

not be fixed overnight, but serious and substantial cuts must be made. The \$100 billion mark is not arbitrary but, rather, marks an important milestone on the road to a sustainable Federal budget. It requires tough choices, but choices that must ultimately be made for the economic health and security of this generation and the next.

RESUMES FOR AMERICA

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the book of Matthew says, "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." That is a prescription for judging the priorities of politicians. We've seen the President's heart in his budget proposal. We've seen it in the continuing resolution that my Republican colleagues have offered.

At a time when they're needed the most, vital safety-net programs are on the chopping block: funding to help low-income Americans with their heating bills, grants to States and cities for community development, Pell grants, and much, much more.

In the midst of the worst economy most of us have ever seen, we are cutting the legs of the unemployed, the underemployed, and the economically insecure right out from under them.

It is clear to me that the President's tax deal with Republicans did not consider the depths of the Nation's historic unemployment problem.

So I'm reissuing my call for unemployed Americans to send their resumes and stories to resumesforAmerica@mail.house.gov. We must organize ourselves. The unemployed party is larger than the tea party.

No jobs are promised, but I will put your story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that our government that is supposed to be of, for, and by the people can begin to live up to the true meaning of its creed.

ResumesforAmerica@mail.house.gov.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. You know, every Texas family must live within a budget. I don't understand why the Federal Government can't do the same. To get our fiscal house in order, we need to cut spending, balance the budget, pay down the debt, and shrink the deficit.

As a fiscal hawk, I know that in November the American taxpayers voted for Congress to roll back the failed stimulus spending, stop bailing out Wall Street, end Government Motors, stop saving Fannie and Freddie, and defund and repeal ObamaCare.

Plain and simple, the American people want Washington to tax less, spend less, and borrow less.

The CR represents some tough choices, but I know the American public is willing to make some sacrifices now so we can make a brighter and better future for our children and grandchildren tomorrow.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE SAFETY

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the State Department is in the process of determining whether it should grant a Presidential permit for the construction of TransCanada's Keystone XL Pipeline, which could deliver up to 900,000 barrels of tar sands oil a day from Alberta, Canada—over 2,000 miles—to refineries on the U.S. gulf coast.

The proposed Keystone XL Pipeline will put communities along its path at unnecessary risk by using conventional technology to carry a blend of raw tar sand oil called diluted bitumen. Diluted bitumen is more corrosive and more likely to cause pipeline leaks than conventional oil. Already the Keystone I Pipeline, which came online just 6 months ago, has experienced seven leaks, and that is for a pipeline that TransCanada claims is the "safest ever built."

Considering the significant dangers of piping bitumen, I find it troubling that the pipeline's route goes directly through the Ogallala Aquifer in the Midwest, which provides clean drinking and irrigation water to most of America's heartland. Despite the dangers of tar sands oil, U.S. regulators do not delineate between this new product and standard petroleum.

We need new regulations. We need to put on hold the planned tar sands pipeline Keystone XL.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we are here to speak about the CR, this continuing resolution, which is going to set forth the budget for the rest of this fiscal year. Yes, it is true we all have a responsibility for the budget, but the bottom line for each and every one of us is how does this budget affect us, how does it affect the people that we represent? Let's look at what the CR does.

I think we all know that in the creation of jobs we must invest in America. We must invest in each and every one of you. When you look at a CR that basically eliminates and puts a chilling effect on all of the major investments that we need, we know that's not the right way to go. But more importantly than that, this is a CR that's going to cut, cut the future, cut those students, 200,000 of them, who rely on Head Start. We all know that we've got to invest in them now. It's also going to

cut those middle class kids who are going to college on Pell grants \$800 a piece.

So when we hear about the budget generally, let's not forget, it's the people. It's the kids that matter.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Republican CR is another broken promise that will eliminate thousands of good paying jobs in construction, law enforcement, research, education, and public safety. This is just more of the same, and this turns us into a pink slip Nation. I believe that's what the goal of the Republicans is, and this bill will cost us jobs today, tomorrow, and in the future by failing to invest in our infrastructure and by failing to invest in education.

Mr. Speaker, the mistakes the majority intends to make today will not be very easy to reverse, and I urge the majority to keep its promise to America, which is it's all about jobs.

□ 1210

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 92 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 92

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. 1) 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. 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except: (1) those received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII dated at least one day before the day of consideration of the amendment (but no later than February 15, 2011); and (2) pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who submitted it for printing or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the

House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, 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.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 1, clause 2(f) of rule XXI shall not apply to amendments addressing objects within more than one suballocation made by the Committee on Appropriations under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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 February 17, 2011, providing for consideration or disposition of H.R. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my new friend, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 92 provides for a modified open rule for consideration of H.R. 1. This bill reaffirms our commitment to fiscal responsibility by implementing two main pillars of our pledge to America: to cut discretionary spending and to ensure an open and bipartisan debate.

If you had told me 6 months ago that I would have been standing here on the floor of the House handling my very first rule on the floor of the House and that we would have been succeeding on two pillars of the pledge to America, I would have told you that might have been wishful thinking. But we have come together as a House, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as a House to bring this process forward today.

Now, you know, Mr. Speaker, as an experienced Member of the Rules Committee in a former life, how unusual it is to have an open process on a continuing resolution. I daresay, even the dean of the House, the gentleman from Michigan, has not seen a continuing resolution come to the floor under the open process that we're bringing it to the floor under today. And that's important, because as I listened to 1-minute this morning, and I heard some folks on the left and heard some folks on the right who weren't quite happy with the way H.R. 1 turned out, that was an important consideration over

the past 4 years, even over the past 10 years, over the past 20 years, because if you weren't happy with the way a continuing resolution turned out when leadership brought it to the floor, too bad for you. You didn't have a voice. You didn't have a vote. You didn't have a process. It was take it or leave it. Whether it was Republican leadership or whether it was Democratic leadership, take it or leave it. In the 112th Congress, our new leadership said we can do better, we have to do better, and the American people deserve better. And today, we are fulfilling that promise.

This open process will allow any Member, Republican or Democrat, to come to the floor today, tomorrow, bring their amendments to the floor so that they can say, We don't think you got it right. My 600,000 constituents back home want to make a change. We think we can do better. We think you did too much. We think you didn't do enough. The first time a continuing resolution has come to the floor in this open process. I ran on that commitment of openness, Mr. Speaker, and I believe in that commitment of openness.

I can't tell you how many times I said that if Speaker NANCY PELOSI rammed a bill through in the middle of the night, that was wrong. And if Speaker Newt Gingrich rammed a bill through in the middle of the night, that was wrong. That right and wrong are not partisan issues. Right and wrong are American issues. I can't tell you how much I enjoyed our Rules Committee hearing last night, Mr. Speaker, where we had the ranking member and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee come forward, lay out competing views about where they think we should take spending in this country, and then agree to come to the floor over the next several days to offer amendments, to work through that process, to make sure that at the end of the day, no longer do we have a take-it-or-leave-it leadership bill from either side of the aisle; that at the end of the day, we have a bill that was truly the work product of this new 112th Congress of this people's House. And it's just with tremendous pride, Mr. Speaker, that I take part in this debate today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today still waiting for the majority to give us a chance to vote on legislation that will create jobs. We are now 6 weeks into the 112th Congress, and we have yet to see a jobs bill from the Republican majority. It's high time the majority party allows us to debate and vote on legislation to get Americans back to work. Instead today, we are debating dangerous and reckless legislation that will cut American jobs and

seriously threaten our ability to build upon our fragile economic recovery.

At a time when many Americans are still struggling to find employment, the Republican majority proposes a spending bill that ends construction projects, takes police off the street, and halts innovation that spurs job creation. This stands in stark contrast to the President's 2012 budget proposal that lowers our Nation's deficit and creates jobs for Americans by investing in national priorities like education, infrastructure, and emerging energy technology.

Unlike some within the Republican Party, the American people are not looking to completely cripple the Federal Government and leave the Nation to the corporate elite. Americans have repeatedly expressed a desire to make smart investments in our national priorities that leave our country more competitive now and into the future, and I stand today with the American people.

The Republicans' slash-and-burn budget does nothing to achieve this goal. It even cuts the most fundamental public services, ending policing programs and defunding educational reform efforts here in the United States. As nations like China and India pour money into the research and development of solar panels, wind power, and high-speed trains, creating thousands of jobs for their citizens, the Republican majority is removing the most fundamental investments in comparable American jobs. This reckless approach not only destroys jobs today but also in the months and years to come.

This is a critical time in America's history, and if we are to compete with nations like China to create jobs in the United States and win the global marketplace, we must support our own Nation with smart, targeted cuts that will lower the deficit but invest in American jobs.

As I said, 6 weeks into the new Congress, and we are still waiting to see this smart, targeted plan to get Americans back to work. Instead, we see this hastily drawn up CR that takes a meat axe to the middle class. And as America waits, the global economy moves ahead, leaving us behind.

As the 112th Congress was sworn into office, we were bombarded with promises that an open and transparent process would make a triumphant return to this House floor. But as we now consider our first appropriations bill, we continue to stand here waiting for that grand return.

□ 1220

Mr. Speaker, while this rule may have the word "open" in the title, I assure you this is not an open process. Through last-minute changes, convoluted parliamentary maneuvers, and a pre-printing requirement, the Republican majority has provided an extremely convoluted and restrictive process.

An open rule means that as the legislative process proceeds, as an amendment passes, it may spark an idea for an amendment that another Member may choose to offer with the changes that are made in the legislation. This rule takes away that ability.

Also, the Republicans adopted, in a party-line vote at 9 p.m. last night, a parliamentary sleight of hand that blocks the transfer of any money from one part of government to another. This means you cannot use an offset from one part of the bill to increase spending in a different part. In all my years serving in Congress, I have never seen such a blanket prohibition, and yet the leadership would have us believe this is an "open process" and that this is "regular order."

To top it all off, Republicans have even given themselves an escape hatch with a martial-law provision of the rule which will allow them to report out a new rule for H.R. 1 that shuts down the amendment process without the normal 1-day waiting period.

This convoluted process has once again illustrated that the Republican Party continues to believe that claiming the sky is green will make it so. The truth is, you can't create jobs with a press release. You can't fix the Nation's health care system with a clever tag line, and you can't create an open and transparent Congress by creating an open rule in name only.

My fellow Democratic colleagues and I are committed to living within our means, while investing in the programs and policies that will help our country compete and win the global future. The Republican majority's continuing resolution couldn't be more dangerous to these values that we all hold dear.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for our communities, support legislation that creates jobs, strengthens the middle class while reducing our deficit. Today's CR does not meet this threshold and, as a result, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on today's rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, you've caught me both on my first rule on the floor and a day where I am just so pleased to be here because of the things that are going on here today, because of the changes that I believe in, both in terms of fiscal responsibility and in terms of openness here in the process.

Now, I understand this rule isn't going to make everyone happy. It doesn't make me happy because we're only here today, and it's been very confusing for folks back home, Mr. Speaker. We talked so much about receiving the President's budget on Capitol Hill yesterday. Of course, that was his budget for FY 2012. We're still here working on the budget for 2011. This is the fifth continuing resolution that we've had to try to get that process right, and it's the first one since I've been sworn in that we've been involved in.

Now, I can tell you, as much of a voice as you have in this continuing resolution today, we have not seen this much debate or this many amendments in the last four continuing resolutions combined. In fact, I'm told that last night more than 400 amendments were filed to be eligible to come to the floor.

Now, I hear from my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, for whom I have deep respect and admiration, that they believe this bill was put together in a hasty process. I'll tell you, we've been working on this bill day and night for weeks.

But then I hear from my friends that they're disappointed that we have a pre-printing requirement to allow for the thoughtful consideration of amendments, and they would rather it just be a willy-nilly process that happens here on the floor as folks come up with good ideas, one by one.

Well, I'll tell you, I look forward to that process. I very much hope we can have that as the appropriations bills move forward.

But, folks, this is a time of urgency. We have troops in harm's way overseas. We have economic development projects going on around this country that have no idea after March 4 whether there will be a single nickel available to support their cause. No idea. It is no way to run a government. And, again, to put credit where credit is due and blame where blame resides, both parties, over the last decade, have been guilty of this horrendous practice of bringing continuing resolutions to the floor.

Today we bring forward a bill that will put a stop to this process, that will get us through the end of 2011 and allow us to go through regular order to bring the remaining appropriations bills to the floor. And it's a process I very much look forward to.

I see my friend Mr. MCGOVERN in the Chamber this morning. He and I had a discussion last night in the Rules Committee about how to go after some, what I would call, egregious tax subsidies, those things that happen on the tax side of the ledger that shouldn't happen. I believe in a fair code. I believe in a code that's transparent, that people understand. You'll see my fair tax pin that I'm wearing here today. I believe in fundamental tax reform.

But today we only have a chance to talk about FY 2011 spending. I want to have that discussion about fundamental tax reform. I want to have the discussion that the gentlelady from New York wants to have about entitlement reform because I know precisely what my colleagues know, which is if we're going to be serious about budgets, that's where the dollars are, that's where the growth is, that's where the change has to come.

But today we have, because it's an open process, simply one bill that we can deal with, simply one idea that we can deal with, and that one idea is spending for FY 2011.

It would have been easy, Mr. Speaker, for this new House to have punted

on making tough decisions. It would have been perfectly legitimate for this new House to say, we didn't cause this problem, we inherited this problem from last year's Congress, and we're just going to continue a continuing resolution on until the end of the year because we don't have the time or the commitment to start making tough choices. But we didn't. And I'm just so proud that we didn't.

What we said is, we have 7 months left in the year. Let's start right now. Let's start right now; and let's lay these ideas out one by one by one, not in big general terms, but in specifics, line item by line item by line item across literally thousands of appropriations accounts.

And we didn't say it's my way or the highway, Mr. Speaker. We said, if you have a better idea, if you have a better idea, come to the floor and let's talk about it. If you have a better idea, if we did too much here, tell us where we did too much and tell us how we can do better. And if we did too little here, tell us where we did too little and tell us how we can make it better.

I so look forward, at the end of this rules consideration, as we pass this rule and move forward in the general debate, to being able to engage in those amendments one by one, not in a back room somewhere, not off in the corner where it's just the leadership involved, but here on the floor of the people's House, for all of America to see, line item by line item by line item about where our priorities are.

Now, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, you know, as I know, that every nickel we collect in Federal revenue today goes to fund entitlements and service our national debt. And every nickel that we spend on every program we're going to talk about today, every program on the discretionary side, on the non-defense discretionary side, is a nickel that we borrow.

So when we talk about are these things good to do, I promise you that that's not where my heart is today. I know there are some good programs out here that are doing good things. What I also know is we're borrowing every nickel to fund those programs from our children and our grandchildren. When we talk about priorities, one of those priorities is paying for what it is we commit this Nation to.

Again, my good friend Mr. MCGOVERN was very persuasive last night when he said, for Pete's sake, they are programs I don't agree with; but dadgummit, if we're going to be involved in them, we ought to fund them; and I couldn't agree with him more. That's hard.

We received the President's budget just yesterday; and over a 10-year window, our systemic deficit never falls below 3 percent of GDP. We don't even qualify to join the European Union. We are so devoid of fiscal responsibility at this point in our Nation's history that we do not even qualify to join the European Union. I tell you, Mr. Speaker,

that's a low standard. We should do better. We should do better. We can do better. We brought H.R. 1 to the floor today, this rule, we'll bring it to the floor this afternoon so that we can do better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that what I really would love to see us debating today is how we're going to get out of Afghanistan and stop paying 8 billion borrowed dollars a month for that.

Also, in an editorial printed today, The New York Times said what I think a lot of us are saying, that this bill will cut vital government functions and not have any lasting impact on the deficit.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 2011]

THE OBAMA BUDGET

On paper, President Obama's new \$3.7 trillion budget is encouraging. It makes a number of tough choices to cut the deficit by a projected \$1.1 trillion over 10 years, which is enough to prevent an uncontrolled explosion of debt in the next decade and, as a result, reduce the risk of a fiscal crisis.

The questions are whether its tough choices are also wise choices and whether it stands a chance in a Congress in which Republicans, who now dominate the House, are obsessed with making indiscriminate short-term cuts in programs they never liked anyway. The Republican cuts would eviscerate vital government functions while not having any lasting impact on the deficit.

What Mr. Obama's budget is most definitely not is a blueprint for dealing with the real long-term problems that feed the budget deficit: rising health care costs, an aging population and a refusal by lawmakers to face the inescapable need to raise taxes at some point. Rather, it defers those critical issues, in hopes, we assume, that both the economy and the political environment will improve in the future.

For the most part, Mr. Obama has managed to cut spending while preserving important government duties. That approach is in stark contrast to Congressional Republicans, who are determined to cut spending deeply, no matter the consequences.

A case in point: the Obama budget's main cut—\$400 billion over 10 years—is the result of a five-year freeze in nonsecurity discretionary programs, a slice of the budget that contains programs that are central to the quality of American lives, including education, environment and financial regulation.

But the cuts are not haphazard. The budget boosts education spending by 11 percent over one year and retains the current maximum level of college Pell grants—up to \$5,500 a year. To offset some of the costs, the budget would eliminate Pell grants for summer school and let interest accrue during school on federal loans for graduate students, rather than starting the interest meter after graduation.

Those are tough cutbacks, but, over all, the Pell grant program would continue to help close to nine million students. The Republican proposal would cut the Pell grant program by 15 percent this year and nearly half over the next two years.

The Obama budget also calls for spending on green energy programs—to be paid for, in part, by eliminating \$46 billion in tax breaks for oil, gas and coal companies over the next decade. Republicans are determined not to raise any taxes, even though investing for the future and taming the deficit are impossible without more money.

The budget would also increase transportation spending by \$242 billion over 10 years. It does not specifically call for an increased gas tax to cover the new costs, though it calls on Congress to come up with new revenues to offset the new spending. Republicans want to eliminate forward-looking programs like high-speed rail.

The budget is responsible in other ways. It would cap the value of itemized deductions for high-income taxpayers and use the savings to extend relief from the alternative minimum tax for three years so that the tax does not ensnare millions of middle- and upper-middle-income taxpayers for whom it was never intended. For nearly a decade, Congress has granted alternative minimum tax relief without paying for it.

House Republicans want to leave military spending out of their budget-cutting entirely, but Mr. Obama's budget reduces projected Pentagon spending by \$78 billion over five years. If anything, Mr. Obama could safely have proposed cutting deeper, as suggested by his own bipartisan deficit panel.

The bill for the military is way too high, above cold-war peak levels, when this country had a superpower adversary. There's a point where the next military spending dollar does not make our society more secure, and it's a point we long ago passed.

Mr. Obama's budget also includes a responsible way to head off steep cuts in what Medicare pays doctors. It would postpone the cuts for two years and offset that added cost with \$62 billion in other health care savings, like expanding the use of cheaper generic drugs.

But not all of Mr. Obama's cuts are acceptable. The president is proposing a reduction by nearly half in the program that provides assistance to low-income families to pay for home heating bills. Shared sacrifice need not involve the very neediest.

Ideally, budget cuts would not start until the economic recovery is more firmly entrenched. But the deficit is a pressing political problem. The Obama budget is balanced enough to start the process of deficit reduction, but not so draconian that it would derail the recovery.

The same cannot be said for the plan put forward by Republicans last week. It would amputate some of government's most vital functions for the next seven months of fiscal year 2011. (They haven't even gotten to next year yet, never mind the more distant future).

Real deficit reduction will require grappling with rising health care costs and an aging population, which means reforms in Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, as well as tax increases to bring revenues in line with obligations.

Mr. Obama's budget does not directly address those big issues, but doing so would require a negotiating partner, and Mr. Obama, at present, does not have one among the Republican leaders in Congress. His latest budget is a good starting point for a discussion—and a budget deal—but only if Republicans are willing participants in the process.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Rules Committee.

□ 1230

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, America's top priority is creating jobs. But here we are, 6 weeks into the 112th Congress, and the Republican leadership has yet to bring a single jobs bill to the floor.

Once again, we're here today to exercise one of our primary constitutional responsibilities as Members of Congress, to pass appropriations legisla-

tion to fund the many basic and essential programs of the Federal Government on which millions of Americans rely. Today is an incredible opportunity for Republicans and Democrats to work together to bridge the gap between parties and pass a bill that meets our shared goals of creating jobs, building infrastructure, and strengthening the economy.

Sadly, the Republican leadership has brought to the floor a continuing resolution that jeopardizes American jobs and our economic future by rolling back investments that are necessary and important to help our private sector grow and help create jobs.

This CR thoughtlessly makes extreme cuts to appease an extreme wing of the other party at the expense of the American people. This CR arbitrarily kills jobs. It would set our country back decades in scientific research simply because Republicans don't like what the science says. Worst of all, it puts our children's health at risk by handcuffing the EPA's ability to please polluters.

The Clean Air Act guards the most vulnerable Americans, those with asthma, lung disease, children, older adults, people with heart disease and diabetes, from the dangers of airborne pollutants. Each year the act prevents tens of thousands of adverse health effects, including asthma attacks, heart attacks, and even premature death. This year alone, it was estimated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency that the Clean Air Act will save 160,000 lives. Yet Republicans plan to starve this lifesaving agency of its funding.

Mr. Speaker, building an excellent public education system that provides each and every American the opportunity to succeed is the most important investment we can make in our future. As President Obama said in his State of the Union address, it is not just about how we cut but what we cut. Education is an investment in our future, and we can't sacrifice our future. But Republicans, through this CR, seem to be willing to sacrifice our future to meet an arbitrary campaign pledge. By cutting to the heart of the learning needs of American children and youth through this extraordinary and nonsensical measure, Republican lawmakers clearly don't understand the meaning of investing in our future as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, at the State and local level, my home State of Colorado also receives a slap in the face from this continuing resolution. A year ago, Highway 36, the highway that connects Boulder to Denver, was awarded a \$10 million TIGER/TIFIA Challenge Grant through the Recovery Act to expand one of the most used and heavily congested highways in our State. The \$10 million Federal investment helped to leverage additional funds in the area, creating \$276 million in employment income and 7,200 jobs. This project impacts 191,000 employees, 10 percent of our State's total.

This CR would rescind \$9.1 million in funding without thought to details or consequences upon which the rest of the funding is built. This is a critical grant for Colorado that we were promised and received leverage.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Colorado's U.S. 36 corridor won the TIGER award because it was one of the most innovative projects in the country. Mr. Speaker, Rome wasn't built in a day, and we can all agree that no State or community should be punished for being innovative.

The American public needs and deserves real solutions. I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule for this CR, as well as the underlying CR, to prevent the irresponsible impact of this Republican spending bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1. This Congress must step up to reverse our Nation's mounting deficit and debt, and this measure before us today takes an important step. This is an important effort, and we need to cut wasteful and duplicative spending. But the reality is these kinds of cuts will never get us to a balanced budget.

Let's be honest. Only 16 percent of our Nation's spending is in non-security discretionary accounts. Today, we are cutting over \$100 billion from just 1/6 of the Federal spending.

The infamous bank robber Willie Sutton once said that he robbed banks because that's where the money is. In our government, the money is in entitlements. For those who are concerned about funding for the sciences and education and medical research and infrastructure, as I am, the way to ensure that our Nation can pay for the programs so many people care about is to deal with the mandatory spending entitlements.

The President's State of the Union address was disappointing. He had a national forum to step up and embrace the recommendations of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility. The Bowles-Simpson Commission clearly recognized the looming fiscal crisis and offered a framework for a serious national conversation to begin on entitlement issues, and do it in a bipartisan way. I didn't agree with every recommendation and would have tried to change some. But had I been appointed to the commission, I would have voted with Senator COBURN and Senator DURBIN for the report. If those Senators, from far opposite sides, could come together for the good of the country, then where is the President?

As important as it is to tighten the Federal discretionary spending bill, we will only continue to tilt at windmills with a budget ledger if we don't deal with the entitlements—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

I believe the opportunity is to come together in a bipartisan way to put everything on the table to deal with it. Also, we need the President to step up to the plate and to be an honest broker on this issue and to lead the Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying continuing resolution.

The spending bill that the Republican leadership is bringing before the House today is reckless, thoughtless, and heartless; and, most disturbingly, it's a jobs killer. I believe that the best way to reduce our deficit and long-term debt is to grow our economy, to help businesses create jobs.

At a time when our economy is emerging from the worst recession in our lifetimes, when millions of Americans are out of work and millions more are struggling to make ends meet, this continuing resolution takes exactly the wrong approach.

Instead of making needed investments in education, medical research, infrastructure, and other priorities, this bill takes a meat axe to them. Instead of strengthening the middle class on Main Street, this bill gives sweetheart deals for Wall Street. Instead of investing in our workers, it protects special interest subsidies for big oil companies and hedge fund managers.

A few weeks ago on this floor, Republicans told us that veterans programs, education, child nutrition, and health care research would be protected. It is clear now that those were empty promises, Mr. Speaker.

For veterans, the bill eliminates a program that offers housing vouchers for homeless veterans. In education, the bill decimates the Pell Grant program by reducing the maximum award by \$800 and by cutting another \$4.9 billion from other education programs. For child nutrition, the bill cuts \$750 million from the Women, Infants, and Children's program. And the bill slashes \$2.5 billion from the National Institutes of Health, jeopardizing important research into diseases like cancer and Alzheimer's and diabetes. It destroys the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a commonsense program to preserve and protect our natural resources and outdoor recreational space, helping local economies grow.

Mr. Speaker, when we brought up the prospect of these cuts a few weeks ago, we were accused of demonizing the debate. Now that we have seen the numbers before us, I am sad to say it is worse than any of us could have predicted.

I find the cuts in education funding to be particularly troublesome. As President Obama made clear in his State of the Union, we must invest in our children if we are to compete in the 21st century economy. In order to maintain our economic standing, in order to create the jobs of the future,

in order to compete against China, we must have a well-educated workforce. So why on Earth would we slash Pell Grants, which help millions of families, 12,000 in my district alone, pay for college? We shouldn't.

This bill will also decimate important lifesaving food aid programs to feed hungry children and refugees. It would literally take the food out of the mouths of some of the most vulnerable people around the world. Mr. Speaker, retreating from the global war against extreme poverty and hunger will undermine not just our moral authority but our national security as well.

I also want to point out that this bill continues the same misguided policy under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike that borrows hundreds of billions of dollars to pay for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. If we are truly serious about reducing the deficit, then those wars need to be ended or paid for. Along with my colleagues like WALTER JONES and others, I'm going to continue to talk about this issue. These wars are bankrupting us, and we need to have a meaningful, thorough debate about them.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I believe this continuing resolution contains exactly the wrong prescription for our Nation. We should be focusing on creating jobs and growing our economy. Instead, this Republican bill would lead to more unemployment, more unfairness, and more hardship with the American people.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and reject this underlying bill.

□ 1240

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the hard-working member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, JACK KINGSTON.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for the time.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we got the President's budget and it was basically more of the same: higher taxes, more spending, more deficits. In fact, it will give us the third year of trillion-dollar deficits. And it made no mention of entitlement reform. In fact, the President ignored the recommendations of his very own hand-picked deficit reduction commission. It was very disappointing. But at the same time I want to work with the President. Where he wants to save money and reduce spending, I think it's important for Republicans to reach out and say yes.

Now it sounds to me like the Democrats want to remove themselves from that process, which is interesting because what we are debating in this \$100 billion spending reduction bill is an open rule process where Democrats can put amendments on the board. And if they do agree with us, as I'm sure they do, that for every dollar we spend, 40 cents is borrowed, that our national debt is 96 percent of our GDP right now, and that spending each year is 25 percent of the GDP, a historical high,

then I know they would want to act with us rather than against us and try to address this situation.

So I say to my Democrat friends, if you feel this is too much, then offer your own spending cuts. This is what can change in Washington this year. Rather than having the same old hollow, rhetorical debate, which incidentally doesn't really pull the rug out from the Republican Party; it pulls the rug out from Congress. It damages our own credibility that we can't come together as representatives of a nation and try to move the country forward together.

Sure we can skirmish over things. For example, we've got \$8½ billion in earmarks eliminated in this mark. Now maybe they want to restore the earmarks. That's fine. We have a reduction of 149 different spending programs. Maybe they want to restore those. Maybe they want to double that amount.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I am pleased to yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. Maybe the Democrats want to insist that the stimulus money stay in there. We go after the remaining portion, \$2 billion. Maybe they think that's a bad thing and maybe we should get more out of it. But rather than just having the same old drama over and over again, hiding behind children and seniors and Pell Grants and everything else, why not come to the table and say, "Here are our cuts"?

Mr. Speaker, this is 2.6 percent. That is to say that if I owed you a dollar and paid you back 97 cents, sure, you might still want that 3 cents from me, but, you know, you're pretty doggone close. This is a 2 percent reduction in a \$3.7 trillion budget.

Now, if the Democrats don't like it, don't call it slashing and burning and all these other descriptions that are lively and make for good rhetoric and good drama. But if anything is irresponsible, it's irresponsible to call a cut of 2.6 percent reckless.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I join her in opposing this rule and urging our colleagues to vote "no" on the rule, "no" on the previous question, and "no" on final passage of the bill.

Voting "no" on the previous question will enable us, if it succeeds, to bring to the floor our Build America Bonds legislation. Build America Bonds is supported, outside the Congress, across the board in a nonpartisan way by those who are building America—who are dredging our ports to enhance our trade, who are building our schools to educate our children, who are building our roads and highways and mass transit to get people to work and back, improving the quality of their lives; and

in moving people and product again to work and to market, growing our economy.

Creating jobs is the number one priority for Democrats. We have said that we will judge every measure that comes before this House by whether it creates jobs, how it strengthens the middle class and how it reduces the deficit.

Indeed, that is what President Obama's budget released just yesterday will do. It will strengthen our Nation, invest in the future, help create jobs, and grow the economy, while reducing the deficit by \$1.1 trillion. It sets us on a path, in President Obama's words, to "out-educate, out-innovate and out-build the rest of the world." That is indeed what we must do.

In terms of innovation and education, the President's budget is a commitment to competitiveness that will keep America number one. In terms of out-building the rest of the world, consider this quote from USA Today:

"Associated General Contractors, a trade group for the construction industry, estimates the plan could create about 5.4 million construction jobs and 10 million more jobs in related industries and the broader economy."

President Obama's budget is a tough budget and it makes tough choices. I don't agree with everything that the President cut in the budget, but it is a statement of values that we must support. It makes cuts and tough ones in a responsible way. As President Obama said yesterday, we must live within our means and invest in the future.

That is in stark contrast to the Republican legislation we debate today. With severe and indiscriminate spending cuts, it goes too far. This legislation will destroy American jobs while harming middle class families, young adults, seniors, and, yes, even our veterans. Since coming into office, Republicans have not put forward any initiatives to create jobs. Indeed, with this legislation, they are making matters worse. According to an independent study just released, the domestic cuts in this bill would destroy 800,000 public- and private-sector jobs. Democrats are saying to the Republican majority: Show us the jobs. Show the American people where the jobs are.

Just today, Speaker BOEHNER said that if jobs are lost as a result of Republican spending cuts, "So be it."

So be it? We believe that our budget should be a statement of our national values. What is important to us must be included in our budget.

Consider what the Republican legislation we debate today would do to diminish our investments in education, halt innovation, destroy good-paying American jobs and make our neighborhoods less secure. Indeed, not even homeless veterans are spared by the Republicans. Our Federal budget, as I said, must be a statement of our national values. We must ask ourselves, is this Republican legislation a statement of our values?

Is it a statement of our values to undermine our commitment to educate the next generation of leaders and innovators? The Republican proposal cuts \$800 per student in the maximum Pell Grant award; thousands of teachers would lose their jobs; and in your neighborhood, class size could increase.

Is it a statement of our values to diminish our efforts to create green jobs and fight disease? This bill cuts \$1.3 billion in investments to spur the clean energy economy of the future. It cuts more than \$1.3 billion for cancer and other disease research.

In terms of innovation and education, the President's budget is a commitment to competitiveness. This legislation is not.

Is it a statement of our values to destroy jobs and undermine investments in our roads, schools and bridges to rebuild America? Tens of thousands of new construction jobs would be lost and 76 projects to upgrade our roads in your districts and bridges in 40 States would be canceled. I mentioned earlier what the general contractors said about creating millions of jobs in the industry and 10 million more jobs indirectly.

□ 1250

Is it a statement of our values to diminish the public safety of our neighborhoods? There would be up to 3,000 fewer cops on the beat in your neighborhood and 2,400 fewer firefighters on the job in our communities coast-to-coast; 3,000 fewer cops on the beat and 2,400 fewer firefighters in our communities coast-to-coast.

Is it a statement of our values to cut funding for homeless veterans? If there was one example of where this goes too far—think of it: Republicans want to eliminate \$75 million from an initiative that offers housing vouchers to our homeless vets. It is a very effective initiative. Republicans want to cut it.

And is it a statement of our values to deprive women of primary care? When it comes to health and education, Republicans put women and children last.

Democrats and Republicans must work together to ensure our Nation lives within its means. That is for sure. We must continue to aggressively attack waste, fraud, and abuse, and we will subject every taxpayer dollar we spend to the toughest scrutiny, ensuring that the American people are getting their money's worth. But Republicans have not presented a responsible plan for addressing the deficit. We believe we can cut the deficit and create jobs. To do so, we must invest in the future.

Democrats do not subscribe to Speaker BOEHNER's verdict that if jobs are lost in this continuing resolution, so be it. Maybe so be it for him, but not so be it for the people who are losing their jobs. Instead, we support President Obama's budget to out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the previous

question, no on the rule, and no on the underlying bill. Let's put this aside and get on with the business the people sent us here to do: Creating jobs, reducing the deficit, strengthening the middle class, and protecting the American people.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am proud to yield 2 minutes to a hardworking member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the rule and the continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we would not be in this position this afternoon if the leadership of the last Congress let the Appropriations Committee do its work last year, to act on the President's budget proposal when it came out, to debate our bills in full committee, to debate our bills on the floor. So that is why we are here today. It would have been great if last year's House leadership had actually listened to the American people.

We would not be in this situation if the President and the congressional leadership hadn't borrowed billions of dollars, mortgaging our future, to spend on multiple stimulus bills and bailouts that did little to create private-sector jobs and restore consumer confidence.

The Department of Energy alone had \$39 billion in stimulus money, all, I might say, borrowed—\$9 billion more than its entire budget. It was a recipe for waste, a scatter gun approach that raised many public expectations but in the end provided few achievements and fewer yet jobs. In many cases it created businesses in the energy sector that could not survive without more government funding. To me, it created false markets. As some described it, it was more money than some knew how to deal with.

For months, those dollars were not obligated, much less spent, hiring up people in the public and private sector that the White House and the House and Senate leadership knew would eventually be laid off. Some might call it a job Ponzi scheme, a blank check owed to our children.

So here we are this week to pick up the pieces, right-size the ship of state, stop spending money we don't have, and restore trust for the American people that has been badly broken.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to just say, in a column printed Sunday in *The New York Times*, prize-winning economist Paul Krugman said the bill will sacrifice the future. He also said, "Republicans don't have a mandate to cut spending; they have a mandate to repeal the laws of arithmetic."

[From the *New York Times*, Feb. 13, 2011]

EAT THE FUTURE
(By Paul Krugman)

On Friday, House Republicans unveiled their proposal for immediate cuts in federal spending. Uncharacteristically, they failed to accompany the release with a catchy slogan.

So I'd like to propose one: Eat the Future.

I'll explain in a minute. First, let's talk about the dilemma the G.O.P. faces.

Republican leaders like to claim that the midterms gave them a mandate for sharp cuts in government spending. Some of us believe that the elections were less about spending than they were about persistent high unemployment, but whatever. The key point to understand is that while many voters say that they want lower spending, press the issue a bit further and it turns out that they only want to cut spending on other people.

That's the lesson from a new survey by the Pew Research Center, in which Americans were asked whether they favored higher or lower spending in a variety of areas. It turns out that they want more, not less, spending on most things, including education and Medicare. They're evenly divided about spending on aid to the unemployed and—surprise—defense.

The only thing they clearly want to cut is foreign aid, which most Americans believe, wrongly, accounts for a large share of the federal budget.

Pew also asked people how they would like to see states close their budget deficits. Do they favor cuts in either education or health care, the main expenses states face? No. Do they favor tax increases? No. The only deficit-reduction measure with significant support was cuts in public-employee pensions—and even there the public was evenly divided.

The moral is clear. Republicans don't have a mandate to cut spending; they have a mandate to repeal the laws of arithmetic.

How can voters be so ill informed? In their defense, bear in mind that they have jobs, children to raise, parents to take care of. They don't have the time or the incentive to study the federal budget, let alone state budgets (which are by and large incomprehensible). So they rely on what they hear from seemingly authoritative figures.

And what they've been hearing ever since Ronald Reagan is that their hard-earned dollars are going to waste, paying for vast armies of useless bureaucrats (payroll is only 5 percent of federal spending) and welfare queens driving Cadillacs. How can we expect voters to appreciate fiscal reality when politicians consistently misrepresent that reality?

Which brings me back to the Republican dilemma. The new House majority promised to deliver \$100 billion in spending cuts—and its members face the prospect of Tea Party primary challenges if they fail to deliver big cuts. Yet the public opposes cuts in programs it likes—and it likes almost everything. What's a politician to do?

The answer, once you think about it, is obvious: sacrifice the future. Focus the cuts on programs whose benefits aren't immediate; basically, eat America's seed corn. There will be a huge price to pay, eventually—but for now, you can keep the base happy.

If you didn't understand that logic, you might be puzzled by many items in the House G.O.P. proposal. Why cut a billion dollars from a highly successful program that provides supplemental nutrition to pregnant mothers, infants, and young children? Why cut \$648 million from nuclear nonproliferation activities? (One terrorist nuke, assembled from stray ex-Soviet fissile material, can ruin your whole day.) Why cut \$578 million from the I.R.S. enforcement budget? (Letting tax cheats run wild doesn't exactly serve the cause of deficit reduction.)

Once you understand the imperatives Republicans face, however, it all makes sense. By slashing future-oriented programs, they can deliver the instant spending cuts Tea Partiers demand, without imposing too much immediate pain on voters. And as for

the future costs—a population damaged by childhood malnutrition, an increased chance of terrorist attacks, a revenue system undermined by widespread tax evasion—well, tomorrow is another day.

In a better world, politicians would talk to voters as if they were adults. They would explain that discretionary spending has little to do with the long-run imbalance between spending and revenues. They would then explain that solving that long-run problem requires two main things: reining in health-care costs and, realistically, increasing taxes to pay for the programs that Americans really want.

But Republican leaders can't do that, of course: they refuse to admit that taxes ever need to rise, and they spent much of the last two years screaming "death panels!" in response to even the most modest, sensible efforts to ensure that Medicare dollars are well spent.

And so they had to produce something like Friday's proposal, a plan that would save remarkably little money but would do a remarkably large amount of harm.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my fellow New Yorker (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and, more importantly, in opposition to the underlying legislation.

I think we all recognize that we must make painful cuts, we must make difficult cuts, but I think it is important to recognize that there is a real difference between painful cuts and difficult cuts and cuts that are destructive, and I want to focus on an area where I think the cuts will be particularly destructive. They will be destructive to ambition, destructive to aspiration, and destructive to our ability to maintain a vibrant economy, and those are the cuts maintained in this legislation that would take \$6.5 billion, \$6.5 billion in one year, out of the student financial aid program, cutting Pell Grants by \$5.6 billion, almost \$5.7 billion, and cutting SEOG, a program that has been in existence since the late 1960s, completely eliminating it to the tune of \$800 million a year. These cuts are destructive.

The most powerful tool that we have to put our economy back on track is an educated workforce, and the most powerful tool we have to bring about the fiscal stability that we need in this country is a growing economy. That is not possible unless we have an educated workforce.

Sixty-three percent of the jobs that will be created over the next 6 years will require post-secondary education. Ninety percent of the jobs that are expected to be the highest growing areas—science, technology, math, health care—require a post-secondary education. And yet the response of the current leadership of this Congress to that is to cut funding that allows students to go on to college. It is wrong-headed and, frankly, it is destructive of our future, and I would urge that my colleagues vote against it.

I will make one last point. The gentleman from New Jersey just said the Democrats did not listen to the American people last year. That is a continuing refrain. Well, the American

people have spoken loudly and clearly about education cuts. Sixty-one percent of them believe that the Federal Government should spend more on education and only 11 percent believe that we should cut education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will control the time on the minority side.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for the time.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a new Congress makes. We have seen in the last 4 years on the Appropriations Committee a lack of any kind of transparent open process. This last year on the other side of the aisle when they were in control, they didn't even pass a budget, a blueprint for spending. And that is why this year, Mr. Speaker, we have a \$1.65 trillion deficit. One year, \$1.65 trillion. We can't continue.

The President's budget that he brought up, which is not just dead on arrival, it is debt on arrival, what this says is that we are going to double the privately held national debt, another \$7 trillion. This is not fiscal restraint. This is not sanity.

I have four grandchildren, and the reason I am here is to make sure that they have a future. We cannot continue this outrageous spending that is going on in Washington. And when you look at this bill that we are talking about on the floor, \$100 billion off of the President's proposal for this past year, that is less than 1/16th of the annual deficit. It is scratching the surface. But because there has been no budget, there has been no fiscal restraint at all in the previous two Congresses, this thing has totally grown way beyond what is comprehensible by any normal person.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, this is the first step to bring some fiscal sanity back to Washington, D.C., to actually understand what the ramifications are long-term in spending. We cannot continue. And it is amazing to me in this rule to have an open process, where people can actually have amendments, I have had some Democrat colleagues come up and say, you mean, we are actually going to have amendments? They don't know how to handle that, because we have had a closed process for the last 4 years. We have second term Members of Congress that have never seen an open rule on an appropriations bill. Let's pass this rule and get our house in order.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the need to be fiscally responsible. I tried last night to offer an amendment in the Rules Committee that would simply

say that we should pay for the war in Afghanistan, that we should not continue to borrow the money. Last year, we borrowed \$450 billion. That went onto the credit card. And that means our kids and grandkids will have to bear that burden. That amendment was not made in order. I couldn't offer that amendment.

We talked last night about the giveaways to big oil companies and the need to get at those subsidies. The way the bill is written, we can't do it. We can't do it. So it's not so open.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, we do believe that reducing our deficit is one of the ways to instill confidence and create jobs. So, Mr. Speaker, I have a proposal for consideration. We give away \$4 billion a year in tax breaks to oil companies. Last week, the former CEO of Shell Oil Company said they don't need these tax breaks any more because they would search for the oil anyway; and, by the way, these companies made about a 53 percent profit last year.

So here's the proposal I would like to make: Let's do away with the \$4 billion in oil company tax breaks. Let's take 80 percent of that money and use it to reduce the deficit, and then let's take the remaining 20 percent of the money and spend it on programs for homeless veterans.

There was a report last week that 16 percent of the homeless in our country are veterans of the military service. This is obviously a condition that's a disgrace to our country and should be stopped. So my proposal under this open rule is that I be permitted to offer an amendment that says let's get rid of the tax breaks for the oil companies, put 80 percent of the money to reducing the deficit, and spend the other 20 percent to help the homeless veterans living on the streets of our country.

Now, it's my understanding, reading this rule, that I will not be permitted to offer that amendment. I would yield to anyone on the majority side if they could tell me whether they agree with my interpretation of the rule. Would I be permitted to offer the amendment that I am proposing on the floor?

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. As a newcomer here to the U.S. House of Representatives, I would certainly defer to the Parliamentarian; but I'm encouraging everyone to bring every amendment. Bring every amendment, Congressman, to the House floor and offer that amendment for debate and discussion.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, I would then respectfully ask the gentleman if the majority would then not lodge a point of order when my amendment comes to the floor.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, to respond.

Mr. WOODALL. I would say to the gentleman that having an open process and abiding by the rules of the House is critical to getting our work done. And if the rules of the House permit this amendment, I look forward to supporting it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, I would just read the words of our Speaker on opening day when he said to us, You will always have the right to a robust debate in an open process that allows you to make your case and offer alternatives.

Always. I'm not sure if "always" applies to this rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman, Mr. MCGOVERN, yielding.

I want to stand here today and tell you that we're all worried about the economy. We're all worried about getting people back to work; we have 9 percent unemployment. But the reality is there are a lot more people who have lost their jobs who have given up looking or are underemployed. This is the most serious economic problem we've faced since the Great Depression.

Now, unfortunately, the choice of the majority is to cut very substantially into programs that are in the domestic accounts and \$15 billion from defense. We all understand we have got to get spending under control and we have to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse. We have to look at this oil subsidy issue, which the oil companies even are embarrassed about.

But what I worry about here is with this approach we are going to hurt the economy. We are going to drive unemployment up. We're going to drive the deficit up. And it is countercyclical. When you cut this much spending, it is going to hurt the fragile recovery, and it's not going to put people back to work.

The other side seems to think that by making these cuts that the private sector is going to say, "aha", and invest all kinds of money and create jobs to offset these cuts. As the Democratic majority leader has just said, there are highly regarded studies out there that show that 800,000 jobs will be lost because of this bill. That will have a major negative impact on the economy.

Also, one program that I looked into and I hope we can fix is the voucher program for homeless veterans. This has been a program that's been going on for about 3 or 4 years. Homeless veterans can get a voucher and go through

their public housing authorities and get a place to live. There are almost 30,000 people in this program; and the ones that are in it are doing better—less alcohol, less drugs. They're getting jobs. They're feeling better about themselves. And there is a need, according to General Shinseki, now head of the VA, for another 30,000 of these vouchers.

This money is in the 2012 budget request. It was in the 2010 budget request. The majority decided to terminate this program. I would hope we could reconsider that. The program is working, and we need another 30,000 of these vouchers.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DICKS. The most recent data indicates that 10,000 of these veterans are from the Iraq and Afghanistan war. These are young people coming back who have served their country, and they deserve to have these vouchers if they need them. And we should restore this program. Again, I think we should vote against the rule, vote against the previous question.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 3 minutes to a true American patriot, a lover of this country, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. STEVE KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I'm very glad to welcome him to the United States Congress. He knows a little bit about what's going on around this organism that we live and work and breathe in.

I come to the floor during this rules debate to raise a subject that I think needs to be brought before this Congress, Mr. Speaker, and that's this: that even though this House in H.R. 2, the second priority of the Speaker, voted to repeal ObamaCare and sent that bill over to the Senate where it was taken up and every Republican voted to repeal ObamaCare—so every Republican in all the United States Congress has voted to repeal ObamaCare. It was bipartisan in this House, by the former Speaker's definition. And even though that took place, we did not shut off the funding to ObamaCare because in a—I won't say a legislative sleight of hand—there was written in the ObamaCare bill automatic appropriations that just last week we were able to pull all those pieces out and add them up and we received a CRS report last Friday that shows that \$105.5 billion are automatically triggered for spending that will implement ObamaCare whether or not we shut off the funds in this CR going forward. These are automatic appropriations.

I believed—and I've seen it for a long time and worked on this thing ever since mid-last summer—that we need to shut off all funding to ObamaCare in every appropriations bill going forward. And we had the assurance that we would have regular order. Well, the

regular order that we have is an open rule that closes out an amendment that would shut off the funding that's automatically appropriated by ObamaCare. If we'd actually had a full regular order, I could have brought that amendment before a subcommittee of Appropriations—asked someone to do—or the full Appropriations Committee. And actually, at the request, I followed all those paths until such time it wasn't written into the bill, as was shutting off funding to transferring people out of Gitmo or cutting off the 1099 or the stimulus plan of the President's.

All of that is written out in the bill, but nothing is in the bill that allows us to write out the automatic \$105 billion dollars. So we're faced with the automatic institutionalization of ObamaCare even while we cut this budget \$100 billion. So I went to Rules last night and asked Rules, Protect my amendment from a point of order so this House can work its will.

□ 1310

Even though I have great respect for all of the members of the Rules Committee, and the tone and tenor of the debate and the dialogue in there could not have been better, the Rules Committee declined to do that.

I am here on this floor now, asking myself: How do I vote "yes" on a rule that I so oppose?

That's my position, Mr. Speaker. I think that, if we fail to act now, now while we have the maximum amount of leverage and the one of two pieces of must-pass legislation—that is the CR, and next is the debt ceiling bill—to shut off the funding to implement ObamaCare, we will have missed our chance. By the way, every appropriations bill will come to the floor with the same kind of rule that will block out anyone from offering any legislation that will shut off the funding, the automatic appropriations to ObamaCare.

So as much as it pains me to be standing here at this point, I can't figure out how I can vote "yes" on a rule that I so oppose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

I was very interested to hear the comments from our friend from Iowa. I couldn't sympathize more with him, and I know I will have his support later in opposing a point of order to an amendment I have to restore Metro funding here in the National Capital region and to offset it with some cuts in certain agricultural subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, today we debate the rule on the full year continuing appropriations act for 2011. While I understand and support the need to establish long-term fiscal responsibility, to reduce spending, to reduce the deficit, and to grow the economy, H.R. 1 is not the way. It takes a meat ax to Amer-

ican competitiveness and actually destroys jobs.

That's why I introduced the Build America Bonds Now to Create Jobs Act, legislation to extend the successful Build America Bonds program, a jobs bill. Creating jobs grows the economy, encourages American innovation, and positions us to remain the global economic leader. During the past 2 years, \$4.4 billion from the Recovery Act leveraged \$181 billion worth of projects to construct and repair schools, bridges, roads, and transit systems in more than 2,270 projects in every State of the Union.

According to Moody's Analytics chief economist and JOHN MCCAIN's 2008 Presidential campaign adviser, infrastructure investments in the Recovery Act resulted in 8 million new or protected jobs that otherwise would have been lost in 2009 and 2010. By extending the Build America Bonds program, we can do more.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this closed rule and to support the amendment to bring the Build America Bonds Now to Create Jobs Act to the floor. Let's create jobs. Let's grow the economy. Let's unleash America competitiveness.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the freedom-loving State of Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. First, let's discuss the rule because we are here debating the rule.

Mr. Speaker, this is essentially an open rule. Yes, it does have a requirement for preprinting, but any Member can offer any amendment they want as long as they preprint it. Now, I understand my colleagues on the other side of the aisle might not like that. It's kind of foreign to them. For the last 4 years, we've had rules come to the floor that were closed. Members didn't have an opportunity to amend them. In fact, if we were under the previous leadership, what we would have here is a closed rule, an hour's debate on this CR. We would pass it and it would be done. Members wouldn't have an opportunity to influence the legislation before us.

This is part of this majority's promise that we are going to open the process and let the Members of Congress, the elected Representatives of the people, have a say in how we craft this legislation and in how it turns out in the long run. I don't understand, frankly, why Members would oppose the rule. I can understand their opposition to the underlying bill, but to oppose the rule makes no sense whatsoever.

Secondly, I rise in support of the underlying legislation. It is tough. The other side of the aisle continues to say all the right things: We've got to make tough decisions. We've got to enforce tough love. We've got to reduce the deficit. We've got to cut our spending. I hear those words and those phrases by every speaker who has come up. Yet

they oppose every effort to try to reduce the spending of the Federal Government as if it is a drastic reduction in what's going to happen and as if it's going to destroy our economy and destroy the Federal Government. Frankly, none of that is true.

Remember, as the gentleman from Iowa did say, we've got a \$1.65 trillion deficit in this budget, \$1.65 trillion. That's on top of the \$14 trillion we're already in debt.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. There is no magic bullet. We know we can't balance this budget simply by reducing non-security, non-defense spending.

Yet as the saying goes: The journey of 1,000 miles begins with a single step. This is that first step.

Yes, we have to get after the entitlement programs if we're going to reduce this deficit. Yes, we have to look at all of our tax structure if we're going to get after this deficit; but we've got to do what the American people instinctively know is the right thing to do, which is to get back to a balanced budget and quit endangering the future of our children and grandchildren.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have entered into the RECORD a statement as to why this is not an open rule and about the restrictions that are on Members who are wishing to offer amendments.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH A MODIFIED OPEN RULE?

A modified open rule such as this one imposes several restrictions on Members wishing to offer amendments:

It stifles the free flow of debate by preventing Members from offering amendments inspired by the debate or by other amendments.

Several years ago Chairman DREIER succinctly explained why an open rule is superior to a modified open rule. He said: "An open rule means that as the legislative process proceeds, as an amendment passes, it can spark an idea for an amendment that another Member may choose to offer with the changes that are made in the legislation."

A modified open rule also limits Members' ability to respond to changes on the floor that would require redrafting an amendment.

And the rule in front of us goes even further than any modified open rule I've ever seen by adding the unprecedented provision that prohibits using offsets from one subcommittee allocation to transfer funds to a different subcommittee allocation.

The rule finally provides for same day consideration of another rule for H.R. 1, which will allow the Republican Majority to report out a new rule shutting down the amendment process and take it to the floor that very same day. We haven't even begun debate, and already Republicans have prepared to further restrict this supposedly open process.

I think Chairman DREIER said it best just last month when describing a rule even less restrictive than this one. He said: "This is not an open rule. I want to make it very clear to all my colleagues again: This is not an open rule."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise not only in strong support of the rule but also in strong support of the continuing resolution.

The American people didn't send us here to pass promises. They didn't ask us to start making tough choices next year. There is always next year, but our effort to rein in the size, scope, and cost of the Federal Government has got to start right now. This continuing resolution honors our commitment, starting with funding for the remainder of the 2011 fiscal year.

As chair of the Financial Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I want to say that our financial services section contains a total of \$20.4 billion, which is a \$3.8 billion, or a 16 percent, reduction from fiscal year 2010 levels, and a reduction of \$4.9 billion, or 19 percent, from the President's fiscal year 2011 request.

Reductions of this magnitude are really challenging but are very necessary given the fiscal situation facing the Nation. Priority funding in this bill is focused on the most essential programs, such as security for the courts, counterterrorism, financial intelligence operations, as well as drug task forces. Yet other programs can easily achieve the new efficiencies this fiscal environment demands, especially at the executive office of the President and the Treasury Department. These agencies should set an example for the rest of the executive branch by recognizing significant budget savings.

For the IRS, the committee believes the agency can achieve efficiencies and has reduced its funding accordingly. In addition, the bill prohibits the IRS from using CR funding to implement the 1099 provision in the health care reform act, which would cause great harm to our small businesses.

It also requires the GSA to become more efficient, and it eliminates funding for construction or major alterations to Federal buildings that have been earmarked in the past by Congress and by the President.

Government has to be accountable to the people and so must government spending. This bill strikes that balance, and it makes priorities at a time when our Congress and our country must begin to face some very tough choices.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by complimenting my friend. He

has an amazing honor. He is able to make history here. We've not been able to find a time that a continuing resolution has been brought to the floor under a modified open rule, and he has done a superb job in managing it.

I didn't really hear my friend from Worcester say much of anything, so I suspect he did a reasonable job in recognizing that we are making history and that we are going to, for the first time, allow any Democrat or Republican to stand up on this floor and offer an amendment to the appropriations bill that is going to be before us, the continuing resolution.

□ 1320

I think that, Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to recognize that it's not only a new day when it comes to the process in this House for us to consider appropriations bills, but it's a new day in that we have stepped forward and recognized that if we don't get our fiscal house in order and bring about dramatic spending cuts, our future is very much in question. And I say that because people used comparisons to crazy places like Greece and California when they talk about the potential problems that the United States of America faces. And I've got to say that, if we don't bring about these kinds of spending cuts, we are going to be passing on to future generations a responsibility that they do not deserve to have. That's why it's up to us to do our job and make sure we get our fiscal house in order.

I mean, as the distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. ROGERS, has said so well, the cuts in this bill that are going to be before us are larger than the gross domestic product of 126 countries, and that's why we've got a monumental responsibility and a chance for Democrats and Republicans together to work on this thing.

And I'm so pleased to see my friend NORM DICKS, the distinguished ranking member, already working on his great product that's going to be coming forward as we seek to have the two of us come together as political parties to resolve our Nation's challenges.

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

Mr. Speaker, Democrats very much want to eliminate wasteful spending. We are committed to making the tough choices to get this budget more balanced, to get our deficit reduced, and start paying down the debt. That's not the issue. The issue is where do you make those cuts.

My friends on the other side of the aisle talked about shared sacrifice. Well, the only people that seem to be sacrificing under their approach are middle-income families and the poorest of the poor in our country. A few weeks ago, at their insistence, millionaires and billionaires got an extension of the Bush tax cuts at a cost of billions of dollars in terms of more borrowed money added on to our deficit. So the

Donald Trumps of the world are not sacrificing.

Big Oil is not sacrificing. Just to put it into perspective that BP, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil, and Shell made a combined profit of over \$1 trillion during this past decade, and yet taxpayers are subsidizing Big Oil companies. Why? And for all the talk about how open this rule is, we can't come up with an amendment that is germane or that will be made in order to go after the subsidies because they are protected.

I mentioned, earlier, the war. We borrowed \$450 billion last year. Our soldiers are sacrificing, their families are sacrificing, and we're not paying for the war. We're just putting it on our credit card. That is unconscionable, and yet an amendment is not eligible to be brought up to insist that we pay for this war.

So where do they cut? Education, more than 200,000 kids kicked out of Head Start and thousands of teachers would lose their jobs. An \$800 reduction per student in the maximum Pell Grant award. Innovation, 20,000 fewer researchers supported at the National Science Foundation trying to find a cure to cancer; a \$1.4 billion reduction in science and energy research to spur a clean energy economy of the future; \$2.5 billion in cuts to the National Institutes of Health, again, trying to find cures for diseases like cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's. If we found a cure for Alzheimer's, we would never have another problem with Medicaid again. Yet you are cutting back on those important investments. High-speed rail being cut back. A loss of 25,000 construction jobs if your bill becomes law. You're cutting cops and firefighters, and yet we're protecting the very wealthy in this country. We're protecting subsidies to major oil and gas companies. It is just wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that I can offer an amendment to the rule to provide that, immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 11, the Build America Bonds to Create Jobs Now Act.

Unlike the irresponsible bill the Republicans want to bring up, which will cut jobs, threaten American innovation, and slash initiatives that create economic growth, this bill will spur job creation here at home by extending through 2012 the successful Build America Bonds to help State and local governments finance the rebuilding of American schools and hospitals, water systems and transit projects at significantly lower costs.

It has been calculated that every \$1 billion in Federal funds invested in infrastructure creates or sustains approximately 35,000 jobs and \$6.2 billion in economic activity.

Build America Bonds are broadly supported by American business, the construction industry, and President Obama, as well as State and local governments. And at a time of fiscal re-

straint, they're a good deal for the American taxpayer, wisely using small public investments to leverage significant private funds to rebuild America and create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous 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 that we can debate and pass real jobs legislation. The American people want us to talk about jobs and how to create jobs and protect jobs. This will do it.

So I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I will say again, I can't believe that here on my first rule we have an open process; for the first time in the history of this House, the best I can tell, an open process on a continuing resolution. Now, we're only dealing with this continuing resolution because of the mess we were left in last year, and we're doing the very best we can with it.

You've heard words like "draconian," "decimates," "slashes." I want to put it in terms that I think we can all understand. I want you to think about it in terms of your family grocery budget, Mr. Speaker. If you went to the grocery store today and bought your groceries for a month, our friends on the other side would have you believe that we want you to fast for an entire day, because that's about what it is, this \$100 billion, about 1 day out of a month's grocery budget.

But if you took that 30 days of groceries and you spread those 30 days around—and that's what we do under an open process. We let you spread it around—add where you want to add; cut where you want to cut; spread that around. Can we do that? Can we do that as a very first step towards getting our fiscal house in order? Not only can we do it, Mr. Speaker, we must do it.

I'm grateful to the leadership for allowing us to do it. I urge a strong "yes" vote on the rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 92 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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. 11) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Build America Bonds program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equal-

ly divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole 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 result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. 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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOODALL. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 17

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, February 17, 2011, Friday, February 18, 2011, or Saturday, February 19, 2011, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 28, 2011, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, February 17, 2011, through Friday, February 25, 2011, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, February 28, 2011, or such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may des-

ignate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

□ 1330

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on House Resolution 92; adopting House Resolution 92; and adopting House Concurrent Resolution 17.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 92) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) 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, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 179, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—240

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire

Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta

Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg

Biggert
Billbray
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
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
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta

Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
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
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
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
Paul

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 (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)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—179

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney

Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
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
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez