

□ 1330

The message has come through that we are, in fact, going to have to get our fiscal house in order if we're going to ensure the strength and the preeminence of the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm going to urge my colleagues to support this rule, and tomorrow we will have a vote on the continuing resolution itself. Then we will begin tomorrow, after we've had that vote, to debate the budget, which is going to be far reaching, it's going to be difficult, but it is clearly the right thing for us to do.

And I will say again, Madam Speaker, that I do hope that on these issues we will be able to continue to work together in a bipartisan way to solve our Nation's problems.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1217, REPEALING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 219 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 219

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 1217) to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the

question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 219 provides for a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1217, which repeals the Prevention and Public Health Fund and rescinds any unobligated funds.

Republicans are on the floor today to fulfill part of our Pledge to America that we would cut spending and we would repeal the Democrats' health care bill passed a year ago. On January 19, this House passed H.R. 2 to repeal ObamaCare completely. The ruling liberal Democrats in the Senate, however, have so far refused to consider H.R. 2, but House Republicans remain undeterred. We will repeal ObamaCare piece by piece if that is what it takes.

Because the liberal elites knew their government takeover of health care was unpopular and would likely have consequences at the ballot box, they included \$105 billion in mandatory taxpayer spending in the law itself to protect their favorite programs.

Let me take a moment to explain the difference between "discretionary" and "mandatory" government spending.

First, it's important to remember that the Federal Government does not have any money of its own, as it has only what it takes in taxes from hard-working Americans or money that it borrows from foreign creditors and our future generations. We are currently borrowing 43 cents of every dollar that the Federal Government spends.

Discretionary spending is appropriated by Congress annually and therefore subject to congressional oversight and review. Discretionary spending allows Congress to be wise stewards of the taxpayers' money by not funding ineffective or duplicative programs. However, what is called mandatory spending funds programs for people who meet certain criteria and occurs irrespective of congressional appropri-

tions and must be spent whether we have the money or not.

The most recognized mandatory spending programs are Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, which operate on autopilot and have not been subject to congressional oversight from year-to-year as funds automatically stream from the Treasury to anyone who qualifies, that is, meets the criteria for a particular benefit.

The bill before us today, H.R. 1217, would repeal a portion of mandatory ObamaCare spending and eliminate a slush fund established for Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius. This slush fund, known as the Prevention and Public Health Fund, will automatically receive \$1 billion when fiscal year 2012 begins in October of this year with automatic increases every year until it reaches \$2 billion annually in fiscal year 2015.

However, there's a very important distinction between this funding and that for Medicare and Social Security in that this funding does not state eligibility criteria.

The liberal elites in Washington think they know how to spend the taxpayers' money better than individual taxpayers and gives Secretary Sebelius \$2 billion a year until Congress acts to repeal her authority to spend without accountability.

Republicans are rejecting this slush fund by considering this bill which would repeal the fund and take back any money that has not already been spent this year. The slush fund is not subject to the annual appropriations process and therefore would not be subject to yearly congressional oversight.

The money will be made available to the Secretary regardless of how she chooses to spend it and whether or not the programs being funded are actually effective.

Again, this is not like Medicare and Social Security. There are no criteria for the spending of this money.

It's important to point out that this bill does not cut any specific program, because the slush fund is used by the Secretary to increase spending above congressionally appropriated levels for whatever program the Secretary chooses.

My colleagues across the aisle will argue that this money is being used to train primary care physicians, to prevent obesity, and to encourage healthy lifestyles. What they won't tell you is that they have absolutely no idea how the money is being used, because they abdicated the authority of Congress to an unelected bureaucrat.

The simple truth is that the money is just as likely to be spent on elective abortion as it is for any other purpose.

In the Democrats' dissenting views from the House Energy and Commerce Committee report, they say without mandatory spending for this slush fund, the programs will not be adequately funded. Well, Madam Speaker, that's what the whole process for appropriations is all about. If the programs need more money, it's up to them to come and justify that.

However, they sang a different tune when liberal House Democrats rammed through a government takeover of health care in November of 2009. They created this slush fund but made it subject to the regular appropriations process. That meant it was subject to yearly congressional oversight and direction for how the money would be spent.

□ 1340

But when the ruling liberal Democrats in the Senate sent over their version of the health care bill, which became law, the slush fund had been made mandatory. The liberal elites claim they put in a safeguard because part of the section creating this slush fund states that Congress has the authority to direct how this funding is spent. Well, as any high school junior civics student could tell you, Congress always has the authority to direct, redirect, repeal, or increase funding. Congress can always pass a new law to change the direction of any funding stream. That's our job as legislators. The need to state explicitly that we have the authority to direct spending in a slush fund is pointless.

The simple truth is that we have a spending crisis in this town in large part due to mandatory spending that operates on autopilot. Instead of working to address our unsustainable spending habits, the ruling Democrats refused even to offer a budget resolution last year or pass a single appropriations bill. The liberal elites failed to lead despite having unchecked control of all levers of power in Washington.

I brought a chart with me today to help illustrate the fact that mandatory spending is out of control in Washington. Madam Speaker, let me show you that because of mandatory spending being on autopilot, by the year 2050 the mandatory spending will absorb all revenue coming into the Federal Government, all tax revenue coming into the Federal Government. That simply is unsustainable. We cannot operate our country when we let three programs take up all of the money that comes into the Federal Government. Something has to be done. And yet the Democrats want to add another program to this, which would speed up this process. We don't need that.

As Washington liberals ignored the growing autopilot spending crisis, adding more unaccountable mandatory spending in the hands of unelected bureaucrats, House Republicans are now working hard to protect the future for our children and grandchildren by restoring congressional oversight of spending.

Now, I am sure many Americans are wondering how a slush fund with a clever title would be spent and why it must be put on autopilot. Let me give you an example. Pitt County, in my home State of North Carolina, received funding from this fund to fix prices at convenience stores so that healthy foods would be less expensive and,

therefore, supposedly more attractive to the consumer. In addition, the Pitt County Health Department now plans to use some of this money to put up signs indicating the location of public parks, bike lanes, and alternate transportation.

Although I am certainly not opposed to parks or healthy eating habits, it seems quite clear that the Founders of this country did not intend the Federal Department of Health and Human Services in Washington, DC, to use taxpayer money to subsidize granola bars or purchase signs for bike lanes or parks.

The Federal Government has no business paying for local and community initiatives such as these, especially when we are borrowing 43 cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends to pay for it. The new House Republican majority is ready to lead this country out of our debt crisis. And it starts with voting for this rule and the underlying bill, which will save taxpayers \$16 billion.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Obviously, this measure amends the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and seeks to repeal those provisions that establish and appropriate funds to the Prevention and Public Health Fund. It also rescinds any unobligated balance appropriated to the fund.

As I listened to my friend from North Carolina, two things jumped out at me immediately. One is her usage and the ruling Republican majority House Members' usage of the term for the Affordable Health Care Act as ObamaCare. I said earlier in the Rules Committee I guess I could call it HastingsCare, because I supported—as did many Members of this Congress who are still here and some who are not, on both sides of the aisle—health care provisions for America long before any of us knew Barack Obama's name.

When it's used the way that it is, it's in some manner attempting to be demeaning of the President. He does not bear the sole responsibility for the Affordable Health Care Act. I would assume some of that responsibility. And what I would say is he and many others in this body did not go far enough in that we did not establish universal health care for all Americans in this country.

The other thing that jumps out on this particular matter, calling it a slush fund and then allowing that it is going to be in the hands of an unelected bureaucrat. It puts us in a strange position in the House of Representatives when my colleagues with the ruling majority of the House of Representatives have sought and been successful in eliminating the opportunities for Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to seek to have appro-

priations earmarked for respective undertakings in their congressional districts. Rather, they would eliminate those earmarks and—guess what?—put it in the hands of unelected bureaucrats.

So I find it inconsistent to make the argument on one hand, and then on the other hand say, Oh, it's okay for the unelected bureaucrats to have some opportunities to spend our money. Quite frankly, I take umbrage with that. I think I can do a better job defining a need for a treatment plant in Belle Glade than can an unelected bureaucrat.

The burden of chronic diseases, such as cancer, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, and stroke, present a significant public health challenge to all of our communities and our Nation as a whole. In my home State of Florida, over 10 million cases of seven chronic diseases—cancer, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, stroke, mental disorders, and pulmonary conditions—were reported early on in this decade at the cost of about \$17.6 billion in treatment, and resulting in \$68.7 billion in lost productivity and economic cost.

Simply put, we have a sick care system, not a health care system. Tens of millions of Americans are suffering from health conditions that could possibly be preventable. This is further exacerbated by the continuing rise of health care costs. Despite the fact that chronic diseases are responsible for seven out of 10 deaths among Americans each year and that they account for 75 percent of our Nation's health care spending, less than 3 percent of our health care spending goes to preventive health care services and health promotion.

As you know, the Affordable Care Act, or the HastingsCare Act, or the Hastings and ObamaCare Act, or the Hastings and Obama and DemocratCare Act created the Prevention and Public Health Fund in order to assist State and community efforts in preventing illness and promoting health. The Prevention and Public Health Fund represents an unprecedented investment of \$15 billion over 10 years to help prevent disease, detect it early, and manage conditions before they become severe. It aims to transform the focus of our system of care from primarily treating illness to maintaining long-term wellness by leveraging the power of preventive medicine.

Through the Community Transformation Grants program, for example, the fund empowers State and local governments and partners to implement community prevention interventions that help reduce chronic disease and health care disparities.

□ 1350

In fact, the fund is already being used in all 50 of our States and the District of Columbia to prevent smoking, increase physical activity, reduce alcohol and drug abuse, increase immunizations, train the Nation's public health

workforce, prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS, and help control the obesity epidemic in our country.

In addition, the Prevention and Public Health Fund provides funding for States to help develop a health insurance exchange by 2014. Footnote there: We should have had a public option, where consumers will have access to a new market of more affordable, quality health coverage, as well as funding for up to 400 school-based centers in order to provide a safety net and improved access to care for children.

Since the enactment of the *HastingsCare*, *ObamaCare*, *DemocraticCare*, *RepublicansDon'tCare* measure last year, the Department of Health and Human Services has awarded approximately \$21.98 million in grants to organizations in Florida alone through the Prevention and Public Health Fund to help improve wellness and prevention efforts, including more than \$9.3 million for community and clinical prevention, more than \$3.1 million for public health infrastructure, and more than \$9.4 million for primary care training.

If we are to reduce health care costs, we must improve the health of all Americans. Investing in proven preventive measures can significantly reduce the risk of developing these diseases, improving people's lives and saving money.

According to a report from Trust For America's Health entitled "Prevention for a Healthier America," investing just \$10 per person per year in proven community-based programs that increase physical activity, improve nutrition, and prevent smoking and other tobacco use could save our Nation more than \$16 billion annually within 5 years.

This is equivalent to and potentially greater than the amount as estimated by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office by which H.R. 1217 reduces direct spending over a 10-year period. Furthermore, a public opinion survey by Trust for America and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation found that 71 percent of Americans favor an increased investment in disease prevention.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is supported also by nearly 600 national organizations, including the American Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, Families USA, and the AIDS Institute.

H.R. 1217, on the other hand, is nothing more than an attack on affordable health insurance, primary care and safety net care for children. This bill is yet another feeble attempt by the ruling majority Republicans to disrupt, dismantle, and ultimately destroy the *HastingsCare*, *ObamaCare*, *DemocraticCare*, *RepublicansDon'tCare* bill one piece at a time, including those programs that have already been funded and are helping millions of middle class, elderly, and working poor Americans and their families as we speak.

The misinformation that pervades the health care debate in this country never ceases to amaze me at all.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, the ruling Republican majority, would have the American people believe that the Prevention and Public Health Fund is a slush fund for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to spend money freely without congressional oversight. This is simply not true. A specific funding amount is allocated for prevention efforts through the fund each year during the fiscal year period: \$500 million in 2010; \$750 million in 2011; \$1 billion in fiscal year 2012 and so on up to \$2 billion beginning in 2015.

This gives the Secretary, whomever she or he may be, under Republicans or Democrats, the flexibility and health care providers the funding certainty that they need to implement prevention and public health interventions that help Americans make healthier decisions for themselves and their families. The Prevention and Public Health Fund is the first and only Federal program with dedicated ongoing resources specifically designed to improve the public. It represents our commitment to preventing illness and investing in our Nation's long-term physical and fiscal health.

Let me say this, Madam Speaker: Every day that I awaken, I start my day by trying to figure what can I do to follow the scriptural mandate to help the least of us. I am curious whether my friends in the ruling majority have the same feeling.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I would just like to point out one small thing to my colleague from Florida. Yes, I do begin wondering every day wondering how I can make life better for other people. But I want to say that there is no accountability whatsoever in this provision of the bill, and we want accountability for every penny of money that we are spending on behalf of the American taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you, my learned colleague from North Carolina.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the 2011 budget agreement that we have passed. We have already heard some of the aspects that this budget agreement addresses, and I am going to address some additional aspects.

I am very pleased to see this House once again value the culture of life. The FY 2011 budget now reinstates the D.C. Hyde amendment to ensure that no congressionally appropriated funds, Federal or local, are used to pay for elective abortions.

According to the Susan B. Anthony List president, Marjorie Dannenfelser, Congress will save the lives of an estimated 1,000 unborn children when it votes to restore this amendment banning the use of taxpayer dollars to pay

for elective abortions in the District of Columbia.

It adjusts the U.N. Family Planning Agency funding from \$55 million to \$40 million. It adjusts international population control/family planning funding from \$648 million to \$575 million.

It adjusts title 10 domestic family planning funding to \$300 million, which is a cut of \$17 million.

This budget also calls for an up-or-down vote in both the House and the Senate, Madam Speaker, on the defunding of Planned Parenthood.

While the fight is certainly not over, we are making great strides in the ongoing effort to not only get our country on a strong fiscal footing but to honor the value of lives born and unborn.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Madam Speaker, you know, I was thinking we are approaching Mother's Day, and I thought of my mother. When it came to budgeting and appropriating money, she did not always have a great deal to work with, but she was a great budget analyst. She was an absolute wizard at crunching numbers, and she was an expert on knowing what worked and what did not.

As a matter of fact, she often told us that an ounce of prevention was worth much more than a pound of cure. And so she knew that when it came to health care, prevention measures are worth much more than their weight in gold. She knew that it would be penny-wise and pound foolish to cut or reduce the meager resources which we expend towards health education, health awareness, health promotion, and health screening.

□ 1400

If we don't think public health activities work, look for some cigarette smoke or cigar smoke in these Chambers. Look at the difference in the cost of treating lung cancer and cirrhosis of the liver versus preventing these diseases from occurring. In Illinois, we have a very proactive public health program, and we don't want to see it reduced, diminished or eliminated.

Yes, we do need to cut spending, and we are cutting spending, but let's not throw out the baby with the bath water. Let's not be penny wise and pound foolish. Let's vote down this rule, and let's vote down H.R. 1217.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to save taxpayers money by cutting wasteful government spending. The program that we are cutting out we cannot be sure does anything for preventative health care. It has designated that, but there is no idea as to where the money is going to be spent. Republicans certainly want to see Americans do a better job of preventing disease and of making their

health care better, but what we fear is that this money may be used for elective abortions, so we are also here today to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

This slush fund directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to invest in prevention and primary care by funding programs and initiatives under the Public Health Services Act. Title X of the Public Health Services Act provides funding for the abortion industry, including organizations like Planned Parenthood, which is the largest abortion provider in the country.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle and the liberals in Washington have really outdone themselves to ensure their favorite constituencies are provided for in their new health care law. This slush fund is yet another Democrat trick to use taxpayer money to subsidize elective abortion. Despite what they may have you believe, supporters of taxpayer-funded elective abortion cannot honestly claim this money cannot be used for elective abortion under Title X. The liberal Democrat elites relinquished all authority over this slush fund to Secretary Sebelius. For far too long, abortion providers have used Title X money to subsidize their operating costs, thereby subsidizing elective abortion.

We've heard a lot of misinformation being circulated in Washington this week about Planned Parenthood, the largest elective abortion provider in the country. As I pointed out in the Rules Committee last night, one of my colleagues across the aisle said that Republicans were "here to kill women" and compared us to Nazis.

Liberal Democrats maintain that women will lose access to preventative care if the government stops funding for the abortion industry. What they are not telling you is that Planned Parenthood has almost \$1 billion in net assets and reported \$737 million in revenues for its most recent filing year. Any big abortion organization making \$737 million a year should be able to function without taxpayer subsidies, Mr. Speaker. This is not about women's health or access to preventative care. Through Federal and State Medicaid programs, low-income women have access to family planning and preventative health services at hospitals, doctors' offices and community health centers nationwide.

Another claim Planned Parenthood makes is that 97 percent of the 3 million patients they served in fiscal 2008 received preventative care services and that only 3 percent received abortions. These supporters of taxpayer-funded abortion ought to check their math. According to their own facts sheet for March 2011, Planned Parenthood clinics performed 332,278 abortions in fiscal year 2008. If they saw 3 million patients and performed 332,278 abortions, that means at least 11 percent of the services provided were abortions.

If they cannot be trusted regarding this simple math, what else are they

hiding from the American people, Mr. Speaker?

Another astounding statistic I would like to share is that 97.6 percent of pregnant women who received services at Planned Parenthood clinics received abortions. Only 2.4 percent of pregnant women received only prenatal or adoption referral services at Planned Parenthood.

Elective abortion is not health care, Mr. Speaker. This is not about preventative health care or about improving access to primary care. This is about subsidizing the big abortion industry. If this slush fund remains unchecked, the Secretary could fund whatever program she chooses to the tune of up to \$2 billion a year. That kind of money can purchase a lot of elective abortions, which strikes at the consciences of so many tax-paying Americans.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, that's just about the most convoluted, backward argument that I can imagine that I've heard in the 19 years that I've been here in the United States Congress.

There is not one dime in the Prevention and Public Health Fund that can or will be used for abortions. The law in this land, enunciated by a legend and an icon, among the other things that Henry Hyde was, is that Federal funds cannot be used for that purpose, and to carry us into that neverland that the previous speaker just spoke of is astoundingly wrong.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida, and I carefully and enthusiastically associate myself with his response.

We are all colleagues here. We call each other "distinguished colleagues," and I call my good friend from North Carolina "distinguished colleague," with whom I disagree with wide and well-versed opposition.

First of all, as we approach a sacred holiday for many of us in this country, it is one of sacrifice, and as we move into the month of May, we begin to look at how mothers sacrifice to take care of their children and not themselves. Many of us during this time frame will be fasting because we find that this draconian road that our Republican friends are on, with the minutest and the smallest of a majority that voted in this low voting election in 2010, is frightening. We need prayer, and we need to fast because this is truly the road to ruin. I just hope that my colleagues who communicate to the American people will tell

the truth. The budget, the repeal of the Prevention and Public Health, the CR, all of them are the road to ruin.

Whether you agree with our President or not, he has it right: the country we can believe in.

With regard to the CR, when you have The Washington Post or any newspaper saying that more than half of the \$38 billion in cuts that are used in this CR for tomorrow are taken out of education, labor and health programs while those at the top 2 percent or 1 percent of the tax bracket keep going on and on—many of whom said we are willing to sacrifice, that we are willing to offer to be able to help this country—and then when they want to repeal the Prevention and Public Health bill so that the brunt of the people going in for medical care will be in the emergency rooms because they will not have had cholesterol checks or high blood pressure checks or checks for sickle cell or diabetes—they won't have any of that. They'll go into the emergency rooms, laying out in comas—that's what the repeal of this legislation is all about.

The question you ask the Republicans is: What is the dream or the vision of America for them? It is a road to ruin, and the budget is an absurd ridiculousness that wants to cut Medicaid and wants to cut Medicaid.

In going back to the CR, how can you tell the District of Columbia citizens, who pay taxes, that they cannot take their own money and use it for the dictates of their elected body?

□ 1410

How can you tell them that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. The gentleman is enormously kind.

I sat and listened to Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON who has lost a vote on this floor that she had, and the citizens of that community, the Mayor and the city council could do nothing but take to the streets to protest. How can you dictate what we do with our own dollars? And so over the next 48 hours, you will see the reason why many Americans are fasting, because they see that this country is going down the road of no return.

And it hurts my heart to think that we're going to rescind \$16 billion that can be used to make a healthier country, to make a country where children can have access to health care, where a little 10-year-old doesn't die because he has an abscess.

I ask my colleagues to vote against all these rules and stop this from going down the road to ruin.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I feel I have to respond somewhat to my colleague from Florida on some of the points that he made.

He said that it is the law of the land that no Federal Government money

can be used to fund abortions. I know my colleague from Florida has been here a lot longer than I have been, and I know that he understands the difference between discretionary spending and mandatory spending, and I know that he knows that the Hyde amendment is only on appropriations bills. And as I explained earlier, Mr. Speaker, the appropriations bills are what we call discretionary spending, and that what the Democrats did in the health care bill was to put this \$2 billion in that bill and call it mandatory spending, which is not subject to the annual appropriations process and therefore does not have the restriction of the Hyde amendment to apply to it.

So I would like to ask my colleague from Florida if he can guarantee on his own word to the American people today that nothing from this \$2 billion that is put in for mandatory spending—it's on automatic pilot—would ever be spent for abortions.

Would the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Of course I will. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FOXX. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Please, let's have a clear understanding that no dollars from this fund are going to be used for abortions.

Ms. FOXX. Can the gentleman guarantee that?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I don't have any opportunity to guarantee whether or not I'm going to be alive in the next 30 seconds, let alone tell you what may happen. But if you ask my belief, and yours was your belief that it may be used is what you said, my dear friend, all I'm saying is it is not going to be. And the law enunciated through Henry Hyde, and almost verbatim has been included in the Affordable Care Act, precludes the use of money for abortions.

Ms. FOXX. I would like to reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman has just made my point. He cannot guarantee that this money will not be used for abortions, and neither can anyone else. And that is the point that we are making, Mr. Speaker. There is no accountability for this \$2 billion. It is a slush fund for the Secretary of Health and Human Services. And it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, for us to take the hard-earned money of American taxpayers and give it to the Secretary with no accountability and with the distinct possibility that the money could be used to fund abortions.

The liberals ruling Washington the past 4 years have failed to address out-of-control mandatory or discretionary spending. In fact, under their control, discretionary spending has increased 84 percent in just 2 years.

As I mentioned earlier, discretionary spending is the money Congress decides annually to spend on programs with inherent congressional oversight. Mandatory, or autopilot, spending is the

money that is automatically pulled from the Treasury without regular congressional oversight. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, when that decision was made for Congress to abrogate its responsibility, but it's a weasel way out. We should be looking at every dollar every year, because that's our responsibility.

Our debt and the liberals' insatiable appetite for perpetual government spending increases are sending America into a tailspin. In response to the complete lack of leadership and fiscal responsibility, House Republicans have been very aggressive in reducing wasteful government overspending, which is the real source of breathtaking budget deficits and private sector unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a chart that comes, I believe, from the Joint Committee on Economics, and it shows what happens when you increase government spending and when you decrease government spending when you're talking about private sector job creation. Every dollar the government takes from the private sector is one less dollar to be spent for private sector innovation and job growth. The government can create only government jobs.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to the 13.5 million Americans counted in the official unemployment rate, more than 900,000 Americans have stopped looking for a job because they think no jobs exist for them. I want to point out here that, again, when we saw increased government spending, you see a decrease in private sector jobs. When you see decreased government spending, you see an increase in private sector jobs. That's what the Republicans want to do. Americans want jobs. They want to work. We need to cut government spending and allow the private sector to grow.

More than 45 percent of Americans seeking work have been unemployed for more than 27 weeks. Real problems demand real solutions, Mr. Speaker. The track record in the House in 3 short months demonstrates that the new House Republican majority has heard the American people and is acting to provide the relief and solutions they deserve. Less government spending is crucial to encouraging private sector job creation and reducing unemployment. And where better to cut possible government spending than where money could be used for abortions?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from California (Ms. MATSUI), a former member of the Rules Committee that we miss.

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am in strong opposition to the rule and the bill before us today.

In 2008, I introduced legislation to create a Prevention and Wellness Trust Fund. Much of what I see in the Pre-

vention and Public Health Fund resembles the goals in my legislation. I introduced the legislation and fought for these preventive care provisions during the Energy and Commerce Committee debate on the health care law. I believe investing in preventive health care is vital to helping Americans access the care they need to stay healthy, reduce their health care costs, and ease the burden on our overcrowded emergency rooms.

Mr. Speaker, we spend more than \$2 trillion annually on health care, more than any other nation on Earth. Yet tens of millions of Americans still suffer from preventable and chronic diseases. In fact, approximately 75 percent of the Nation's health care expenditure is spent on treating chronic conditions. These conditions account for seven of 10 deaths in America.

For too long, the health delivery system in our country has been focused on only treating people after they get sick, not before. Prevention has been a luxury, if not an afterthought. Studies have shown that regular access to primary and preventive care can help keep people healthier, help avoid chronic conditions, catch diseases earlier, and therefore help lower costs.

Sacramento resident Tyler, an active teenager, was a picture of model health. One day he noticed that he was having heart problems during football practice. Taking precautions, his parents took him to a doctor to run tests and found that he had a cardiac abnormality. Today, after taking the necessary preventive steps, Tyler is healthy. Thankfully, he sought preventive measures early, which kept his condition from worsening and likely saved his life.

□ 1420

Not every story ends as happily as Tyler's, though. Millions of Americans every year are diagnosed with chronic diseases because they did not have such access to preventive care. That is the focus of this fund, to improve prevention. This funding will reduce individual and taxpayer cost while saving lives. However, that fact is being overlooked by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This bill before us will have a devastating effect on the future health of America, both in terms of our physical health and for our fiscal responsibility.

In order to truly improve both our health and our health care in this country, we must focus on prevention. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out again that Republicans would like to see more preventive care. However, the example that my colleague from California used says nothing about this bill because there is nothing in here to guarantee that this money will go to preventive care, absolutely nothing. There is no accountability in this legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my classmate and my good friend.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to both this rule and H.R. 1217, the legislation to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund of the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act uses Hyde-like language. I was on the Energy and Commerce Committee; I still am. We put it into the Affordable Care Act that there will not be one penny of Federal funds that will go for elective abortions.

The Hyde Act may be on appropriations bills, but the Affordable Care Act has that language in there. I know there is going to be a lot of talk during debate about the legislation and how we need to reduce our deficits, and tough funding cuts will need to be made by Congress in order to bring down our national debt. H.R. 1217 is not meaningful legislation to reduce our debt, nor is it a plan to create jobs or spur the growth in our economy. This legislation is yet another attempt by the majority to dismantle and repeal the Affordable Care Act because they do not have the support to do the straight repeal of health reform.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I know that this bill would be the first of several pieces that will mark a reversal of position by the majority on what has been previously bipartisan-supported health care concepts.

I have worked across the aisle for years with my colleagues on many prevention provisions, including Prevention and Public Health Fund that would fund the integration of primary care services into publicly funded mental and behavioral health settings. To date, Texas alone has received \$495,000 for this program. I introduced this legislation for several years with bipartisan support from Representative TIM MURPHY. At the time it was called the Community Mental Health Services Improvement Act. And yet here we are today rolling back funding on these important bipartisan provisions to fulfill campaign promises.

We know that prevention programs will ultimately save our health care system in the future. What we did with the Prevention and Public Health Fund in the Affordable Care Act was to make a down payment on reducing preventable health conditions such as diabetes, obesity, strokes, and heart disease. The fund represents an unprecedented investment—\$15 billion over 10 years—that will help prevent disease, detect it early, and manage conditions before they become severe. By concentrating on the causes of chronic disease, the Affordable Care Act helps move the Nation from a focus on sickness and disease to one based on wellness and prevention.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Don't let the majority fool you today by saying this legislation is a cost-saving measure. Several things that they won't be highlighting in relation to this legislation are the cost of treating these chronic diseases in Texas alone totaled over \$17.2 billion, and chronic diseases resulted in \$75.3 billion in lost productivity and economic costs to Texas.

If we want to have a debate on saving money and creating jobs, I would like the majority to show us their job-creating and deficit-reduction plan. They have been in power for 100 days, and we have spent most of the time by creating more debt by repealing provisions in health reform that would actually save my State billions of dollars. Today is yet another example of the majority's misguided priorities.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, please inform both sides the remaining amount of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 7 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. 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. 1354, the American Jobs Matter Act of 2011.

To address that, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, in Washington over the last few months, we have seen a lot of what we are seeing today, a lot of talk from my Republican colleagues about ideological budget cuts and about divisive social issues. And today, once more, we are here debating repeal of part or all of the health care bill.

But back home, we are hearing about one thing and largely one thing only, and that is job creation. Now, I appreciate my friend from North Carolina dressing up her remarks with some talk about jobs, but this debate today isn't about creating jobs. It is about a political agenda to take on the Democratically passed health care bill.

But we need to start plugging into where Main Street is and having a real conversation about job creation in this country, and so I am here today to talk about one idea in particular that can reach out to the 5,000 manufacturers in my State, and the tens of thousands more of manufacturing employees who are looking for good middle class work and help from Congress that hasn't been forthcoming in the last 3 months.

Since 2001, this country has shut down over 42,000 manufacturing plants. We have lost about 5 million manufacturing jobs; but during that same period of time, we have increased spending on defense manufacturing in this

country by 81 percent. The problem is that 81 percent increase hasn't gone to factories in Connecticut or North Carolina or Florida or anywhere else. It has gone overseas because after building loophole after loophole into our domestic sourcing laws, like the Buy America Act, we are hemorrhaging manufacturing jobs in part because we are spending more and more taxpayer dollars overseas.

So we need to defeat this previous question so we can bring a commonsense jobs bill to the floor of the House of Representatives, the American Jobs Matter Act.

Now, let me explain what this bill does. It is pretty simple. It says that anytime a Federal agency is awarding a contract, in particular the Department of Defense, that they can give a leg up, that they can give preference to the bidder who promises and guarantees to create more U.S. jobs. Most of my constituents think that already happens. They already think we have some system in place to make sure that our taxpayer dollars are being used to give preference to American companies rather than foreign companies. It is not happening. The law doesn't allow it.

So let's pass today the American Jobs Matter Act. It will make sure that our money gets spent on our jobs here at home.

A quick story from Connecticut: I have a company that makes copper nickel tubing in Waterbury, Connecticut. They are the only American company that supplies that product to the Virginia submarine class. There is one company in Europe that makes it. But because we can't give them preference by law today, they have lost one of their two most important contracts to that European supplier, and along with it dozens of American jobs. That is our money going overseas, and we need to do something about it rather than debating the health care bill all over again.

When people really care about building back those manufacturing jobs, we should in fact be spending every day in this Congress talking about bills like the American Jobs Matter Act. Instead, we are talking about defunding Sesame Street, about destroying Planned Parenthood, and once again today talking about repealing the health care bill; and, in fact, a part of the health care bill that is going to create jobs through preventive health care services.

It is no wonder that Americans think so little of this Republican Congress, because they are not focused on what people out there are focused on, J-O-B-S, jobs. The American Jobs Matter Act, if we bring it to the floor today, is a commonsense measure to simply target taxpayer money to the creation of American jobs. We don't have to spend any more money to create American jobs. We just have to spend the money we are already spending better. We spend half the military dollars in the

world coming out of the U.S. budget, and this engine of expenditure should be used not only to make this country stronger militarily, but also to make it stronger economically.

□ 1430

The American Jobs Matter Act is one way to get there. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can get to the real business of this country—creating good-paying middle class jobs.

Ms. FOXX. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that the gentleman from Connecticut spoke to 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 yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, no prevention and public health funds are or can be used to pay for abortions, and this bill has absolutely nothing to do with that. What it will stop, this bill as offered by the ruling Republican House, is immunization for kids and seniors, programs to stop childhood obesity and to prevent heart disease and diabetes. That's what they are stopping. Please don't be misled. No dollars from this fund will be used for abortion.

If we as legislators are to be about the business of helping Americans live healthy, productive lives, we must change our fundamental approach to health care by investing in illness prevention, not just treatment.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is the key to a coordinated, comprehensive, sustainable and accountable approach to improving our Nation's health outcomes. I would also add that at a time when Americans are looking to Congress for leadership, the Republican ruling majority in the House are continuing their assault on comprehensive health care reform that expands coverage to 32 million people instead of focusing on job creation.

It's time to stop playing games with the health of the American people and get down to business. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so that we can debate and pass a jobs bill without any further delay. I also urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would just like to say in response to my colleague from Florida that I think this rule and the underlying bill have a lot more to do with elective abortions than they do with government contracting.

Mr. Speaker, we have discussed at great length today why Secretary

Sebelius does not need a slush fund set on autopilot. The American people expect their elected representatives to be wise guardians of their hard-earned dollars. They vehemently objected to the ruling Democrat agenda of Federal overreach into their daily lives and sent a clear message to Washington last November: Government must be responsible and accountable.

All across America, American families are tightening their belts, cutting their budgets and living within their means. It's time Washington did the same.

For these reasons and many more, I urge my colleagues, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bill so we can restore congressional spending oversight and save the taxpayers \$16 billion over the next 10 years.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 219 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. 1354) to amend titles 10 and 41, United States Code, to allow contracting officers to consider information regarding domestic employment before awarding a Federal contract, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. 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.

Ms. FOXX. 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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-

minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 219, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 218; and adoption of House Resolution 218, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 182, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—238

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

NAYS—182

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

NOT VOTING—12

□ 1459

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. COURTNEY and INSLEE, and Ms. EDWARDS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 180, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

YEAS—237

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

NAYS—180

Ackerman	Braley (IA)	Clarke (NY)
Altmire	Brown (FL)	Cleaver
Andrews	Butterfield	Clyburn
Baca	Capps	Cohen
Baldwin	Capuano	Connolly (VA)
Barrow	Cardoza	Conyers
Bass (CA)	Carnahan	Cooper
Becerra	Carney	Costa
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Costello
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Bishop (NY)	Chandler	Critz
Blumenauer	Chu	Crowley
Boswell	Ciilline	Cuellar
Brady (PA)	Clarke (MI)	Cummings

Davis (CA)	Kissell	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Richardson
DeFazio	Langevin	Richmond
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ross (AR)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Levin	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Doggett	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Donnelly (IN)	Loeb sack	Sánchez, Linda
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	T.
Edwards	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	Luján	Sarbanes
Eshoo	Lynch	Schiff
Farr	Maloney	Schrader
Fattah	Markey	Schwartz
Filner	Matheson	Scott (VA)
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Scott, David
Fudge	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Garamendi	McCollum	Sewell
Gonzalez	McDermott	Sherman
Green, Al	McGovern	Sires
Green, Gene	McNerney	Slaughter
Grijalva	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Gutierrez	Miller (NC)	Speier
Hanabusa	Miller, George	Stark
Hastings (FL)	Moore	Sutton
Heinrich	Moran	Thompson (CA)
Higgins	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Himes	Nadler	Tierney
Hinchey	Napolitano	Tonko
Hirono	Neal	Towns
Holden	Oliver	Tsongas
Holt	Owens	Van Hollen
Honda	Pallone	Visclosky
Hoyer	Pascarell	Walz (MN)
Inlee	Pastor (AZ)	Wasserman
Israel	Payne	Schultz
Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Waters
Jackson Lee	Perlmutter	Watt
(TX)	Peters	Waxman
Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Weiner
Johnson, E. B.	Polis	Welch
Kaptur	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Keating	Quigley	Woolsey
Kildee	Rahall	Wu
Kind	Rangel	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Berman	Giffords	Palazzo
Cantor	Hinojosa	Reichert
Clay	McCarthy (CA)	Schakowsky
Engel	Meeks	Velázquez
Fleming	Olson	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1505

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 258, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 258, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 258, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1473, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 35, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 36, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 218) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

YEAS—242

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

Lankford	Palazzo	Scott, Austin
Latham	Paul	Sensenbrenner
LaTourette	Paulsen	Sessions
Latta	Pearce	Shimkus
Lewis (CA)	Pence	Shuler
LoBiondo	Petri	Shuster
Long	Pitts	Simpson
Lucas	Platts	Smith (NE)
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Lummis	Pompeo	Smith (TX)
Lungren, Daniel	Possey	Southerland
E.	Price (GA)	Stearns
Mack	Quayle	Stivers
Manzullo	Reed	Stutzman
Marchant	Rehberg	Sullivan
Marino	Renacci	Terry
McCarthy (CA)	Ribble	Thompson (PA)
McCaul	Rigell	Thornberry
McClintock	Rivera	Tiberi
McCotter	Roby	Tipton
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Tipton
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Turner
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Upton
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Walberg
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Walden
Meehan	Rokita	Walsh (IL)
Mica	Rooney	Webster
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	West
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Westmoreland
Miller, Gary	Ross (FL)	Whitfield
Mulvaney	Royce	Wilson (SC)
Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Wittman
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Wolf
Neugebauer	Scalise	Womack
Noem	Schilling	Woodall
Nugent	Schmidt	Yoder
Nunes	Schock	Young (FL)
Nunnelee	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Olson	Scott (SC)	

NAYS—183

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