

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlemen from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members shall have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, America's 27 million small businesses drive U.S. economic growth and innovation. Those small companies have created 64 percent of our net new jobs over the past 15 years. Strong and vibrant economies are built from the ground up, and as our Nation's entrepreneurs are making decisions to take risks and invest they need to know that their elected officials are looking out for them and providing them with the certainty they need to have confidence moving forward. That confidence will result in increased economic output, new jobs, and a better way of life for all Americans.

The legislation we have before us is a simple extension of programs overseen by the Small Business Administration through September 30, 2011. The current authorizing legislation expires at the end of this month, and we need additional time to continue our legislative work.

Chief among the programs we are extending today is the Small Business Innovative Research Act, the largest Federal Government small business research and development initiative. Earlier this month, the Small Business Committee held a markup of legislation that would fully authorize the SBIR program through 2014. This bipartisan legislation passed our committee by voice vote, and we are ready to bring this legislation to the floor to provide our small entrepreneurs with the certainty that they need to move forward. Unfortunately, the long term SBIR reauthorization introduced by our counterparts in the other body has been stalled and the prospect of them passing that legislation still remains unclear. We have reached out to the other body and are continuing a constructive dialogue on finding a solution to fully authorize the SBIR program as well as other important small business initiatives. It is my hope that we can continue to work in a bipartisan and bicameral way to pass this long-term reauthorization.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on S. 990, as amended.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the economy is showing signs of recovery on several fronts, adding 1 million jobs in the last 6 months. While this is very good news, we still have a long way to go, and this is why we need small firms more than ever.

Small businesses, which create two-thirds of new jobs, drive employment gains and economic expansion. Time and again, they have generated the ideas and know-how that spark job growth. However, entrepreneurs must have the resources and tools they need to start up or expand. The legislation we are considering today provides them and extends the authorization of several Small Business Administration programs. For many firms these initiatives are critical, enabling them to secure financing and more effectively compete for Federal contracts.

While we must keep these programs operational, it is unfortunate that we are doing so through another temporary extension. However, it is my hope that we can reach a lasting agreement on the agency's authorization so that we do not have to come back here again in a few months.

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

I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me reiterate that small businesses can and will lead our economic recovery, and this is a very strong case for fully authorizing the SBIR and STTR programs. They have a proven track record of creating jobs, advancing innovative science in the marketplace, and solving Federal agency problems.

These programs provide a bridge between product conception and marketability—a step of vital importance for innovative ideas to become a reality. The new technologies and discoveries that come out of these programs go a long way towards keeping our competitive edge in the world marketplace, and the SBIR and the STTR programs are the kind of public-private partnership that is essential to the continued growth of our economy.

I look forward to working with Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ, our colleagues on the Small Business Committee, and our colleagues in the other body on a long-term reauthorization in the coming months.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 990, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 274

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—Mr. Goodlatte, to rank immediately after Ms. Foxx.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1310

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1216, REPEALING MANDATORY FUNDING FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1540, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012; AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 269 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 269

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. 1216) to amend the Public Health Service Act to convert funding for graduate medical education in qualified teaching health centers from direct appropriations to an authorization of appropriations. 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 received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII in a daily issue dated May 23, 2011, and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. 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 recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. 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. 1540) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2012, 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 Armed Services. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of May 27, 2011, providing for consideration or disposition of a measure addressing expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 269 provides for a modified open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1216,

which amends the Public Health Service Act to convert funding for graduate medical education in qualified teaching health centers from mandatory spending to an authorization of appropriations; H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act; and same-day consideration of a rule to consider extending certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh modified open rule that the House Republican majority has offered this Congress, compared to the liberal Democrats' one modified open rule during the entire 111th Congress.

The first underlying bill today, H.R. 1216, continues the fulfillment of the Republican Pledge to America and illustrates that once again Republicans are keeping our promises to the American people to cut Federal spending. The American people want transparency of Washington's spending of hard-earned taxpayer dollars. In an act of gross irresponsibility, the Federal Government is spending \$1 out of \$4 of gross domestic product.

We hear the term "Federal money" as though it is manna from heaven. Let me dispel that misconception, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government has only the money it takes away from hardworking American families through taxes or the money it borrows. As a Nation, we are currently borrowing 43 cents for every dollar spent at the Federal level.

Some argue that to balance the Federal Government and pay down our debt, we should raise taxes. As a fiscal conservative, I have to disagree. Raising taxes on hardworking Americans and job creators is simply a way to pass the blame. We must rein in out-of-control Washington spending and put an end to it. The American people are sick and tired of reckless government spending and Washington's disregard for basic budgeting principles of living within its means. This is one of the many reasons I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill before us today, Mr. Speaker.

H.R. 1216 restores congressional oversight to Federal spending by ending the autopilot spending for physician residency programs at teaching health centers and restoring it to the annual appropriations process. When a program is put on autopilot, Congress abdicates its authority to unelected bureaucrats and takes a hands-off approach. House Republicans are committed to ending that approach to Federal spending and ensuring that government programs are accountable for how they are spending money. No longer will we accept politically popular excuses. Each program must prove that it is a wise steward of taxpayer dollars. If Congress will not address out-of-control spending now, we are passing the buck to our children and grandchildren.

Therefore, I commend my Republican colleagues at the House Energy and Commerce Committee for seeking to end mandatory or autopilot funding for programs in the liberal Democrats'

government takeover of health care. 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, Mr. Speaker, to explain the difference between discretionary and mandatory government spending. Discretionary spending is appropriated by Congress annually and, therefore, subject to congressional oversight and review. Discretionary spending allows Members of Congress the opportunity to be wise stewards of the taxpayers' money by not funding ineffective or duplicative programs. On the contrary, mandatory spending operates irrespective of congressional appropriations 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 for a particular benefit.

It cannot be emphasized enough that the liberal elites in Washington chose to hastily ram through their government takeover of health care with no regard for the staunch opposition of the American people. The audacity of an elected official or, worse, an unelected bureaucrat basically saying to a taxpayer that he or she knows how to spend the taxpayer's money better than the individual taxpayer is appalling. That is what the ruling liberal elites in Washington did when they chose to forgo the annual appropriations, also known as oversight, process by putting their favorite programs on autopilot under ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that Washington should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. During committee consideration of the underlying bill, my Republican colleagues rightly pointed out that the liberal Democrats in control last Congress put the funding for residencies at teaching health centers on autopilot but left residency programs at children's hospitals to fend for themselves in the annual appropriations process. In fact, President Obama's FY 2012 budget proposes eliminating funding for residency programs at children's hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to understand why residencies at teaching health centers should receive special treatment. Why were these residency programs protected while others languished and were eventually proposed to be eliminated?

□ 1320

This is a classic example of Washington bureaucrats deciding which programs will win and which will lose. As I said earlier, every program should be properly scrutinized by Congress

through the appropriations process and be accountable for how it is spending taxpayer money. While this accountability should always be important, it's even more critical because we're facing the third straight year of trillion dollar deficits. This fiscal year our deficit will be \$1.6 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, remember the figure I mentioned earlier about our Nation's borrowing habits? We're borrowing 43 cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends. This translates to a national debt that has now reached more than \$14 trillion and has gotten the attention of the American people. If you're having a hard time visualizing \$14 trillion, let me put it this way: If America was required to pay back its national debt right now, each citizen—man, woman, and child—would owe more than \$46,000.

The simple truth is that we have a spending crisis in this town due in large part to mandatory spending that operates on autopilot. House Republicans are committed to bringing government spending under control, and we're continuing to build on our Pledge to America by restoring congressional oversight and accountability for government programs.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina and my friend, Dr. FOXX, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this rule allows for the consideration of H.R. 1216, the Graduate Medical Education Direct Spending Repeal Act, and general debate for H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, and this rule also allows for a martial law consideration of the reauthorization of the Patriot Act sometime this week.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this is a disappointing rule. While I have no problem with a rule providing for general debate for the Defense authorization bill, it is disappointing that this rule also includes these two other provisions—especially the martial law rule.

Let me begin with H.R. 1216. This bill is simple—it's another chance for the Republicans to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. It's one more part of their repeal agenda.

The funny thing is, Mr. Speaker, Republicans continue to push their repeal agenda, but they haven't put any plan forward to replace these new health care provisions that we passed. The truth is that the Republicans are not only trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act, they are also trying to repeal Medicare. This is outrageous. The American people do not want the House Republicans to dismantle Medicare.

The Affordable Care Act, Mr. Speaker, provides dedicated funding for the training of family doctors through graduate medical education programs at teaching health centers. The Republicans, while they claim they support doctors and training programs, don't believe in this dedicated funding. This bill not only rescinds the direct funding for these programs, it reduces the authorization by nearly \$50 million.

Now, everyone knows there is a shortage of primary care physicians in this country. Why, then, do Republicans want to undercut efforts to bring physicians into areas of desperate need?

Making these funds discretionary will jeopardize the 11 programs currently underway across the country—including one program in my home State of Massachusetts. Making these funds discretionary does nothing to help our constituents who are struggling to obtain primary care. Making this program discretionary will deter other entities from making business decisions necessary to expand residency training—decisions like securing commitments from key stakeholders to agree to train new or additional residents, applying for accreditation if not already eligible, and hiring new faculty with funding over the next few years.

Finally, claims that this bill saves hundreds of millions of dollars are just not true. Republicans may claim that this bill will cut nearly \$200 million from the deficit, but that's only true if Congress provides no funding for this program. CBO—the nonpartisan budget arbiter that Republicans frequently ignore—estimates that \$184 million will be appropriated over 5 years, meaning only \$11 million will be saved by H.R. 1216. So claims of this incredible fiscal austerity are simply not true.

Now, a second part of this rule is the martial law portion for same-day consideration of the Patriot Act extension. The Senate is currently debating this reauthorization, and the Republicans feel it necessary to once again jam this bill through this House as soon as the Senate is done with it. This is no way to debate legislation dealing with our homeland security and basic civil rights and civil liberties. This is an important issue. Members need time to be able to understand all of the implications of the Patriot Act.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, let me say just a few words about the fiscal year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act which we will begin general debate on later today.

All Members of this House are strongly committed to protecting our national security—regardless of party, region, or political point of view. It has been the tradition of the House Armed Services Committee, at the staff and Member level, to work in a bipartisan way to carefully craft the annual defense authorizations bill, and I recognize Chairman BUCK McKEON and Ranking Member ADAM SMITH for continuing that collegiality.

But given such a tradition, it comes as a surprise to see so many provisions in H.R. 1540 that attempt to repudiate and attack several of the President's national security policies. From warehousing low-level detainees for an indeterminate amount of time, to delaying the implementation of the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, to hamstringing the implementation of the bipartisan-supported New START Treaty, to seeking a so-called updated authorization for the use of military force that no longer references the devastating 9/11 attacks against America, but instead gives broad authority to the executive branch to pursue military operations anywhere for any length of time—such changes have all the appearance of a partisan agenda.

This afternoon, the Rules Committee will be reviewing many of the amendments on these and other issues, and I hope that they will be made in order so that a broad range of issues and recommendations might be considered and voted upon by this body.

Now, a number of those amendments will deal with the future of our policy and military operations in Afghanistan.

As most of my colleagues know, I believe that we need to rethink our strategy in Afghanistan. It is bankrupting our Nation. The gentlelady from North Carolina talks about the deficit. I will remind her and others that we are borrowing to pay for the war in Afghanistan. We are borrowing approximately \$8.2 billion a month. That's billion with a "b."

So if we're going to get serious about deficit reduction, we either need to end these wars—which I think we should do—or if you support them, you ought to pay for them.

This war has already demanded the lives of 1,573 of our service men and women and gravely wounded tens of thousands of our troops. And right now, there is no true end in sight.

The death of Osama bin Laden creates an opportunity for us to reexamine our policy in Afghanistan and ask the President exactly how and when he will bring the last troops home to their families and their communities.

The death of bin Laden provides us with a moment to commend our intelligence and uniformed men and women, and it also allows us to bring fresh eyes to what kind of defense budget and priorities best fit the needs of our Nation and our national security, especially in these difficult economic times.

I hope that the Rules Committee will embrace such a debate, allow a broad range of amendments to be made in order, and support a fresh and critical examination of the policies and priorities put forward in H.R. 1540.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for bringing up some issues that need to be responded to.

First of all, let me say he says that we plan to repeal Medicare. It was the

Democrats who, in voting for the health care act that took over health care in this country to the Federal Government, who cut \$500 billion from Medicare—a half a trillion dollars. Republicans have made no recommendations to cut Medicare at all. Only the Democrats have voted to do that. Not Republicans.

Republicans want to save Medicare, Mr. Speaker. That is what we are doing. We're recommending that we save Medicare for the future. The Democrats are the only ones who want to repeal Medicare by cutting that money from it.

Let me mention a couple of other things that my colleague has spoken about in terms of underlying bills.

□ 1330

In terms of the Patriot Act, I believe it is the Attorney General, the Democrat Attorney General, Mr. Holder, who has recommended not only that the Patriot Act be renewed, but that all three of these provisions be made permanent. It is coming from that side of the aisle that they want the Patriot Act renewed. So their President is pushing for this.

In terms of borrowing for the war, Mr. Speaker, you know, it is the Federal Government and only the Federal Government that provides for the national defense of this country. That is why we have a Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. It's why we became the United States. No other branch of government can provide for our national security. Every other branch of government, however, can handle health care, can handle education, can handle many of the things that the Federal Government has gotten itself into that it has no business being involved in. So if we had to borrow money, we wouldn't be borrowing money if we weren't in these other things. We would have ample resources to provide for the national defense.

But I would also like to point out to my colleague from Massachusetts that it was a Democratic President who took us into a third war, with no authorization from the Congress. And it is not the Republicans who are creating this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill made in order under this rule is H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend we will all pause to observe Memorial Day, as we should. As we debate this very important bill, we need to keep in mind the men and women of the Armed Forces and their families. We also need to keep in mind those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of all of our freedoms, including this process of freely debating our laws and the idea of the role of government. We could not be here today without the sacrifices of those who served in the military and kept us a free people. I hope that's what everyone keeps on their mind this weekend when they celebrate Memorial Day.

As James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers, "The operations of the Federal Government will be most extensive and important in times of war and danger." Our Founding Fathers had a clear view that the primary and central job of the Federal Government was to "provide for the common defense." Providing for the common defense is the mandate of our Constitution. It's not an issue that should divide us in partisan rancor, but unite us as a country that supports our military and provides them with the tools to do their very important job.

One need not look too far back in history to find words that remind us of our responsibility to provide for the common defense. President Ronald Reagan, in his first inaugural address, promised to "check and reverse the growth of government," but also to "maintain sufficient strength to prevail if need be, knowing that if we do so we will have the best chance of never having to use that strength." That message, Mr. Speaker, still holds true today.

Not only does this bill ensure that our troops are properly equipped, but it also provides the men and women of the military and their families with the resources and support they need, deserve, and have earned. The fiscal year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act takes a detailed approach to ensuring that the investments in our national security are in line with our fiscal priorities and realities.

The bill has a clear mandate of fiscal responsibility, transparency, and accountability within the Department of Defense. It also provides incentives to have competition for every taxpayer dollar associated with funding of defense requirements. The bill addresses a wide range of recent policy changes at the Department of Defense, including the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell; reaffirming the Defense of Marriage Act, which protects one man-one woman marriage; as well as ensuring that our military is properly equipped, trained, and staffed for any future threats to our national security.

Just as our men and women in uniform stand ready to defend our country, Congress must also tackle the fiscal crisis facing our Nation. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, is more dangerous to our national security than the crushing debt that our country is in. Many of my colleagues have come to the floor warning that the sky was going to fall and Armageddon would be upon us if we did not raise the debt ceiling. Well, last week we hit the debt ceiling, and guess what? The sky is still up there and we are paying our bills.

History shows that in 1985, 1995, and 2002, Congress delayed raising the debt ceiling for months without an Armageddon-like economic meltdown. Our intent on this side of the aisle is to pay down the debt with fiscally disciplined and responsible budgets that reduce deficit spending. With a system like that in place, there will be no need to

continue to raise the debt ceiling and create further financial burdens that could cost each American over \$40,000. Imagine a better American future. Imagine what Americans can achieve if we are freed from Washington's debt burden.

On March 16, 2006, a young Senator took the floor in the United States Senate and said, "The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It's a sign we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policy." Mr. Speaker, that Senator voted against raising the debt ceiling, and that Senator was Barack Obama, our current President. As far as that statement goes, I agree with the President that our dependency on foreign funds is reckless and a danger to our national security.

Just as dangerous is the failure to achieve energy security. Republicans strongly believe that energy security depends on domestic energy production. Our friends, the liberal Democrats and President Obama, have actively blocked and delayed American energy production, destroying jobs, raising energy prices, and making the U.S. more reliant on unstable foreign countries for energy. This is hurting American families and small businesses, who are vital to creating the new private sector jobs we so desperately need during this time of high unemployment.

The liberal proposals fail to create jobs in America but help create jobs overseas for the citizens of foreign nations. We need policies that allow us to take advantage of our natural resources and our innovative culture to develop new sources of energy and create jobs here at home.

To date, the Obama administration has pursued an anti-energy agenda, rife with policies that block domestic energy production and destroy jobs. The consequences of this agenda are dire. In the short term, it fuels a rise in gas prices and costs for consumers, and in the long term it limits innovation and stifles economic growth and job creation.

Mr. Speaker, we need to approve this rule which we are debating and the underlying bills so that we can stop the funding of abortions and so that we can fund our military. And we need to look at the other policies that are being promoted by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and in the White House to see that we can become more secure as a Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel I need to clarify the record on a couple of things.

My friend from North Carolina said that the Republicans want to protect Medicare. I would suggest that she read the bill that she voted for and other Republicans voted for, the so-called

Ryan budget. The way they protect Medicare is by destroying it. They turn it into a voucher system. And it will mean seniors will pay more and they will get less protection. It is outrageous what they're proposing. And more and more Americans are reading the bill, and they are outraged by what they are seeing.

Democrats, and I hope some thoughtful Republicans, will stand firm and protect Medicare. It is the most important, successful program in our history, along with Social Security. And efforts to dismantle it and to put more burden on our senior citizens for their health care, and basically a major giveaway to the insurance companies, is not protecting Medicare.

□ 1340

The gentlelady talks about the reckless spending in Washington. I will remind all of my colleagues that when Bill Clinton left office, we didn't have a deficit; we were paying down our debt. There was a detailed article in *The Washington Post* not too long ago explaining how we went from no deficit to now a huge deficit. It includes tax giveaways to the wealthiest people in this country that were not paid for, you know.

I find it somewhat sad that one of the first things that was done in terms of addressing some of our economic concerns was to protect the tax cuts for people like Donald Trump but then to go in and cut emergency fuel assistance for poor people and to go after food and nutrition programs and Pell Grants. That's not the way we should be balancing the budget.

But *The Washington Post* talks about these tax cuts for the wealthy that were not paid for; on top of that, two wars that were not paid for. Now, I am against these wars; but if you are for them, you ought to pay for them. That's the way we have done it throughout our history. World War II, we paid for it. There was a war tax. We had war bonds. The Vietnam War was paid for in part by eroding Lyndon Johnson's Great Society. It was paid for. But now we have these wars that are not paid for, \$8.2 billion a month in Afghanistan alone.

So I hope this is not a partisan agenda when we talk about the war in Afghanistan, and I am not here to put the blame on one party or another. I hope that we can have these amendments on the floor and have some thoughtful discussion about ways we could bring this war to an end. I think Democrats, and I know a lot of Republicans, feel that we should bring this war to an end.

In terms of energy policy, I think people are horrified that we continue to protect taxpayer subsidies to Big Oil companies while they are gouging us at the gas pump. It is unbelievable that we can't have a debate on this floor about taking away these taxpayer subsidies to Big Oil that are making record profits. So I hope that we will talk a little bit more about that at the end of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a former member of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation. H.R. 1216 would put the future primary care workforce into question.

The Affordable Care Act included critical funding for several grant programs designed to increase the size of the health care workforce and, specifically, to increase the number of general practice and primary care physicians. Primary care has long been neglected in our country and it has been well documented that our country faces a looming shortage of primary care providers.

The Affordable Care Act will help train and develop 16,000 new primary care providers. That means 16,000 more primary care doctors to help keep our children and families healthy, as studies strongly associate healthier outcomes with regular access to care.

Unfortunately, the bill before us would call all of this into question. If this bill were enacted, we would no longer have the pipeline of primary care providers to meet demand and we would continue the status quo, which for too many is either foregoing care or seeking care in the emergency room. This perpetuates the onset of chronic conditions such as heart disease, diabetes, and cancer. This is increasing costs and costing lives.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and to vote down this bill for the future of our physical and fiscal health of our constituents and our country.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you very much, Mr. MCGOVERN.

And to my friend on the other side of the aisle, I want to say that I will be offering an amendment to the defense authorization bill which would defund the war in Libya. The war is unconstitutional. The President did not come to this Congress. He went to the U.N. Security Council. He went to a number of international bodies. He didn't come to the United States Congress. Last week, the President did not observe the tolling of the War Powers Act; so he is in violation of the statute.

The action over in Libya has already exceeded the U.N. mandate. It's in violation of the U.N. mandate, and there have been violations of international law. What are we doing there? What does anyone think we can afford, and why aren't we trying to find a path to peace so we aren't called upon to spend more money there?

I mean, these are questions we have to be asking. That is why Congress should start by saying, look, you are not going to spend any more money

over there. And there are people who are saying, Mr. Speaker, that, well, it's not the United States; it's NATO.

Now, think about this. The Guardian UK did this study where 93 percent of the cruise missiles are paid for by the US; 66 percent of the personnel involved in Libya, against Libya, from the U.S.; 50 percent of the aircraft, 50 percent of all ships. And they're saying this is a NATO operation?

Come on. I mean, we really have to recognize what's going on here, which is an expansion of the war power by the Executive, and it's time that we challenge that. And one thing we certainly shouldn't do is to support the amendment offered by my friend Mr. MCKEON that wants to hand over to the President Congress' constitutional authority to declare an authorized war, substantially altering the delicate balance of power which the Founding Fathers envisioned.

The annual reauthorization of the Department of Defense contains unprecedented and dangerous language, which gives the President virtually unchecked power to take this country to war and to keep us there.

The bill substantially undermines the Constitution, the institution that the Constitution set up, that is, Congress, and sets the United States on a path to permanent war.

Congress has to protect the American people from the overreach of any Chief Executive—Democrat, Republican—any Chief Executive who is enamored with unilateralism, preemption, first strike, and the power to prosecute war without constitutional authority or statutory prescriptions.

Permanent global war isn't the answer. It's not going to increase our national security. Far from ridding the world of terrorism, it will become a terrorist recruitment program. The war in Iraq, based on lies. The war in Afghanistan, based on a misreading of history. Yet in Iraq we will spend over \$3 trillion. In Afghanistan we have already spent over a half trillion dollars.

We have people out of work here. We have people who are losing their homes, losing their health care, losing their retirement security, and all we hear from the White House is they want more war or they want authorization for more war. We have to stop that. And while we're stopping that, we have to stop this national security state and stop the extension of the Patriot Act, which is also in this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I need to point out to my colleague from Massachusetts, as I do almost every time that we are on the floor together, and I do enjoy being on the floor with him, that he always brings up the fact that we had a surplus when President Clinton left office. Well, the reason we had a surplus, Mr. Speaker, when President Clinton left office had nothing to do with President Clinton. It had all to do with the fact that we had Republicans in charge of the Congress.

And just before the Democrats took over the Congress in 2007, as my colleague from Massachusetts so well knows, the CBO projected that there would be a surplus in the United States. However, the Democrats took over in January of 2007 and immediately we began running deficits because of their profligate spending.

I would also like to point out to my colleague from Massachusetts, as he so well knows, that the Democrats who are in control of the Senate held a vote last week on whether or not to change the Tax Code in order to disallow incentives that are given to the oil companies for securing oil for this country. And as he knows, again, it's controlled by the Democrats. It was turned down by the Senate.

So I would like to point out to him that Republicans are not responsible for the deficit and Republicans are not responsible for denying legal tax exemptions to oil companies. It is the Democrats who are responsible for that.

I will allow my colleague to make comments, but I won't allow him to rewrite history.

□ 1350

Mr. Speaker, we have great political unrest in the Middle East, and the growing demand from China threatens our ability to secure long-term reserves of oil from foreign entities. That's why we must pursue an alternative energy policy in this country, one that puts to use our domestic supplies and technologies.

Republicans are going to continue to pursue an all-of-the-above energy plan aimed at increasing our domestic production to bring down energy prices while creating jobs here at home and ending our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

What that means, Mr. Speaker, is we believe in conservation, we believe in alternatives, but we also believe in using the resources that the good Lord gave us here in this country which are being denied to the American people by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Mr. Speaker, American families cannot wait any longer for relief at the pump. American families cannot wait any longer for increased jobs.

As we head back to our districts for the Memorial Day holiday, it's fitting that we should all give thanks to those who have given their lives in defense of the freedom that we very much cherish. Every day, courageous young men and women from all over America volunteer to serve our country in the military. They do not join for the great pay, luxurious lifestyle and swanky accommodations. They join the military and serve with dignity and honor because they love this country and they love what we stand for. They serve a much higher purpose than themselves. What our troops provide for us can be summarized in one word: America.

We need now to all come together as supporters of the young men and

women of the Armed Forces and their families as proud Americans and provide them with the tools and resources that these brave volunteers deserve, which is why my colleagues and I all need to vote for the underlying bill, the Defense authorization bill.

But we also need to vote for the rule, which is going to allow for almost an unlimited number of amendments to be offered, Mr. Speaker, unlike what our colleagues did when they were in charge in the 110th and 111th Congresses.

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

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

The late great Daniel Patrick Moynihan once said, you're entitled to your own opinions, but not your own facts. And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, when this record surplus was turned into a record deficit, I will remind the gentlelady that the Republicans controlled the House, they controlled the Senate, and they controlled the White House. And that is when we passed these tax cuts for the richest people in the world, and they were not paid for. And that is when we embarked on two wars that were not paid for.

It appears that the gentlelady wants to continue these wars. I want to end them. But if you're going to continue them, then pay for them, because it is not fair to the men and women who are sacrificing their lives and the men and women who are in harm's way and their families to just accumulate all this debt and pass it on to them, their children and their grandchildren. If we are going to go to war, we all ought to take some responsibility.

And, finally, on the issue of the taxpayer subsidies for oil companies, we have not had a debate on this House floor or a vote on this House floor on this. I don't care what the Senate did or did not do. I'm not a Member of the United States Senate. I'm a Member of the United States House of Representatives. And under this new and open process that we were promised, by the way, not a single open rule yet—not a single open rule—but under this new and open process, we can't bring an amendment to the floor to be able to debate this issue.

So I would respectfully suggest that maybe my colleague from North Carolina and the Rules Committee will once in a while vote for an open rule so we can bring some of these things to the floor.

At this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill in its current form.

By delaying the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, this bill will weaken our Armed Forces and further confuse an issue that our country and our military have simply moved past. This bill in its current form says to gay and lesbian servicemembers, you're welcome to

fight and die for our country as long as you live in secret.

Mr. Speaker, Don't Ask, Don't Tell requires brave men and women in our military to live in constant fear of being dismissed for an aspect of their personal lives that has no bearing on their job performance.

It's a law that serves no purpose. It's a law that hinders our military's effectiveness. It's a law that Congress has already voted to appeal. And it's a law, frankly, that's un-American. Yet here we are, again, considering a bill that would continue to codify discrimination. We should not go back to those dark days, and we will not go back.

In April, the service chiefs reported to the House Armed Services Committee that the process of certifying the end of Don't Ask, Don't Tell is moving forward, and the response from servicemembers has been overwhelmingly positive. Vice Admiral Gortney, staff director for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, reported the appeals process was moving ahead without incident. Clifford Stanley, under Secretary of Defense for personnel and readiness, told the committee that training programs to prepare for the repeal are going "extremely well."

So we know the military supports moving forward, as do the vast majority of the American people: 72 percent support the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

Don't Ask, Don't Tell hurts military readiness and national security every day. To date, over 13,000 servicemembers who have been trained at taxpayer expense have been forced out of the military under this policy. It's hard to believe that dismissing mission-critical servicemembers or linguists fluent in Arabic, Korean and Farsi will somehow make us more effective or combat ready. The Commander in Chief, the Secretary of Defense, who I might add was originally appointed by President Bush, as well as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, support repeal.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for Don't Ask, Don't Tell to move from the law books to the dustbins of history. Its only value is as a lesson to future generations that our Nation is stronger when we welcome all members of the American family and weaker when we divide and discriminate.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and support the gentleman's motion to move the previous question. This motion demonstrates we are serious about creating jobs, growing the economy, and lowering gas prices.

My Republican colleagues are instead relitigating an issue that was debated exhaustively over the past year. As I traveled all across my district last week, not surprisingly, not a single one

of my constituents said the health reform should be altered to fund graduate medical education in qualified teaching health centers through direct appropriations. Rather, my constituents want to hear what Congress is doing now to lower the price of a gallon of gas. They want to know how we are responding to turmoil in the Middle East and speculation by Wall Street, which are causing this price spike.

In Montauk Point, the eastern most point of my district, regular unleaded gas cost \$4.89 a gallon yesterday. Recreational and commercial fishermen, small businesses and the whole local economy are all being squeezed by gas prices.

My constituents want to know what Congress is doing in response and how we plan to create jobs and expand our economy. But since the new Republican majority took over this year, we haven't debated a single jobs initiative or any meaningful proposal to reduce the price of gas for consumers—not one. In the 140 days since the 112th Congress began, we have debated zero job bills and only a handful of bills related to energy, most of which focus on reducing the price of gas 10 years from now, maybe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can focus on our priorities: Reducing gas prices, creating jobs and helping middle class American keep up in today's economy.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I ask how much time I have remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from North Carolina has 9 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to support the efforts of my colleague from New York (Mr. BISHOP). And let me just say the American people are sending a clear message to Republicans: Show us the jobs. After 140 days of the new GOP majority, they keep pursuing their agenda that destroys jobs and stalls our economic growth.

This week is no different. And today, Republicans are only making matters worse, voting to kill graduate medical education in qualified teaching health care centers.

The previous question, as Mr. BISHOP referred to it, is based on H.R. 964, the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act. And it takes a stand for working families facing tough times and paying so much more at the pump. During an international oil crisis, as declared by the President, this legislation makes it illegal to sell gasoline at excessive prices and prevents Big Oil from taking advantage of consumers and engaging in price gouging.

□ 1400

The cost of a barrel of oil and a gallon of gas has reached their highest

level in years, with no end in sight, and America's middle class is paying the price.

Republicans must join with Democrats to oppose price gouging and to ease the burden on our middle class. We must work together to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, and responsibly reduce the deficit.

To help consumers at the pump and provide some relief to small businesses and families struggling with high gas prices, this legislation expands the authority of the President to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to combat market manipulation and bring down the price, and makes it a Federal crime to sell gasoline at excessive prices.

The legislation also protects taxpayers, holds Big Oil accountable, repeals the largest tax breaks for the Big Five Oil companies, and ensures that oil companies pay billions of dollars owed to taxpayers for drilling on public lands. This is part of our multifaceted effort to lower the price of gas now, bring relief to consumers and taxpayers, strengthen our energy security, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and hold Big Oil accountable.

Republicans' "drill-only, oil above all" plan is really a boon for Big Oil and does nothing to reduce the pain at the pump for America's middle class families who are facing these prices each and every day. Republicans are simply returning to the Bush policies for Big Oil—continuing to pursue "drill-only" policies with fewer safeguards and no accountability, that has us sending a billion dollars a day overseas for foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 964, the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act introduced by Representative TIM BISHOP of New York.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so we can debate and pass a bill that actually addresses the price of gas. I have tried, Mr. Speaker, on numerous times in the Rules Committee to bring responsible amendments to the floor that would get at this issue of taxpayer subsidies to Big Oil companies, and every single time my Republican friends have voted "no." Every time there has been an opportunity to try to address this issue, they have voted "no."

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to bring our attention to the upcoming Memorial Day because we are going to be honoring the fallen and praise their service and sacrifice. We need to remember the families of the fallen and reassure them that their sacrifice and the life of that hero was not lost in vain. We are also very proud of our troops who are currently serving, and we want to make sure that they get that message from us in this body, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to point out to my colleague from Massachusetts that the unemployment rate was 5 percent when they took over the Congress, or approximately 5 percent when they took over Congress in January 2007. Under their control and President Obama's, it reached 10 percent, and has stayed at around 9 percent while they were in control. So I want to again make it clear that we have worked hard to make the economy work again, and we are going to continue that.

Mr. Speaker, although I have said it also before, it bears repeating: Americans are sick and tired of reckless government spending, creating only government jobs which hurts our overall economy and creates high unemployment. Americans are deeply concerned about the outrageous level of Federal debt. Our constituents are concerned about the piece of our economy that is now owned by other countries like China. They are very concerned about the fact that so much of our tax dollars, the tax dollars they pay, go toward paying interest on the debt instead of using it for the country's immediate needs.

Mr. Speaker, that is why Americans are looking at the new House Republican majority for real answers to their concerns. After 4 years of a complete lack of leadership in Congress under the Democrats, we have rolled up our sleeves and are making the tough decisions to get our economy and fiscal house back in shape. The Federal Government must learn to live within its means and be accountable for how it spends taxpayer money.

House Republicans are continuing to fulfill our pledge to America and keep the promises we made to the American people before the election last November. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of congressional oversight and against special interests by voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bills.

The material referred to previously by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 269 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 4. 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. 964) to protect consumers from price-gouging of gasoline and other fuels, 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 Energy and Commerce. 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 recommend 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 4 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 re-

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 179, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—233

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

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

NAYS—179

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

Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Braley (IA)
Cantor
Clarke (NY)
Cummings
Filner
Frelinghuysen
Giffords

Guinta
Hanabusa
Hastings (WA)
King (IA)
Long
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)

McHenry
Pastor (AZ)
Perlmutter
Sullivan
Wu

□ 1432

Messrs. KEATING, TONKO, RUSH, SIRES, Ms. SEWELL, and Ms. MOORE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 333, I was away from the Capitol region attending the Civil Rights Freedom Riders' 50th Anniversary Celebration. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 181, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

AYES—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishke
Berg
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter

Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs

Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston

Kinzing (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem

Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt

Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
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)

NOES—181

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

Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
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
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud

Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Braley (IA)
Cantor
Filner
Frelinghuysen

Giffords
Hanabusa
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling

Long
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)

□ 1440

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 against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 334, I was away from the Capitol region attending the Civil Rights Freedom Riders' 50th Anniversary Celebration. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1216.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

REPEALING MANDATORY FUNDING FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 269 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1216.

□ 1442

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1216) to amend the Public Health Service Act to convert funding for graduate medical education in qualified teaching health centers from direct appropriations to an authorization of appropriations, with Mr. POE of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1216.

The health care bill that was signed into law last year spent over a trillion dollars and empowered Federal bureaucrats more than it did the American