strong respect for the District of Columbia and its residents and his support for our right to self-government as American citizens.

I oppose this rule, I oppose this bill, and at the appropriate time, I will have a substitute to redirect the funds in this bill in accordance with the home-rule wishes of the District of Columbia. May I say, I appreciate the words of my good friend from Utah, but I do resent the use of the word "liberty" at a time when this bill will deprive the residents of the District of Columbia of the liberty every other district has in deciding local educational decisions for itself. They have it in Utah, and we will never be satisfied as long as we do not have each and every right you have in Utah.

Now, the majority ought to approach this rule with caution. Many in the House ran on the promise to reduce the power of the Federal Government and to reduce the budget. Now, we are 3 months into the new Congress, and if they vote for this rule, they will be breaking their promises.

They will be voting for an unprecedented expansion of the Federal Gov-

ernment's power into the quintessentially local decision of elementary and secondary education. They will be voting for this rule against the will of the jurisdiction, the only jurisdiction to which it applies, the District of Columbia. They will be voting for this rule with no consultation with any elected official in the local jurisdiction involved. They will be voting to authorize the Federal Government to mandate that a local government offer a program for students to attend private schools at public expense, Federal expense, that is. They will be voting to increase the deficit by \$300 million with no offset whatsoever for these funds because this is a new program and their own protocols demand an offset for new programs.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. To complete her thought, I yield the gentle lady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. NORTON. So in the first test of their legislative cut-go protocol, they will be voting to violate it. They will be voting to do so with \$300 million added to the deficit at a time when they are cutting \$11.6 billion with a "b" from education throughout the United States of America. We are American citizens.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, again, I appreciate the opportunity of discussing this particular issue.

There is one effect where the Delegate from the District of Columbia does have something in common with the State of Utah. Over 70 percent of my land is owned by the Federal Government in Utah, and it is one of those factors that inhibits our ability to fund our education system in the State of Utah. The District of Columbia has that same initiative problem with so much of the land owned by the Federal Government.

The difference, though, is that this program is giving Federal money to the District of Columbia to fund not just the scholarship opportunity but also increased funds to fund their charter schools, as well as funds to fund the regular public education system. In that respect, I wish we were very similar to what's happening in the District of Columbia, but unfortunately we are not.

□ 1300

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can address this important issue of currency manipulation and trade.

Manufacturers in my home State of Rhode Island and those across the Nation are working hard and playing by

the rules, and they are suffering disproportionately because their Chinese counterparts refuse to play by the same set of rules in the global economy.

One way Chinese businesses cheat is by keeping their currency artificially low so that their imports are cheaper than U.S. goods. That is simply not fair, and this practice must end. Artificially low Chinese currency contributes greatly to the global trade imbalance, which puts U.S. businesses and workers at a significant disadvantage.

China's unfair currency manipulation has destroyed millions of good-paying American jobs and jeopardizes the future of the American middle class. Employment in manufacturing shrank from 20 million jobs in 1979 to fewer than 12 million jobs today. In Rhode Island, we experienced the loss of more than 30,000 manufacturing jobs in the last decade alone.

Despite these sobering statistics, the American manufacturing sector is in the midst of a resurgence. If this vital economic engine is to be sustained, Congress must continue its investments in programs that help manufacturers compete in the global economy, ending currency manipulation. And by doing that, we can level the playing field for American manufacturers, give them a fighting chance to compete, and speed up our economic recovery and create jobs.

With so many factories shuttered, small businesses barely hanging on, and Rhode Island workers continuing to look for jobs, we can't afford to wait any longer for the Chinese to correct their unfair trade practices. That's why I am proud to cosponsor this legislation to end China's unfair currency manipulation, because in States like Rhode Island, we have to fight back against countries like China that won't stick to their obligations under international agreements and play by the rules.

If our country is going to compete in the global economy, we have to guarantee that manufacturers are not disadvantaged by an uneven playing field in foreign trade. We must demand that China play by the rules.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time so I can find another baseball metaphor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Sort of like "Joe DiMaggio was against vouchers."

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield myself 10 seconds to explain that we are still on the D.C. voucher matter, but the previous question is with reference to Chinese currency.

With that, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, my good friend from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, the Republican follies go on. The Republicans have done nothing in their 13

weeks in charge of this House to help Americans get jobs, nothing to open markets for businesses to expand, nothing to open up markets overseas for American workers and businesses to compete more fairly. While they hold the economy hostage to their cultural war agenda, maybe we could do something to help the American people.

I rise today in support of the effort to defeat the previous question so that we can take a first step toward addressing the egregious imbalance between China's currency and our own. For too long, the Chinese have been playing unfairly in the international trade arena, and this Congress has to send a clear message that China must become a responsible player in multilateral trade. The Chinese export-driven strategy is smart, but subsidizing it by suppressing their currency is an unfair way to do it.

This effort is a good step, and we should follow up by working together with our trading partners to bring a multilateral WTO case against China on the currency issue. This common-sense legislation helps the Commerce Department do a fairer job for making the multilateral mechanisms more available to U.S. businesses. We must send a clear signal with this legislation that the American people respect international agreements and expect fairness.

After years of an unlevel playing field, it is time to act; and this motion to defeat it and bring it to the floor is the right kind of measured first step we can take now. I hope the Republicans will join us in helping this economy. I am tired of reading the Constitution and all the silly things we have done for the last 13 weeks. When are we going to see anything having to do with job creation?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend, the distinguished 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.

Madam Speaker, some of the 15 million unemployed Americans no doubt got together with some of their friends this morning around a kitchen table and talked about another fruitless day of job searching, another sleepless night, another paycheckless Friday that's coming. And I wonder, Madam Speaker, what they would think about what's going on on the floor of this House today. At a time when there are 15 million Americans out of work, the House majority has decided to pretend that it is the District of Columbia Board of Education.

Now, there are profound issues about the quality of schools for children in

the District of Columbia. I would be guided by their elected representative, Ms. HOLMES NORTON, who speaks for them but tragically does not have the right to vote on their behalf. She should have that right. But beyond that, what are we doing?

This is a time when Americans are struggling and suffering and losing their homes. What we should be doing is coming together, Republicans and Democrats, on this floor to create an environment where entrepreneurs and small businesses can create jobs for the American people.

We have a proposal on the floor right now that would say the following: Let's stop China from unfairly manipulating its currency that puts American manufacturers at a disadvantage.

It is estimated that 1 million manufacturing jobs could be added in this country if the Chinese were made to stop their unfair practice of discriminating and manipulating currency. Now, you may think that's a good idea or a bad idea. I think it's a good idea. But why don't we take a vote on that instead of how to run the District of Columbia Public Schools? That's a question that the voters of the District of Columbia should decide for themselves. What we ought to decide is to get our act together and get Americans back to work.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am not objecting at all to the concepts and the comments about Chinese trade. I think that's a legitimate issue. It has its time and place, perhaps not necessarily on this particular bill. But as an approach that the opposition, the minority, wishes to take, I can understand that.

I do, though, have my baseball analogy still here, and I'm not going to count the DiMaggio joke because that was made up. That was not a true one. But it is true that Casey Stengel at one time, talking about I think one of the best second basemen ever, Bobby Richardson, said: I just can't understand it. He doesn't smoke, he doesn't drink, he doesn't stay out at night, and he still can't hit .250.

Now, even though a healthy lifestyle may extend a career, it still has no ability or connection to the ability of hitting a curve ball. But those kind of non sequiturs are part and parcel of the entire debate that we will be having not just on this rule but also extended on to the other debate as well.

I find it personally very difficult to understand why anyone would oppose this bill, which only expands choices for D.C.'s brightest and least financially blessed schoolkids and does not subtract from school funding for D.C. public schools. In fact, it increases funding while keeping within Federal budget disciplines. It increases the percentage of money going to the charter school program as well as to the public schools. This is a win-win-win situation because it sends money to three

distinct efforts: the regular public school; the charter schools, which have a waiting list more than ever before; and also this Opportunity Scholarship Program, which had a waiting list and will again as well.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1310

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, my friend is absolutely correct about the Joe DiMaggio comment. But I've been around long enough to remember the Washington Senators. One of my personal friends played baseball with them, Earl Battey, and I won't tell you some of the things that Earl said to me when it wasn't about school vouchers.

But I leave to the seriousness of the moment 5 minutes of my remaining time to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who has, with great persistence, tried to get clarity about taxation without representation.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, you know, in the later days of European colonialism, countries like France allowed some representation from the colonies because the whole notion of voting on the fate of the colonies with nobody there who could also vote seemed even then to be a dilemma they could not live with. And I don't understand how any Member of the House believes she has a right to vote on local education matters or any other local matter affecting any part of the United States, including the District of Columbia.

I note, Madam Speaker, that Mr. POLIS of the Rules Committee indicated yesterday that there was a county in Colorado that had created its own voucher program. I respect that because they didn't come to the Federal Government to ask that their local voucher program be funded, nor, Madam Speaker, did we.

I think every Member of this House ought to ask, since we've had 5 years of a voucher bill, why is there no national bill on the floor? I think the gentleman from Florida has said one of the good reasons, and that is that the Bush Department of Education found that, when compared with the students in comparable schools in DC, there was no increase in test scores in math or reading. So there's a merit reason why there's no national bill.

But there's another reason why. The majority doesn't have the nerve to put a national voucher bill on the floor because it knows that in each and every state referendum, including in referendums in Utah, from which my good friend comes, not once has such a referendum succeeded.

I don't know why the majority thinks it can go home now and say I voted for vouchers, when you, yourselves, were against the use of public money for private schools in your district. I would not like to be at that town meeting where you have to explain why you voted for a rule for \$300

million for one district that did not want that money for that purpose.

Madam Speaker, I very much resent the use of Article I, Section VIII of the Constitution whenever the majority wants to move in on the District of Columbia with one of its pet ideas, or because it disagrees with some issue in the District of Columbia. That's quintessentially the absence of democracy.

It's one thing to have no democracy. It's another thing to press your version of policy on another jurisdiction. That's why I have an alternative, a substitute that I will be bringing at an appropriate time.

Madam Speaker, in 1973, after 150 years, this Congress finally said we have been wrong for most of the existence of our country in allowing no democracy whatsoever in the District of Columbia, no mayor, no city council. We give up. We delegate self-government to you. We are out of your affairs.

Self-government means nothing if the District of Columbia can still be a dumping ground for every pet project and pet idea of the majority. We have our own pet ideas, and we will insist on respect for our own ideas, and not yours.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would advise my friend from Utah that I am going to be the last speaker.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I will yield 10 minutes if the gentleman from California wants it. Otherwise, I will be happy to use what he does not use.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, first, let me thank my friend for his superb management of this rule and to say that I have the utmost respect for my colleague from the District of Columbia. Since I reside here in the District of Columbia, she represents me here in this institution. And when I'm here—of course I'm a Californian, first and foremost—but when I'm here, I get her newsletters in the mail. She and I have served on a commission together, focused on reform of this Congress in the 1990s, and I do have the utmost respect for her.

That is one of the main reasons that we chose, when she offered the one amendment to this measure, to make it in order, because there's been a commitment that Speaker BOEHNER and I and others have made that we want to have a free-flowing debate. And I think that the notion of concluding that somehow this is a cut-and-dried issue was really wrong.

I have to say that I felt, as I sat in the Rules Committee last night and listened to my good friend and I listened to Mr. MCGOVERN, I was really saying, my gosh, maybe there is no support for this measure at all. Especially when Mr. MCGOVERN, the second ranking Democrat on the Rules Committee, said every city council member in the District of Columbia is opposed to this measure. In fact, he said it not once but two, maybe even three, times.

And then I was handed a list. And I have just been told that Mr. BISHOP raised at the beginning that there are going to be lists on either side.

But the notion, to conclude, Madam Speaker, that we somehow are imposing the will of the majority on the people of the District of Columbia, that there's no support for this whatsoever, which is what I inferred from what was offered in the Rules Committee last night, is just plain wrong.

I don't often cite the editorial work of The Washington Post, but The Washington Post has editorialized strongly in support of this notion. Why? Because they're committed, as I believe we all are, Democrats and Republicans alike, I believe that all of my colleagues are committed to improving educational opportunities for our fellow Americans.

I think that what we need to recognize is that educational choice is an important thing, and that's why The Washington Post has editorialized in support of this.

And then when one looks at the list of D.C. leaders, some currently holding office, some formerly having held elective office here in the District of Columbia, the notion that there's only one voice that's elected by the people of the District of Columbia is an inaccurate one.

The fact is, the chairman of the city council, chairman-at-large, Kwame Brown, is a supporter of this measure. The former mayor, Adrian Fenty. I recognize that he did not win reelection. I don't know that this was the sole determinant in the outcome of that election. But Adrian Fenty, in fact, is a supporter of this measure.

The mayor before that, Anthony Williams, is a supporter of this measure. Marion Barry, the former mayor; Kevin Chavous, former chairman of the D.C. City Council Education Committee; Patrick Mara, the D.C. school board member; and, of course, the often-cited Michelle Rhee, the former D.C. school chancellor, they all happen to be supporters of this measure.

And so that's why, some elected, some not elected, some hold office today, some formerly held office, but I believe, Madam Speaker, that every single one of these people, along with the editorial pages, as I said, of The Post, The Journal, a number of other publications, lots of organizations are very, very committed to ensuring the quality of education is improved in the District of Columbia, and, Madam Speaker, they are very, very com-

mitted to ensuring that we see the quality of education improved across this country.

□ 1320

It is very important for us to do that. And that is why I find it very interesting that the previous question battle that we are dealing with here is one that is designed to focus on the issue of international trade and creating jobs here in the United States.

I can understand there is a great deal of concern about the fact that jobs have fled overseas. That has happened because of the policies of the United States of America. The fact that we have the highest tax rate on job creators of any country in the world, the fact that we have chosen over the last few years to stick our heads in the sand when it has come to market opening opportunities through trade agreements which have been signed by our past administration and the leaders of other countries, is an indication that we have chosen to ignore great job-creating opportunities. And I am speaking about these trade agreements, the ones that President Obama said that he would like to see us pass here in the House. First, the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement which he talked about. And I am grateful that he talked about the importance of Colombia and Panama, two agreements that were actually signed before the completion of the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

Now, Madam Speaker, if we were to focus attention on those items, plus reducing that top rate on job creators from 35 percent to 25 percent, that would do more to create job opportunities than almost anything we could do.

And then we get back to the core issue here, and that is education. We need to make sure that the United States of America, as we seek to remain competitive in this global economy, that we have the best educated young people. That is why educational choice, I believe, is critically important.

We are going to have an opportunity for debate. The Rules Committee has chosen to make in order and give 40 minutes of debate to my friend from the District of Columbia so we will be able to continue this exchange.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" in favor of the previous question, and in so doing, we will be able to pursue tremendous items like the pending three free trade agreements and reducing the top rate on corporate income, those on job creators, so that we can generate more job opportunities in this country.

Vote "yes" on the previous question. Vote "yes" on the rule. I believe that the underlying legislation will dramatically enhance the opportunity for young people in the District of Columbia to have educational opportunities that they otherwise would not have.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield 1 minute of that time to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. No one ever said that everybody in the District of Columbia or even every public official was against vouchers.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I just said that Mr. MCGOVERN in the debate last night in the Rules Committee said that every city council member, and then I was given this list.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Ms. NORTON. On the contrary, a letter is on its way up here from city council members. The present mayor opposes the bill. Yes, the former mayor was for the bill. The largest demonstration of citizens since I have been in the Congress was held when this bill was imposed on the District of Columbia.

If you ask people in the District of Columbia, "Would you support some Federal money for vouchers?" a lot of them will say yes. If you ask them the right question, "Would you want money for private school vouchers or would you want money for public charter schools?" hands down, they will say, relieve those long waiting lists of all of us trying to get in our public charter schools and give the money to our public charter schools.

Nobody on that side of the aisle knows anything about the residents of the District of Columbia or they never would have put this bill in in the first place.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time, and I will tell the gentleman from Florida that I am prepared to close when he is.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much, and I shall conclude.

I say to the chairman, before he leaves the room, that if any American corporation is paying 35 percent corporate tax, they need to fire their accountants.

Madam Speaker, if the people of the District of Columbia wanted a school voucher program, they would have created one—without the interference of Congress.

This pilot program was allowed to expire for a reason: It didn't work.

Why the self-proclaimed party of fiscal conservatism would support authorizing millions, 300 of those, in new spending for a downright useless program with no offset is beyond me. It is time for Republicans to take their hands out of the internal affairs of the District, and instead focus on what our constituents sent us here to do—rebuild our economy and put Americans back to work.

At a time when our Nation's schools and communities find themselves in dire fiscal straits, we should not be

throwing money away to revive a program that has, by all objective measures, failed.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, so we can debate and pass real jobs legislation today. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Once again, I appreciate the discussion, I appreciate my good friend from Florida if for no other reason that all of a sudden people are now sending me baseball stories and analogies here. I have one from Casey Stengel which I will save for the next time we join together here on the floor.

Madam Speaker, it is fairly clear what we are dealing with in this particular bill. This is money that is within our Federal budgetary discipline. We are talking with this bill about money that would go to the traditional public education system in the District of Columbia, an equal amount of money that would go to the charter schools which does have a waiting list here in the District of Columbia, as well as money that would go to this new opportunity scholarship.

Once again, with our dueling statistics, whether one wants to say that it was successful or not, the bottom line is still there were parents who wanted that program, there were parents who complained when the program was taken away from them by Congress, and there are parents who still want this program reestablished. They want those options for their children.

We have a choice here. If we act favorably on this bill, we empower those parents. If we refuse to act favorably on this bill, then we limit those parents and the choices that they seem to want. That is one of those issues that is there.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate the fairness of this structured rule. I urge its adoption, along with the underlying legislation. I urge members to support this rule which will allow the House to consider good legislation that affords bright and competitive D.C. students with an enhanced opportunity to pursue a higher quality of education while not harming the underlying public education system in the District of Columbia.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 186 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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. 639) to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify that countervailing duties may be imposed to address subsidies relating to a fundamentally undervalued currency of any foreign country. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consider-

ation of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. 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 rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

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. BISHOP of Utah. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 186, if ordered; and approval of the Journal, by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 182, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

YEAS—237

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

Huelskamp	McMorris
Huizenga (MI)	Rodgers
Hultgren	Meehan
Hunter	Mica
Hurt	Miller (FL)
Issa	Miller (MI)
Jenkins	Miller, Gary
Johnson (IL)	Mulvaney
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)
Johnson, Sam	Myrick
Jones	Neugebauer
Jordan	Noem
Kelly	Nugent
King (IA)	Nunes
King (NY)	Nunnelee
Kingston	Olson
Kinzinger (IL)	Palazzo
Kline	Paul
Labrador	Paulsen
Lamborn	Pearce
Lance	Pence
Landry	Petri
Lankford	Pitts
Latham	Platts
LaTourette	Poe (TX)
Latta	Pompeo
Lewis (CA)	Posey
LoBiondo	Price (GA)
Long	Quayle
Lucas	Reed
Luetkemeyer	Rehberg
Lummis	Reichert
Lungren, Daniel	Renacci
E.	Ribble
Mack	Rigell
Manzullo	Rivera
Marchant	Roby
Marino	Roe (TN)
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)
McCauley	Rogers (KY)
McClintock	Rogers (MI)
McCotter	Rohrabacher
McHenry	Rokita
McKeon	Rooney
McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen
	Roskam

NAYS—182

Ackerman	Engel
Andrews	Eshoo
Baca	Farr
Baldwin	Fattah
Barrow	Filner
Bass (CA)	Frank (MA)
Becerra	Fudge
Berkley	Garamendi
Berman	Gonzalez
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Grijalva
Boren	Gutierrez
Boswell	Hanabusa
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)
Braley (IA)	Heinrich
Brown (FL)	Higgins
Capps	Himes
Capuano	Hinchee
Carter	Hinojosa
Carnahan	Hirono
Carney	Holden
Castor (FL)	Holt
Chandler	Honda
Chu	Hoyer
Cicilline	Inslee
Clarke (MI)	Israel
Clay	Jackson (IL)
Clyburn	Jackson Lee
Cohen	(TX)
Connolly (VA)	Johnson (GA)
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.
Costa	Kaptur
Courtney	Keating
Critz	Kildee
Crowley	Kind
Cuellar	Kissell
Cummings	Kucinich
Davis (CA)	Langevin
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)
DeFazio	Larson (CT)
DeGette	Lee (CA)
DeLauro	Levin
Deutch	Lewis (GA)
Dicks	Lipinski
Dingell	Loeback
Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe
Donnelly (IN)	Lowe
Doyle	Lujan
Edwards	Lynch
Ellison	Maloney

Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, 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
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Barton (TX)	Cleaver	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Conyers	Shuler
Campbell	Costello	Whitfield
Carson (IN)	Frelinghuysen	
Clarke (NY)	Giffords	

□ 1353

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Messrs. TIERNEY, CLARKE of Michigan, HONDA, ISRAEL, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 235, nays 178, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

YEAS—235

Adams	Dent	Herger
Aderholt	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Akin	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Alexander	Dold	Huizenga (MI)
Altmire	Dreier	Hultgren
Amash	Duffy	Hunter
Austria	Duncan (SC)	Hurt
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Bachus	Ellmers	Jenkins
Barletta	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Bartlett	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Benishek	Fincher	Johnson, Sam
Berg	Fitzpatrick	Jones
Biggert	Flake	Jordan
Bilbray	Fleischmann	Kelly
Bilirakis	Fleming	King (IA)
Bishop (UT)	Flores	King (NY)
Black	Forbes	Kingston
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)
Bonner	Foxx	Kline
Bono Mack	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Boustany	Galleghy	Lamborn
Brady (TX)	Gardner	Lance
Broun (GA)	Garrett	Landry
Buchanan	Gerlach	Lankford
Bucshon	Gibbs	Latham
Buerkle	Gibson	LaTourette
Burgess	Gingrey (GA)	Latta
Burton (IN)	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)
Calvert	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Camp	Gosar	LoBiondo
Canseco	Gowdy	Long
	Granger	Lucas
	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
	Graves (MO)	Lummis
	Griffin (AR)	Lungren, Daniel
	Griffith (VA)	E.
	Grimm	Mack
	Guinta	Manzullo
	Guthrie	Marchant
	Hall	Marino
	Hanna	McCarthy (CA)
	Harper	McCauley
	Harris	McClintock
	Hartzler	McCotter
	Hastings (WA)	McHenry
	Heck	McKeon
	Hensarling	McKinley

McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg

Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
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)

Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Giffords
Hayworth

Heller
Polis
Quigley
Rangel

Shuler
Slaughter

McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rehberg
Reichert
Ribble

Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—178

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

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
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)
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens

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

NOT VOTING—19

Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Brooks

Butterfield
Campbell
Carson (IN)

Clarke (NY)
Clever
Davis (IL)

Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Giffords
Hayworth

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishak
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchson
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw

Heller
Polis
Quigley
Rangel

Critz
Crowley
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Loeb sack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon

Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Loeb sack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon

McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rehberg
Reichert
Ribble

Altmire
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Ellison
Farenthold
Farr
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Foxy
Fudge
Gardner
Gibbs
Graves (MO)

Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heller
Hinchey
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Keating
Kinzinger (IL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Napolitano

Carson (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Clever
Frelinghuysen
Giffords

Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Reyes
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Sires
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Towns
Visclosky
Weiner
Wu
Young (AK)

□ 1400

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 309, nays 107, answered “present” 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]
YEAS—309

NAYS—107

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1408

Ms. BASS of California changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”
So the Journal was approved.