

from under women with this cruel Republican budget?

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4089, SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE ACT OF 2012, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 614 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 624

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. 4089) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting. 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 Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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. (a) Pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 112, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress has adopted such concurrent resolution (with the modifications specified in subsection (b)).

(b) In section 201(b) of House Concurrent Resolution 112, as adopted by the House, the following amounts shall apply:

(1) \$7,710,000,000 (in lieu of \$8,200,000,000) for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013 with

respect to the Committee on Agriculture; and

(2) \$3,490,000,000 (in lieu of \$3,000,000,000) for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013 with respect to the Committee on Financial Services.

□ 1230

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 614 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentlewoman from Wisconsin makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order not necessarily out of concern for unfunded mandates, although there are likely some in the underlying bill, H.R. 4089.

But before I begin, Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state the inquiry.

Ms. MOORE. The rule clearly states, "Pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 112, as adopted by the House, shall have the force and effect in the House as though Congress had adopted such concurrent resolution."

Does this mean that the rule deems that the Senate will have passed H. Con. Res. 112?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the resolution during its pendency. That is a matter for debate.

Ms. MOORE. Okay. We will have to debate this. The language, as I have construed it, says it shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress, which would include the Senate, had adopted such concurrent resolution. That is subject to debate.

So I want the House to be really clear here that, given this language, there is a real—it seems probable and likely that if we vote "yes" for House Concurrent Resolution 112, the Republican budget, which ends Medicare for a voucher system, ends the entitlement under Medicaid, cuts food support, cuts funds by \$134 billion over 10 years, that we could be deeming this to be passed.

I am raising again, Mr. Speaker, the question about that use of "Congress

has adopted such concurrent resolution," meaning also the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would reiterate that the issue is a matter for debate, and the Chair will not interpret the language of the resolution during its pendency.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your lack of clarity.

I raise this point of order because it's important to uncover whether or not the underlying rule for this Natural Resources bill—it's a Natural Resources bill—also deems the Republican budget plan to end Medicare as we know it, slash funding for SNAP.

When it comes to the Republican budget, my Democratic colleagues are most definitely not asleep at the wheel. And we want to take this moment to shed light on what's going on here.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a member of that prestigious committee, the House Committee on the Budget, and a long-time advocate for sound budgetary policy. I recognize the importance of tackling our deficit and debt head-on, carefully balancing both the spending and revenue-raising sides of our ledger.

But House Republicans, led by my dear colleague from Wisconsin, have put out a budget that is neither sound nor balanced. This budget finds a jaw-dropping 62 percent of its \$5.3 trillion in nondefense budget cuts over 10 years from programs that serve the most vulnerable of our society, the poor, and I might add in the most vulnerable, women and children, since we've just recently established in this last week that women were very important in our economy.

In addition to the sheer magnitude of these raw numbers, I want to make it clear that the Republican budget contains major departures from current policy. This budget heralds welfare reform as a vital victory and plots the next chapter of so-called "reforms" for other areas of the safety net.

Our core programs are not spared by this budgetary trick. This budget takes an aim at Medicare. We're told that by stripping Medicare of its entitled status, cutting \$30 billion out of Medicare, that we're going to save it. We're going to save Medicare by subtracting \$30 billion. That's not the kind of math I learned at North Division High.

And we're going to set seniors adrift in the private market. Now, this budget does nothing to cut the cost of health care in the private market. It only passes those costs on to seniors.

The cuts to the SNAP program have not gotten as much attention as the Medicare cuts, even though they are cause for collective alarm. As we know, over half of our citizens in the United States, working people, many of them, found themselves with no other income. They had no job. We played phony baloney with the unemployment insurance. They had nothing except SNAP, formerly known as food stamps.

□ 1240

And so they had no other income other than the food stamp program,

SNAP, but yet we're going to cut \$134 million out of this program and convert it again to a block grant and handcuff SNAP's ability to respond to its increased need.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask you how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I yield 2 minutes to my good friend and neighbor from the great State of Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I rise in support of her point of order.

All this talk of "deeming and passing," those words mean nothing to the American people, but the vote we are about to take means a lot.

What Republicans are trying to do is to jam through the Republican budget and pretend that it's the law of the land. They have to play these games because last year the American people rejected this budget the first time around. But instead of doing some soul-searching and offering a bill that reflects the true priorities of this Nation, the Republicans have doubled down, and the results are truly astonishing.

As has been mentioned, this budget ends the Medicare guarantee while raising health costs for seniors who have an average income of just \$19,000 a year. It increases defense spending while placing a cap on food assistance and cutting Medicaid. It gives the average multi-millionaire—listen to this—a tax break of \$394,000 while raising taxes on the middle class. It protects subsidies for oil companies and corporations that ship jobs overseas while slashing investments that create jobs and rebuild the middle class. The cuts are so severe that if their policies are carried out, by 2050 there is almost nothing left of discretionary spending but defense. As the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has said, most of the rest of the government will simply "cease to exist."

But it doesn't have to be this way. Yesterday, Republicans in the Senate rejected a perfectly reasonable proposal—that millionaires and billionaires shouldn't pay a lower tax rate than a middle class family does. They should have passed the Buffett rule in the Senate, which would have been an important first step toward addressing our fiscal challenges in a fair way—a way that cuts waste, not opportunity; protects Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid; creates jobs and builds the economy; and asks more from those who can afford it.

This Republican budget is not a serious effort. It's a radical proposal. But I'll give them credit for one thing: at least they're honest in proposing this irresponsible budget.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I reserve the balance of my time. I would love to hear what the

opponents to my point of order have to say.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to be down here for this procedural issue that is before us. The question before the House is: Should the House now consider House Resolution 614? While the resolution waives all point of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any points of order.

The waiver is prophylactic in nature. The Congressional Budget Office has stated that H.R. 4089 contains no inter-governmental or private sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act and would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments. Again, Mr. Speaker, this waiver is prophylactic, and the motion from the gentlelady from Wisconsin is dilatory.

In order for the House to continue our scheduled business for today, we need to continue on with this proposal and dealing with the rule that is before us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he would yield to a question.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Well, I would be happy to, but I don't control the time.

Ms. MOORE. I would yield my time for the purpose of your answering my question.

The Speaker has declined to answer my parliamentary query and said that that would be settled during the debate. So is it your understanding that passage of this resolution will or will not deem the Republican budget to have been passed in all of the Congress? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I would not dare to try and supersede my interpretation over the Speaker's interpretation. That is his responsibility. However—

Ms. MOORE. No, no, no. He said it would be determined during debate.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Would you allow me to answer the question?

Ms. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. That is still the Speaker's responsibility. However, what deeming applies to is that these are for procedural considerations allowed to go forward until such time as an actual budget has indeed passed. So the answer to your question is actually both: Temporarily, yes; long term, obviously no.

Ms. MOORE. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. At some time, the Senate has to do their work. Hopefully, they will do it soon and then this issue would be moot.

Ms. MOORE. Reclaiming my time from the point at which I said I was reclaiming my time. And I ask that he be taxed for that extra time because he al-

ready gave me his answer—that, yes, it would be deemed to be passed.

I just want to remind people, in this week when we have learned how important it is to have a stable, good budget for women, that this program slashes funding for Medicaid—two-thirds of adults are women who depend on it. It slashes Medicare—two-thirds of the recipients are women. And 85 percent of Medicare recipients that are older than 85 depend on it.

It cuts support for key programs like childcare, which are important to women, and job training. It cuts core programs like food stamps. Our Presidential candidate said that 93 percent of women lost jobs during the recession. Why would we want to take away the safety net of food stamps when women put food on the table every day trying to feed their babies?

Mr. Speaker, this program—which will be deemed to be passed—needs more review, and I would ask you to find my point of order in time.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. MOORE. I want to thank the gentleman for a vigorous debate—at least on my part—and I would ask my colleagues to take a closer look.

This is the Congress of the United States of America. We are supposed to do things very carefully. This is the budget that we're setting out, the moral document for how this country is to be run, and we should not be deeming it as passed, as this resolution calls for.

I would ask all my colleagues to support my point of order and ask them to vote against this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, once again, I wish to remind the body that we are dealing with a procedural issue. We've heard a great deal of policy debate here, but what we are dealing with is a procedural issue.

The policy of the debate has been debated on this floor and will be debated in the future as well under two criteria: one, either allowing our committees to move forward with its authorization, appropriations, and reconciliation efforts, in which case certain procedural techniques must take place; or, two, actually allowing the Senate to do their work and pass a budget, going to a conference, and then moving forward in that manner. One way or the other, the procedure must go forward. This is not policy we're debating here, it's procedure.

There is precedence for what we are doing. Indeed, in the last Congress, H.R. 1500, the opposition party, the minority party, also deemed resolutions and brought them forward—actually, it's happened six times in our history. The only difference between the deeming that we have here and the deeming

that happened in the last session of Congress is that this particular budget—which will be debated again—actually went through a committee and had a vote on the floor. Unfortunately, when the Democrat Party did that a couple years ago, they had not gone through a committee, they did not have a debate on the floor or in committee or a vote on anything. Actually, the numbers that were deemed at that time were less than 1-day's notice before they were actually voted on the floor. And everyone who has spoken against this procedure voted for that particular deeming a couple of years ago in the last Congress.

□ 1250

There is precedence for this, and the precedence is solely a procedural issue. This is not the time to talk about the policy. There was a time before, and there will be time in the future. This is a procedural precedent, and we can only move forward in doing the work of this Congress—and I appreciate the other side for at least admitting that the Republicans are trying to move forward in the work of this Congress—if we have certain procedural issues done in advance. That's what we are attempting to do.

So, in order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business of this day, I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of the consideration of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 175, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—234

Adams	Burgess	Emerson
Aderholt	Calvert	Farenthold
Akin	Camp	Fitzpatrick
Alexander	Campbell	Flake
Amash	Canseco	Fleischmann
Amodel	Cantor	Fleming
Bachmann	Capito	Flores
Bachus	Carter	Forbes
Barletta	Cassidy	Fortenberry
Bartlett	Chabot	Fox
Barton (TX)	Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)
Bass (NH)	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Benishkek	Coffman (CO)	Gallely
Berg	Cole	Gardner
Biggert	Conaway	Garrett
Bilbray	Cravaack	Gerlach
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gibson
Black	Culberson	Gingrey (GA)
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Gingrey (GA)
Bonner	Dent	Goodlatte
Bono Mack	DesJarlais	Gosar
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Gowdy
Brady (TX)	Dold	Granger
Brooks	Dreier	Graves (GA)
Broun (GA)	Duffy	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Griffin (AR)
Bueshon	Duncan (TN)	Griffith (VA)
Buerkle	Eillers	Grimm

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

NAYS—175

Ackerman	Dingell	Lewis (GA)
Altmire	Donnelly (IN)	Lipinski
Baca	Doyle	Loeb
Baldwin	Edwards	Loeb
Barrow	Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe
Bass (CA)	Engel	Lowey
Becerra	Eshoo	Lujan
Berkley	Farr	Lynch
Berman	Fattah	Maloney
Bishop (GA)	Frank (MA)	Markey
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	Matheson
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Matsui
Bonamici	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Boren	Green, Al	McCollum
Boswell	Green, Gene	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	McGovern
Braley (IA)	Gutierrez	McNerney
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Meeks
Butterfield	Hanabusa	Michaud
Capps	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Capuano	Heinrich	Miller, George
Carmahan	Higgins	Moore
Carson (IN)	Himes	Moran
Castor (FL)	Hinche	Murphy (CT)
Chandler	Hinojosa	Nadler
Chu	Hochul	Neal
Ciilline	Holden	Olver
Clarke (MI)	Holt	Owens
Clarke (NY)	Honda	Pallone
Clay	Hoyer	Pascarell
Cleaver	Israel	Pastor (AZ)
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Connolly (VA)	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Conyers	(TX)	Peters
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree (ME)
Courtney	Kaptur	Polis
Critz	Keating	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kildee	Quigley
Cuellar	Kind	Rahall
Davis (CA)	Kissell	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Richardson
DeFazio	Langevin	Richmond
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ross (AR)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Levin	Ruppersberger
		Rush

Ryan (OH)	Sires	Visclosky
Sanchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Walz (MN)
T.	Speler	Wasserman
Sanchez, Loretta	Stark	Schultz
Sarbanes	Sutton	Waters
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Watt
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Waxman
Schrader	Tierney	Welch
Schwartz	Tonko	Wilson (FL)
Scott, David	Towns	Woolsey
Serrano	Tsongas	Yarmuth
Sewell	Van Hollen	
Sherman	Velazquez	

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Denham	Napolitano
Austria	Doggett	Rangel
Burton (IN)	Filner	Scott (VA)
Cardoza	Fincher	Slaughter
Carney	Hirono	Walberg
Cohen	Johnson (IL)	Whitfield
Costello	Marino	
Cummings	McIntyre	

Ms. CHU, Messrs. OLIVER and GARAMENDI changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SHIMKUS and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

□ 1317

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 154, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 154 due to a family health emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Question of Consideration of H. Res. 614, the resolution providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4089, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, to continue on, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1320

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The resolution provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 4089, a bill to protect the traditional rights of American sportsmen to fish and hunt on public lands free from undue and illogical bureaucratic restrictions and unwarranted and irrational limitations, and

provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I am actually pleased to stand before this House today and support this rule, as well as the underlying legislation. Far too often decisions are made to placate certain political special interest groups who are headquartered far away from the locations they seek to dominate and control, and too often the needs of local citizens and local taxpayers who live in those areas in which the impact will occur are ignored. This asks for our consideration.

Too often local and State considerations are not taken into account. Too often there are inconsistencies within the public domain where the BLM, Fish and Wildlife, and the National Park Service will have different rules. And the difficulty, obviously, for a citizen is not knowing where one starts and where one ends. This bill tries to bring some consistency. And though I don't know how much of the debate will occur on this particular issue, it is about hunting and fishing on public lands.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, technically, this rule allows for consideration of H.R. 4089, the Sportsmen's Heritage Act, a patchwork quilt of four different bills that ease restrictions on guns and hunting. This bill, a sop to the gun lobby, deserves to be defeated by the House.

But that's not the most important part or most egregious part of this rule. That's because of the language slipped into this rule at the last minute by the Rules Committee—language that sets the budget numbers for the next fiscal year, and language that, Mr. Speaker, once again ends the Medicare guarantee for America's seniors.

That's right, Mr. Speaker. Last night, the Republicans on the Rules Committee pulled a switcheroo just before our vote on the rule. Now, these weren't just harmless, innocuous provisions. No, Mr. Speaker. These provisions would effectively enact the Ryan budget and require that Congress use it as a framework for the rest of the year.

The irony is that by adopting this language now, the Republican leadership is admitting that their awful budget resolution isn't going anywhere and that this so-called "deeming resolution" is the only way forward. It's ironic because they are using parliamentary tricks and sleight-of-hand to pretend that their budget has the force of law. Where are the Tea Party

folks who used to be so outraged at this kind of abuse of regular order? Why aren't they yelling and screaming?

There hasn't been a single committee debate or markup on this language. These provisions undercut the bipartisan budget floor negotiated by President Obama and Speaker BOEHNER in the Budget Control Act. And worst of all, these provisions end the Medicare guarantee again.

The American people get it. They said "no" to the Ryan budget last year. They don't want Medicare to turn into a voucher program. They don't want to see their health care rationed or cut. They don't want Washington politicians trying to pull the rug out from underneath them after years of contributing to this important program.

We made a promise to America's seniors, Mr. Speaker. And once again, the Republican leadership is breaking their promise.

Mr. Speaker, it's bad enough that the Republican leadership doesn't want to focus on getting Americans back to work. It's bad enough that they're pushing cuts that will make hunger in America worse. That's evidenced by the fact that tomorrow in the Agriculture Committee we're going to be asked to vote on a package to cut \$33 billion out of the SNAP program, increasing hunger in America if that would succeed. But their insistence on continuing to push for an end to Medicare is indescribable.

Now, I'm sure my Republican friends will deny that they want to end Medicare for America's seniors. They'll say their idea is bipartisan, even though it's not. They'll say that the detractors are exaggerating. But the truth hurts. This is not bipartisan. Yes, Senator RON WYDEN cosponsored health care legislation with Congressman PAUL RYAN, but Senator WYDEN has also said that he does not support the Medicare provisions in the Ryan budget. Once again, he said he does not support the provisions in the Ryan budget with regard to Medicare. I'm sure someone will, once again, try to twist his words around, but they are very clear to me, Mr. Speaker.

This plan is not bipartisan. This is wholly owned by the Republicans and the Republican leadership, and I know my friends will say that this doesn't change Medicare. That, too, is a misrepresentation of their plan. But don't take my word for it. Let me read directly from the AARP's letter opposing the Ryan budget:

By creating a "premium support" system for future Medicare beneficiaries, the proposal is likely to simply increase costs for beneficiaries while removing Medicare's promise of secure health coverage.

AARP goes on to say:

The premium support method described in the proposal—unlike private plan options that currently exist in Medicare—would likely "price out" traditional Medicare as a viable option, thus rendering the choice of traditional Medicare as a false promise. The proposal also leaves open the possibility for

private plans to tailor their plans to healthy beneficiaries—again, putting traditional Medicare at risk.

Finally, AARP says:

Converting Medicare to a series of private options would undermine the market power of Medicare and could lead to higher costs for seniors.

That's a hard-hitting analysis from a nonpartisan group, and it shatters the myth that the Ryan Medicare plan wouldn't harm current or future seniors.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats oppose the Ryan budget because it's the wrong plan for America, and the deeming language included in this rule would force the Ryan budget on this House without a direct vote. That's right: there's no up-or-down vote on this plan. No, the rule simply "deems" that the Ryan budget takes effect, despite the lack of a budget resolution conference report.

Americans want us to focus on jobs and the economy, not on partisan games designed to throw red meat to the right wing of the right wing. Reject this rule and reject the Ryan Medicare plan.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. As was stated on the point of order, when we talk about deeming—a term that, obviously, most Americans have never heard—a procedural issue, we have had the policy debate, and we will have in the future the policy debate. But this point is about procedure.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me, I'd actually like to go back to the topic of the debate we have today and the topic of the rule and, indeed, the topic of the bill, which deals with hunting and fishing. That ought to be what we are talking about in here, because that is the issue before us in the underlying bill—hunting and fishing. And it is significant because what this bill asks for those who are sportsmen in America is that hunting and fishing be recognized as a historic and traditional recreation activity and that our bureaucracy back here in Washington will support and protect those hunting and fishing rights, although we do not insist that they prioritize them.

What that means in simple language is if the agencies back here in the bureaucracies of Washington decide that some area of public land should be closed to public recreation, they have to have a darn good reason to do it. In fact, the bill lists some reasons to do it—fire safety, public safety, national security, or compliance with State laws or regulations, and only then and there. Indeed, in addition to having that criteria, unlike other elements when we deal with public-lands issues, there is a specific time limit on when these decisions have to be made; and if, indeed, the agency will not make those decisions in a timely fashion, it reverts back to what it was and these activities may go forward.

Do we need to do this? Of course we do. One Bureau of Land Management official implied that recreational hunting should be eliminated on public

lands because, in his words: The urbanites freak out when they hear the sound of shots being done on public lands.

I suggest to you that is not a logical reason on why hunting and fishing rights should be prohibited; and, therefore, you need this language in here to make sure those hunting and fishing rights are indeed protected.

There will be one amendment that will come forward later on that talks about recreational shooting. I want to remind this body that under the rules that we have, that includes such things as reenactments. If ever the Bureau of Land Management or the National Park Service has a reenactment, if that amendment were to be passed, you couldn't actually shoot a flintlock because it would violate some of the proposed rules here.

□ 1330

It also goes on to say that Congress has, for a long time, banned EPA from making rules or regulations dealing with lead ammunition or flying equipment. And yet, once again, we have a nuisance lawsuit that was filed on March of this particular year petitioning the EPA to make a decision to try and ban this particular process. There is no scientific evidence for that petition.

But we don't know necessarily what some of the agencies in here making bureaucratic regulations—in effect, making a legislative decision within the body of an executive agency—will do. Therefore, this legislation, once again, makes it crystal clear that Congress has spoken on this issue, that Congress has primacy on this issue, and that Congress' decision on this issue should, indeed, be respected.

This bill stops red tape by the bureaucracies that has stopped legal hunting trophies from coming into this country. I emphasize the word "legal" hunting trophies.

This bill is supported by every sportsmen's group imaginable.

Some people would say this is a Second Amendment issue. I don't necessarily want to go that far because our Second Amendment is about an individual right to self-defense. Hunting was not the purview of the Second Amendment when it was adopted. But, indeed, the ability of people to bear weapons on public lands to do hunting and fishing when it is allowable is important, and it is important for us to step forward and say that it should be protected.

In essence, what this bill does is say to those who like to recreate on public lands, and that recreation includes hunting and fishing, that is a traditional, that is a historic activity and that should be maintained, and any of those efforts by special interest groups to try and curtail that will be rejected by this Congress. That's why this bill is here, that's why this bill is significant, that's why this bill is important, and that's why this bill should be passed,

including the rule to start forward in that process.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we will talk about other elements, I'm sure, that will come up, but we can do that at a later time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I can see why my good friend from Utah is so desperate not to talk about the deem-and-pass language which is included in this rule. I would remind him, and I remind others on the other side, that back in March of 2010, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER said that the deem-and-pass strategy was "one of the most outrageous things I have seen since I have been in Congress." That's what the current Speaker of the House said back in March of 2010. And now, astonishingly, everybody on the other side of the aisle is quiet about that.

Let me just say this, Mr. Speaker. This place is becoming an institution where trivial matters get debated passionately and important ones not at all. My friend from Utah is saying this is all about the guns, the gun issue. Well, that's the least important part of what this rule does.

This rule deems the Ryan budget. It basically says that we're going to operate under those very difficult numbers that Congressman RYAN and the Republicans' Budget Committee have passed. And what it means is that we're going to end Medicare as we know it. That's more important to talk about than guns. What it means is that we're going to force more people into food insecurity and hunger because it's going to result in drastic cuts in food and nutrition programs. That's more important to talk about than guns.

The fact of the matter is this rule undercuts the social safety net in this country. This rule, if it is passed and these numbers become what the House operates under, I think will destroy the middle class and will force more people in the middle into poverty. It undercuts programs in education, and it undercuts programs in environmental protection and investments in our infrastructure and aid to cities and towns helping our police, helping our firefighters.

As I said—I cannot say this enough—this ends Medicare as we know it. If people want to end Medicare, then vote for this rule, because that's exactly what this rule will require. And I think that's outrageous. There are some things worth fighting for; and the protection of Medicare is one of those things, at least on our side of the aisle, we think is worth fighting for.

So please do not be fooled that this is some innocuous rule that would merely bring up a bill dealing with guns. This bill deems the Ryan budget as basically passed, as if it has gone through the House and the Senate, and the numbers that we're going to operate under in all of our committees.

I think that as the American people pay closer attention to what is hap-

pening here, they get more and more outraged by the activities of the Republican leadership. This is not what the American people want. They rejected this attempt to undercut Medicare last year, and they're going to reject it again.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule. Vote "no" on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the concerns of some people who do not live in areas that have a vast amount of public lands owned and controlled by the Federal Government, who don't see the need for some of those situations to be modified, rectified, and secured.

For those of us who have the joy of the Federal Government as an absentee landlord, this bill is actually of significance. It's not just another gun bill; it's dealing with ways of life and recreation opportunities that should and ought to be maintained at all times.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is the deeming portion of this that happens to be there. Senator Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota, that name that goes back to my childhood, once gave a wonderful article in which he told people that if you were a Senator not to worry about the rules of the Senate because none of the Senators know what they are, so just go ahead and try what you want to. He also said that if you're a House Member, rules of the House are too complex, so just ask the Parliamentarians; don't try to learn them. There's a load of wisdom in that, because what we have in here, in this particular deeming section, is a procedural issue, something that must take place according to our rules if we, indeed, are to go forward with the work of what Congress is supposed to be.

Unlike the rhetoric that we have heard so far, this is not the debate on the policy issue. That has happened in the past. That will come again in the future. This rule is simply about the procedure if we allow Congress to move forward with our work.

I have said there is precedent for this. Six times in the history of the House these kind of deeming provisions have been written into the budget. Is it good? Of course not. No one wants to do it this way. But it has to go forward simply because of the dynamics of the two Houses that we have here right now.

As I said, this has precedent for it.

In 2010, indeed, there was another deeming motion that was made here on the floor in House Resolution 1500 of that particular year. The gentleman from Massachusetts was the sponsor of that on the floor, as well, in which, at that time, under Democratic control, we also deemed. There was a difference, though, in that deeming of that time. Under this time, there has been a budget that has gone through the Budget Committee and that was voted on in the Budget Committee and was debated on the floor and passed on the floor.

In 2010, there was no budget that went through a Budget Committee and did not have a vote. Indeed, the numbers were only given a day before the actual vote took place under martial law. At that time, in 2010, this House resolution was hereby adopted. We're not doing that this time. What we are simply doing is allowing the process to go forward.

Now, there are two ways of doing this: either we can pass this deeming concept for the House so that the appropriation bills and the authorization bills and the reconciliation bills within their committee can go forward with some kind of standard on what they are doing. To do so without that is like playing a baseball game without any umpires where no one is there to say what is a ball and what is a strike and if there is an out or a safe. That's what this concept would do.

There's another way of solving that same problem, and that's asking our good friends on the other side of this Chamber, the Senate, to finally pass a budget so that we can work together and move forward.

Look, the Senate has refused to pass a budget in, now, 1,081 days; 1,081 days the Senate has refused to do a budget on their side. And we should not be paralyzed because of their inaction. In 1,081 days, Henry VIII married, divorced, and beheaded his wife in less time than that.

The Senate should be willing to move forward, and if they did, if they passed the budget and we have this conference committee, we could actually move forward in that time. But without that, we have to do something else procedural so that our committees can actually pass authorization bills, appropriation bills, and reconciliation bills and bring them here to the floor in some kind of order.

We have to have a budget if you don't want to have a government shutdown. You have to have a budget if you want a reconciliation that will solve what Secretary Panetta says is that sequester meat ax that would happen to the defense of this country.

□ 1340

You have to have a budget because the Senate refuses to do a budget. I find it surprising that some on the other side are basically arguing not to do anything, which would actually lead to shutting down the government or draconian cuts, or basically telling us we're not supposed to do our work. That is ridiculous.

This is not a great concept. I'm not happy that we're doing this. It would be much better if the Senate would do their work and let us work together.

Or maybe there's a third option. Congressman Berger of Wisconsin, back in the 1920s, suggested that a constitutional amendment would be passed to dissolve the U.S. Senate and leave only the House. That is a third option that would solve our problems, and perhaps our friends on the other side would like that option better.

Sans that opportunity, we've got to move forward. This is a procedural issue to move us forward with precedents, having been done in the last Congress, precedents. I ask that you consider that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that if this were nothing, my friends on the other side of the aisle would not be hiding this deeming language in a rule dealing with guns. We'd have a straight up-or-down-vote on the floor on the deeming provision.

The fact of the matter is that this rule magically puts the Ryan budget into effect, and what that means is an end to Medicare as we know it. And we're going to fight my friends on the other side of the aisle who want to destroy one of the most important social programs that we have in this country.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for giving us all this opportunity to speak about what is happening on the floor today. It's happening just as we have returned from 2 weeks with our constituents, listening to them talk about core challenges facing the American people and the key priorities our families, businesses, and workers are facing.

Americans have made it clear over and over again. It is their constant message. We must work together to create jobs and grow our economy. We must preserve the economic security of our seniors, the middle class, and small business owners. This is all the backbone of the middle class, the backbone of our democracy.

We must protect Medicare and not dismantle it. And yet, Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues are at it again. Not once, not twice, not three times, but now four times are they voting to cut the Medicare guarantee. We must protect Medicare.

We must enact a budget that reflects our Nation's values of fairness and opportunity and puts the American Dream in reach for every American. Yet, House Republicans simply refuse to listen to what the American people are saying to us. Instead, they have decided to pull a stunt here today and "deem and pass" their devastating budget. They know their budget cannot stand the scrutiny of the House, the Senate and the rest, so they want to deem and pass it using a procedural trick to pretend that both the House and the Senate have signed off on their radical agenda.

But the American people know better. They know that the Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee, making seniors pay more to get less on the way to severing the Medicare guarantee completely; that this budget destroys more than 4 million jobs in the next 2 years, destroys jobs. And three, gives a tax cut of nearly \$400,000 to people making more than \$1 million per

year, protects tax breaks for special interests and Big Oil, and forces the middle class to foot the bill. Ends the Medicare guarantee, is a job killer to the tune of 4 million jobs, gives over \$400,000 in tax cuts to people making over \$1 million a year. How can that be a statement of our national values?

We also know that the Republican budget will undermine Medicaid for the elderly and people with disabilities, slash critical investments in education—education, where all innovation springs from, education, the source of America's competitiveness internationally, education, the source of people reaching their aspirations in life. Education, jobs, and health care would be slashed.

And we know that cuts have to be made, and important spending decisions must be made. But you just can't say let seniors pay more for Medicare, let's not invest in education and the rest, while we give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country.

So this bill, called a budget bill, breaks the deal. It breaks the debt agreement. It makes matters worse for the deficit. It breaks the deal struck last summer, abandoning a firm bipartisan promise to the American people.

Americans already rejected the Republican budget plan last year, and this year is no different, except the Republicans think so—by bringing it up over and over again, and this time by saying we know it can't pass the Senate, so we'll just deem it passed in the House.

Rather than trying to fool the American people, the Republicans are being called upon to join us today in opposing today's previous question and simply allowing the House to vote. And our measure would say, if the Republicans contend—and they do—that their bill does not hurt Medicare, then let the House go on record and say that our measure would prohibit any plan to eliminate Medicare, raise costs, ration care, or reduce the benefits for seniors and people with disabilities.

By supporting our proposal we can keep the bedrock promise to our seniors that, after a lifetime of work, all Americans should be able to retire with dignity and security.

As Members of Congress, we each have a responsibility to protect Medicare for our seniors, to create jobs for our workers, to grow our economy, to build a strong, all-inclusive, and thriving middle class.

As Democrats, we are committed to reigniting the American Dream, to building ladders of opportunity for all who want to work hard, play by the rules, and take responsibility. And we want them all to succeed. We just don't want people that make over \$1 million to climb up their ladder, make over \$1 million a year, and then pull up the ladder so that no one else can even reach some level of success.

We ask our House Republican friends, please let us work together to reach

our shared goals to strengthen families, to secure a future of prosperity for all people in our country.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question to stop the drive to deem and pass a measure that will end the Medicare guarantee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the former Speaker’s visit to the floor, and I have a comment to make about the verbiage of deem and pass.

But first, before we get there, I’d like to actually have someone talk about the resolution itself. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) to actually go back to what it’s supposed to be about, hunting and fishing.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the legislation and the rule as well.

Our Nation has been blessed with such magnificent natural wonders that provide great enjoyment for those who hunt and fish, and today, our sportsmen continue a wonderful and a great tradition that has defined our Nation.

Unfortunately, far too often sportsmen are stymied in their efforts to build upon this great American tradition and heritage because of overzealous bureaucrats and activists who seem to want to go to almost any means, really, to stop hunting and fishing.

Today, by passing the Sportsmen’s Heritage Act of 2012, we will make a statement of support for our Nation’s sportsmen and -women. This bill states clearly that fishing and hunting and shooting are important activities that create jobs and must continue on public land, and it requires those that manage the land to make it accessible and holds them accountable.

It takes away the power from the bureaucrats to limit types of ammunition and fishing tackle that they’ve been trying to limit that can be used on public lands. And it removes red tape that keeps hunters from bringing home a limited number of legally-taken trophies from Canada as well.

□ 1350

And today, Mr. Speaker, we will send a very clear message to American sportsmen and American sportswomen that we are on your side. We value the important role that you play in upholding our national heritage and its great tradition of America, and the jobs that you create through your activities as well.

I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this very important legislation and this rule as well.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just repeat, this rule has very little to do with sportsmen, but it has an awful lot to do with ending the Medicare guarantee as we know it.

At this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the opportunity to join in this debate.

First of all, I would like to strongly agree with the previous speakers on our side of the aisle that this is trying to shield the public from the full consequences of the Republican budget.

We just left the Budget Committee, where we had an opportunity for people to start looking at what is going to happen were their budget to move forward. And make no mistake, if our friends on the other side of the aisle thought that this “deem and pass” was just a little modest procedural thing to do and it was a good idea, we would be having the budget discussion here with trumpets blaring. The reason we’re not is what you saw in a moment of candor by the Presidential nominee—evidently—Romney talking about what’s going to happen. About Departments like Housing and Education that are going to be shrunk or eliminated, talking about the massive tax increases that are going to be necessary on middle America if they’re going to give these additional tax reductions for people who need it least.

There’s a reason why this is being shuffled through without a full, honest debate about the consequences. I’m hopeful that this falls short. But make no mistake, this is a sad effort to back away from assertions from the Republicans that they were going to try and open up the process, be inclusive, engage people in a broad discussion. Instead we get legislation like this.

I listened to my good friend from Michigan just sort of passing over, for example, the little item about being able to bring in trophies animals that have been hunted in Canada. Back up and look at what’s happening here. This encourages people to hunt for trophies the polar bears, which are threatened and endangered. They know that they’re not supposed to import it back into the United States, but now these people go out and kill these animals for trophy, for sport. Now they’re going to be able to bring them here to the United States even though for years it’s been inappropriate to do so. What sort of incentive is this to respect our efforts to protect threatened and endangered species like the polar bear?

Opening up public lands? We’re all in favor of being able to use public lands. I come from the West. I’m one of those States where the Federal stewardship is over half the land. I represent Federal areas in my district, and I represent a lot of people who hunt and fish. I also represent a lot of people who like to hike, people who like the wilderness experience, people who respect efforts to try and manage our forests.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. This legislation, if it were enacted—and mercifully it won’t be—would enable some bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. to trump the decisions of local land managers to try and protect, for example, in condition

of high fire hazard. We saw forest fires in Colorado started by recreational target shooting.

Now, of course our friends on the other side of the aisle aren’t concerned about increased global warming, increased drought, extreme weather conditions; but for heavens sakes, taking away the ability of the local managers to be good stewards of the land, to take away the authority of the EPA to ever deal with appropriate regulations on things like lead is just silly. It’s not appropriate, it’s not good policy, and it’s part of an effort to obscure the real efforts that are under way, and that has to do with being able to weasel this Republican budget legislation through with as little public scrutiny as possible.

I strongly urge rejection of the rule.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Oregon for being here. It was exhilarating to hear someone actually talking about the bill before us. Unfortunately, it was slightly inaccurate as well, so if I could make a couple of corrections.

The trophy concept that is there is not opening it up for new elements. It is simply saying those trophies that were already legally hunted and have been denied access to this country can be accessed into this country. It doesn’t expand anything. Indeed, rather than actually taking away State and local control, one of the provisions of this bill is that the rules will be attuned to State and local laws, which means State and local authorities actually have a great deal of authority under this particular bill. They have more authority than a bureaucrat sitting here in Washington.

But let me go back to what the other people wish to talk about, and that is this deeming concept again—even though that is one of the provisions and is still not the basis of the bill.

I taught debate for almost a dozen years, and I had a debate coach when I was younger who used to say when you’re totally lost on an issue and you don’t know what to do, just find an argument and keep drilling it in over and over again and just maybe the judge will vote for you. You’ve heard that happening today. No decision is being made on this procedural vote. We did actually have a debate and vote 3 weeks ago. That debate would have been appropriate, was appropriate 3 weeks ago, and will be appropriate in the future, but not necessarily. This is a procedural vote on how we move forward; it is not a policy vote on how we move forward.

Words do have consequences and meaning. The Speaker was kind enough to come in here and talk about how we are deeming and passing something. I have to take umbrage of that slightly. We are not deeming something and passing something. That actually took place in 2010 when Speaker PELOSI presided over House Resolution 1500 that, indeed, deemed and then passed something—passed something that had not

gone through committee, had not been discussed or voted by anybody. And with less than a day of actually looking at the numbers, that was deemed and then passed.

What we are talking about here is passing something which happened 3 weeks ago and now, so that we can go forward with the discussion in our committees, deeming it simply because the Senate, once again, in over 1,000 days has failed to allow us, in a traditional way, to move forward. That's why this is a procedural vote. This is not about policy. This is not an effort where you have to pass something to find out what's in it. This is the procedure in which we will go forward on something we have already passed out of committee, on something which is in the nature of what is going forward, which has been debated here on the floor, and now allow it to be debated further. This is procedural. This is procedural.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Isn't it the case that, in passing this rule, we provide the process by which the budget will be implemented in the House of Representatives? Isn't that the case?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate that. And reclaiming the time very briefly because I know you're the next speaker and you're going to go over this issue one more time, yeah, that's exactly what—there has to be a procedure to go forward. But, once again, unlike what happened in 2010, we're not pulling the numbers out of thin air. You actually had the chance to debate that earlier in your Budget Committee and will have the chance to debate that again on the floor as well as in the committee. That's process; it's a process. If you want to, again, go across the rotunda and talk to your friends over on the other side, maybe we wouldn't have to do that. But until they're willing to do something, we have a procedural problem here.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time and look forward to hearing the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the ranking member of the Budget Committee, again, I want to make it clear to everybody who's watching this that this rule is about a lot more than a gun bill. This rule is about how we're going to proceed with the appropriations for the various committees. So, again, if this wasn't so controversial, my Republican friends would have brought up this deeming language on its own; but instead, they're hiding it in this gun bill, and they're trying not to talk about what this means. What this means is an end to the Medicare guarantee, among other things. It means an end to the social safety net in this country.

I think this is a horrible, horrible way to proceed. I think the budget that was passed by the House is horrible.

But to move forward in this manner I think is very, very disruptive.

People need to understand that this is not just a rule that allows a gun bill to come to the floor and, oh, by the way, there's a few little minor procedural things that are contained in this rule. This is a big deal, this is a huge deal, and my colleagues need to know that.

At this point, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

□ 1400

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN. He is absolutely right. The next vote will be a vote to double down on the Republican budget.

I appreciate the answer from my colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP). What the next vote will allow, the vote on the rule, is for the House to proceed with the implementation of the Republican budget. Therefore, if you think that budget is the wrong direction for this country, you should vote against the rule and not give the House the authority to move forward, because that's what the next vote is all about.

Mr. Speaker, let's just remember what that budget does. I would just remind my colleagues that the issue in the debate was not whether or not we reduce the long-term deficit in this country. We've got to do that. The issue was how we do that. The Republican budget did not follow the advice of every bipartisan group that has looked at the challenge of deficit reduction, because those bipartisan groups have said that we need to take a balanced approach—meaning, we've got to make some tough cuts.

We passed some of the Budget Control Act, and we needed to do more. They also said that we needed to deal with the revenue side of the equation, but the Republican budget doesn't ask for one penny—one penny—from millionaires for the purposes of deficit reduction. It doesn't close one single tax loophole for the purposes of deficit reduction—not one. In fact, the overwhelming majority of our Republican colleagues have signed a pledge saying they won't do that, that they won't close one tax loophole for the purpose of deficit reduction. Now, the American people understand the math of the budget. If you say that we're not going to ask the wealthiest to do a little more as part of reducing the deficit, it means you've got to sock it to everybody else even harder.

Just this week, we saw this play out. Yesterday, in the Senate, they had a vote on the Buffett rule. It is a very simple proposition: let's ask millionaires to pay the same effective tax rate as their secretaries. Every Democratic Senator but one voted for it. Every Republican Senator but one voted against it.

Contrast that to what's going to happen in the House on Thursday. Here in

the House on Thursday, they're going to do another tax break. Look at the Joint Tax Committee, a nonpartisan group. Where did the bulk of those funds go—to hedge funds? to Washington law firms? There was \$50 billion added to the deficit in 1 year, and it would be \$500 billion over 10 years. When you give tax cuts like that and if you also want to reduce the deficit, it means you cut into everything else. So what do you cut? You do cut the Medicare guarantee. You hit seniors on Medicare. I'll just show you a chart that shows exactly what they do here.

If you look at this chart, it shows the current support that seniors receive under the Medicare program. That's the blue line. This is the percentage of support they get from the Medicare program. As you can see, if you continue the Medicare program at the current levels of support, it maintains that at that level. This green line is the level of support that Members of Congress get as part of the Federal employees' health benefit plan. Members of Congress get a fixed percentage of the premium costs as part of their plan. When the costs go up, Members of Congress' support for the plan goes up accordingly, and that's why the level of support from Members of Congress—that's the green line—stays constant over time. As for the Medicare voucher plan, huh-uh. Under the Medicare voucher plan, as costs for health care rise, the amount of the vouchers seniors get will not keep pace. That's how they reduce the deficit.

In other words, it's another round of tax cuts for millionaires; but for seniors who have a median income today of under \$22,000, they're going to give them a voucher that doesn't keep pace with health care costs. For Members of Congress, your plan keeps pace with rising health care costs; not so for seniors on Medicare. Why? Again, it's not a balanced approach.

What else does it do? We just had a hearing today in the Budget Committee on what it does to Medicaid. It shreds the social safety net. It cuts Medicaid by \$800 billion over the next 10 years. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, by the year 2022, Medicaid will be cut by 30 percent and, by the year 2050, by 75 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I would remind my colleagues that two-thirds of Medicaid funding goes to seniors in nursing homes and to care for disabled individuals, and another 20 percent goes to kids from low-income families. They would whack that in their budgets, in the Republican budget, by \$800 billion. At the same time, if you'd just take the portion of the tax cut in the Republican budget that extends the Bush tax cuts for the folks at the very top, that's \$961 billion, but they don't want

to ask those Americans to go back to paying the same rates that they were paying during the Clinton administration—the same rates. The economy was booming and 20 million jobs were created—but no, they want to give the folks at the very high end a tax break and cut Medicaid by \$810 billion.

Those are the choices that are made in the Republican budget, and that's what this vote on this rule is all about: whether we should allow this body to go forward and implement that budget. It's wrong for the country. It's displaced priorities.

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

My old debate coach is looking down on our actions and is smiling, saying his advice was right. Just keep making the same arguments over and over again, and maybe someone will actually believe those. This, actually, still is about a sportsmen bill and about hunting and fishing rights on public property.

What the gentleman from Maryland just said is 99 percent accurate. There is one slight difference in what he said, and that is that this would be deemed until such time as there is a conference report. If there, indeed, is another avenue to go, ask the Senate to do its work, to do its job, to have a conference committee, and to actually move forward in that manner. Otherwise, we have to either do it in an improvised way, which is this, or you have to simply not do it at all.

Actually, one of the end results of what the other side is telling us to do is to simply not do anything. Do not go forward with any ideas. Do not go forward with reconciliation, and have a defense sequestration go into effect that would devastate the military that Secretary Panetta is begging you not to do. You have to do something procedurally to move forward. This vote does not implement anything. This vote allows our committees to go back and do the work that we were supposed to do. You defeat this, and we go back to a policy of doing nothing.

As I said before, there is precedent for what we are doing. I don't know why we say we are burying this in a hunting bill; but in 2010 when we did this deeming practice over another administration, it was buried in section 4 of House Resolution 1500. Once again, in going through a different process back then because no committee had ever looked at those numbers before, they were deemed and passed. This time, we actually passed a bill. We debated it in committee. We debated it on the floor. Now we are going to deem those numbers until such time as the Senate is responsible enough to do its work and have a conference committee report so that the House at least does what we are charged to do, and that is the work of the American people.

This is a procedural resolution that allows our committees to go forward to find solutions and to do it with some

order to it. It doesn't presuppose what the final decision will be. That's the argument that's being made here. It does not presuppose the final decision. It is the procedure to go forward, Madam Speaker, and that is why we so desperately need to do this—so the House can do its work when the Senate refuses to do its work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just remind my colleagues that, by deeming these numbers, what my colleagues will be doing if they vote for this rule will be to give the Republican leadership the green light to go ahead and dismantle Medicare, to end the Medicare guarantee for our senior citizens.

□ 1410

It will be a green light to go after anti-hunger and nutrition programs. It's the green light to go after education programs. As the ranking member on the Budget Committee said very clearly, we all want to balance the budget, we all understand we need to deal with our debt. But the way my friends on the other side of the aisle have outlined their plan, it is so one-sided. The burden is all on middle-income families, all on those who are poor.

Their way of balancing the budget is to lower the quality of life for the middle class in this country. And there are other choices to be made. For example, making sure that Donald Trump pays his fair share or that we close some of these corporate tax loopholes or go after some of these subsidies for the big oil companies. Instead, all of the plans that have been put forward by my Republican friends are all aimed at those in the middle and those struggling to get into the middle. That is why we are so outraged here today. We believe in Medicare. We don't want to end the Medicare guarantee for our senior citizens.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, our good friend from the State of Utah posed the question: What do the American people want?

I suppose that most of us would like to hunt on public land and fish, and the underlying bill does that. Unfortunately, tacked on to that bill—should this rule actually pass the House—will be something that I'm sure the American people do not want. And that is the crux of this current debate. The debate here is really about what will be added to the hunting and fishing legislation.

Let's consider for a moment exactly what it is. It is the end of Medicare as we know it. It sets up a program that will, as surely as we are here on the floor at this moment, terminate Medicare. It's also a bill that will immediately double the interest rate on

every student loan taken out here in the United States. It's also a bill that will put 200,000 students out of school, out of college because the Pell Grants are reduced. It's also a bill that will take \$80 billion a year out of Medicaid, some 62 percent, 63 percent of which goes to nursing homes. So seniors will not be able to get into nursing homes and those who are there may not be able to stay.

What is being tacked onto the hunting and fishing bill here is something that the American public does not want. The American public does not want to see students thrown out of school, does not want to see Medicare end for seniors, does not want to see seniors no longer able to go to a nursing home, does not want to see the food stamps terminated as unemployment increases and as we find some 20 percent of American children in poverty unable to get a decent meal 7 days a week. That's what the American public does not want, but what the Republicans are offering with this rule is precisely that.

We ought to vote "no" on this rule. If you must deem, put it in a separate bill and let's have an up-and-down vote on that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished ranking member from the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

The Republican budget reads like the legislative version of the "Hunger Games," pitting American families in an unfair and losing battle against billionaires and Big Oil.

One, the Republican budget doles out tax breaks that the wealthiest don't need and we can't afford; two, gives away \$4 billion in annual tax breaks for oil companies; three, abandons grandma and grandpa, forcing them to pay more for health care or forgo coverage altogether; four, takes food out of the mouths of hungry children all across our country.

Just yesterday, Senate Republicans refused to fix a broken system that allows CEOs to pay a lower tax rate than their secretaries. Here in the House, the Republican leadership has called the Buffett rule a hoax. The real hoax is the Republican budget. The GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party. Now it stands for Guaranteed Oil Profits; now it stands for Gut and Get Old People; now it stands for Greed Over Principle. One hundred years after the Titanic sank, the Republican budget throws working Americans overboard while saving the lifeboats for the wealthiest.

The "Hunger Games," that's what the Republicans are playing. For the entertainment of the billionaires and the oil companies, we—that is the Republicans—are now going to sacrifice

the programs that help the neediest children in our country. It is a budget that does not deserve the support of any Member of this institution.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I would urge the gentleman to pay particular attention to some of the amendments that are proposed under this rule, one of which would actually probably prohibit those Hollywood people from making movies on public lands again if any kind of hunting and fishing action were to be required.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I would just like to say to my friend that as the lone Republican who represents Hollywood, I don't like aspersions being cast at my very distinguished constituents, as my friend has just chosen to do.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, Madam Speaker, let me yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Rules Committee, who is here to clean up the mess I have made so far.

Mr. DREIER. Well, it's going to take more than 5 minutes to clean up that mess.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that while I am here to clean up Mr. BISHOP's mess, I've got to say I never in my wildest dreams believed that the ship that my grandmother almost rode on, but didn't quite get on, the Titanic, would be brought into this debate. I'm very impressed that my friend from Massachusetts has proceeded to do that.

But I will say that another of his lines, Madam Speaker, was just absolutely incredible: taking food from the mouths of hungry children. Come on, give me a break. Madam Speaker, the notion that anyone—Democrat or Republican alike—would in any way embrace the notion of taking food from the mouths of hungry children is one of the most preposterous things imaginable. We want to ensure that every single child in this country has opportunity, as well as food. We want to make sure that we're able to get our fiscal house in order. And frankly, as I listened to all of the complaints being leveled about the action that we will take with passage of this rule, it is simply unhappiness over the fact that our friends on the other side of the aisle have lost the budget debate.

Madam Speaker, what we're doing is very simply doing the work that this body has charged us with doing. The work that we've been charged with doing is to put into place a reconciliation package, getting the authorizing committees to work on the charge of a budget.

One of the words that we regularly hear the American people use to malign all of Washington, D.C., is the word "gridlock." I'm not one of those. I subscribe to the George Will view that sometimes the notion of having a President of one party and a Congress of a different party is not necessarily a

bad thing. But we know that the term "gridlock" is used as a pejorative.

Madam Speaker, I can think of not much that would exacerbate gridlock more than our saying the House passed its budget and we all know that the Senate has failed in more than 3 years and 100-some-odd days since they've passed a budget, that the Senate has failed to pass a budget. So we have the responsibility, since we have been able to pass a budget here, to do our work.

This notion of calling it deem and pass and somehow likening it to the outrageous proposal that—fortunately the American people stood up and said it was not acceptable, and finally the House responded by not deeming and passing that incredible health care bill, which is potentially unconstitutional. We'll see what the Supreme Court says sometime this summer. But the idea of characterizing that with our doing exactly what Democrats did when it came to the budget in the past and that is that since the work hadn't been done, the reconciliation process had to begin, we had to do the work that follows the passage of a budget. That's exactly what we're doing.

□ 1420

To somehow describe this as extraordinary is, again, a gross mischaracterization of what it is that we have before us.

Madam Speaker, I will say that for us to proceed with this rule and consideration of this very important measure, we have a \$15.5 trillion national debt. We have budget deficits as far as the eye can see. The so-called Buffett rule, I mean its author in the Senate acknowledged yesterday that it would do nothing—Senator WHITEHOUSE said it would do nothing to create jobs, and he threw out there, he said, it's not going to solve all the ailments of society. It's not going to cure all the ailments of society.

The fact is we need to focus on job creation, on economic growth, and that's exactly what we're trying to do with this budget. This budget is designed to get our economy growing, and at the same time it's designed to, yes, ensure, with the social safety net, that those who are truly in need are able to benefit from those programs. But it's designed to make sure that those programs will not go into extinction completely. And it's designed to ensure that we create opportunity for every man and women in this country, as many people have been discouraged, as many people are struggling to have the opportunity to find a job. The budget that we have is designed to encourage the kind of government structure which will make it possible for that to happen.

Madam Speaker, let me just say with that, I encourage an "aye" vote on this rule. Let's get down to work. That's what the American people want us to do.

And I hope and pray that I have cleaned up for Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I just want to respond to something that my distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee said. You know, he implied that when my colleague from Massachusetts said that the Republican budget plans would literally take the food out of the mouths of children, that somehow we were engaged in hyperbole or some kind of empty rhetoric.

I don't know whether my chairman knows that tomorrow in the House Agriculture Committee, under the direction of the Republican leadership, that they are going to cut \$33 billion out of the SNAP program.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I would say to my friend, obviously we have to deal with very, very serious fiscal challenges that exist here, and I know that these State-run programs are designed to ensure that those who are truly in need are able to benefit, and so no one has the desire to take food from the mouths of hungry children.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. But \$33 billion in cuts will reduce benefits to people. It will take, literally, food off the table for many families and a lot of working families, too.

Under the Republican leadership's direction, the Agriculture Committee is not going after excessive subsidies and big agri-businesses. It's going after SNAP, food stamps. I am going to have an amendment in the Rules Committee today, when we bring up the transportation bill I think for, like, the 15th time I have offered it, to go after the billions of dollars that we give to oil companies in subsidies. Taxpayers subsidize these programs. We never get an opportunity to vote on the House floor.

But the Republican leadership is not only not allowing me to do that, they are not saying we should go after and trim this corporate welfare. What they are saying is \$33 billion in cuts to SNAP. That is outrageous.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I will yield to the gentleman in 1 second.

I know these are difficult budgetary times. I mean, you know, to not ask the Donald Trumps of the world to pay a little bit more and rather, instead, to cut \$33 billion in SNAP, or to not insist that we pay for these wars that seem to go on forever, and let that add to our debt, but go after poor people who are on SNAP, that's where the outrage is. I can't believe that that's the first place we are turning.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. Let me just say that I agree with part of his statement here, that being that we need to look at overall tax reform. I concur with the notion of

reducing any kind of subsidies. I don't like the idea of engaging in social planning through tax policy, and so I hope in the context of overall tax reform that we will be able to do exactly what my friend is arguing when it comes to the issue of subsidization. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire of the gentleman from Utah how many more speakers he has?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. How many would you like me to have?

Mr. MCGOVERN. As many as you want.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Then we will have that many, but I hope I will be the last.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I will close for our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for up to 1½ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that Republicans can't use so-called reconciliation procedures to force through the elimination of Medicare as we know it or force through cuts to Medicare benefits for seniors or people with disabilities.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, we have a choice here. We can either balance our budget and deal with our deficit and our debt in a fair and balanced manner, or we can do it in the way that the Republican leadership has proposed, which is to basically put the burden on middle-income families and those struggling to get into the middle, and to put an added burden on our senior citizens.

Make no mistake about it: if you vote for this rule, you are voting to end the Medicare guarantee. That is their plan, and that is what they have said. There is no question about it.

I think it is outrageous. I think when Warren Buffett pays a lower tax rate than his secretary there is something wrong with our tax system. When corporations get all these special loopholes so they don't have to pay taxes but middle-income families have to, there is something wrong with this system. We need some balance.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, there is, as I finish this, a couple of areas I want to talk about. There are children who are preparing to go to preschool today who have lived their entire lives without seeing the Senate actually pass a budget. Were that not

the case, we would not be here with this particular issue, and if they actually were to pass a budget, we would go forward without this particular issue.

Once again, the merits of the budget notwithstanding, this vote does not implement anything; it allows us the procedure to go forward to implement something. The underlying bill still does talk about the ability of those of us who live in public land States to have hunting and fishing rights guaranteed and protected without the heavy hand of Washington bureaucrats stopping that concept. Indeed, State law will have to be considered before they do any kind of concept.

I also want to put one other concept before you, just in closing, that illustrates the problem we have with the American people on how we waste money and, indeed, that needs to be one of the first things of our consideration.

CBO has scored this bill as potentially costing \$12 million. It doesn't make a difference. There is nothing mandated in here that needs to have a review under the NEPA process of these bills. The administration said that we might have to go through this process, therefore, you should score it at \$12 million.

Let's make an assumption that you actually had to go through the reprocessing of going through all of the land management plans. And I would ask the people the question: Does it make sense that it would take \$12 million for the Park Service and the BLM to decide whether hunting would or would not be allowed? Could that not be done with the Secretary and a cell phone within a week if we actually were decent about what we were attempting to do?

When, indeed, we have bills like this in which the administration and the government is trying to say, well, it will cost \$12 million to make the decision of whether hunting is allowed or not, it puts all of our efforts into question. It does not make sense. And it may be one of the reasons why we need to look at what we are doing internally first, and that would be an appropriate thing to take place.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate that this is still a procedural vote on a rule that is extremely fair, and it is appropriate to the underlying legislation of H.R. 4089, which does talk about fishing and hunting rights, preserving that time-honored tradition and, indeed, allowing those of us in the West to make sure that we are not precluded from those traditional areas of activity. It's a good bill and, more importantly, this is a fair rule, and I urge you to adopt it.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 614 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 3. PROHIBITING USE OF RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES FOR ELIMINATION OF MEDICARE PROGRAM AND INCREASED COSTS OR REDUCED BENEFITS TO SENIORS AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) No measure reported by a committee pursuant to reconciliation directives in House Concurrent Resolution 112 shall be considered a reconciliation bill for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if it contains a provision that, with respect to the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, furthers, promotes, provides for, or implements any of the following:

(1) Eliminating guaranteed health insurance benefits for seniors or people with disabilities under such program.

(2) Establishing a Medicare voucher plan that provides limited payments to seniors or people with disabilities to purchase health care in the private health insurance market or otherwise increasing Medicare beneficiary costs.

(b) No measure reported by a committee pursuant to reconciliation directives in House Concurrent Resolution 112 shall be considered a reconciliation bill for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if it contains a provision that, with respect to seniors or people with disabilities, furthers, promotes, provides for, or implements any of the following:

(1) Rationing health care.

(2) Raising revenues or premiums for seniors or people with disabilities under section 1818 of the Social Security Act, section 1818A of such Act, or section 1839A of such Act.

(3) Increasing cost-sharing (including deductibles, coinsurance, and copayments) under the Medicare program for seniors or people with disabilities.

(4) Otherwise restricting benefits or modifying eligibility criteria under such program for seniors or people with disabilities.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minutes votes on adopting House Resolution 614, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1815.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 179, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—235

Adams Biggert Buerkle
Aderholt Bilbray Burgess
Alexander Bilirakis Burton (IN)
Amash Bishop (UT) Calvert
Amodoi Black Camp
Austria Blackburn Campbell
Bachmann Bonner Canseco
Bachus Bono Mack Cantor
Barletta Boustany Capito
Bartlett Brady (TX) Carter
Barton (TX) Brooks Cassidy
Bass (NH) Broun (GA) Chabot
Benishkek Buchanan Chaffetz
Berg Bucshon Coble

Coffman (CO) Jenkins
Cole Johnson (IL)
Conaway Johnson (OH)
Cravaack Johnson, Sam
Crawford Jordan
Crenshaw Kelly
Culberson King (IA)
Davis (KY) King (NY)
Denham Kingston
Dent Kinzinger (IL)
DesJarlais Kline
Diaz-Balart Labrador
Dold Lamborn
Dreier Lance
Duffy Landry
Duncan (SC) Lankford
Duncan (TN) Latham
Ellmers LaTourette
Emerson Latta
Farenthold Lewis (CA)
Fitzpatrick LoBiondo
Flake Long
Fleischmann Lucas
Fleming Luetkemeyer
Flores Lummis
Forbes Lungren, Daniel
Fortenberry E.
Foxy Mack
Franks (AZ) Manullo
Frelinghuysen Marchant
Gardner McCarthy (CA)
Garrett McCaul
Gerlach McClintock
Gibbs McCotter
Gibson McHenry
Gingrey (GA) McKeon
Gohmert McKinley
Goodlatte McMorris
Gosar Rodgers
Gowdy Meehan
Granger Mica
Graves (GA) Miller (FL)
Graves (MO) Miller (MI)
Griffin (AR) Miller, Gary
Griffith (VA) Mulvaney
Grimm Murphy (PA)
Guinta Myrick
Guthrie Neugebauer
Hall Noem
Hanna Nugent
Harper Nunes
Harris Nunnelee
Hartzler Olson
Hastings (WA) Palazzo
Hayworth Paul
Heck Paulsen
Hensarling Pearce
Herger Pence
Herrera Beutler Petri
Huelskamp Platts
Huizenga (MI) Poe (TX)
Hultgren Pompeo
Hunter Posey
Hurt Price (GA)
Issa Quayle

NAYS—179

Ackerman Clyburn Grijalva
Altmire Connolly (VA) Gutierrez
Baca Conyers Hahn
Baldwin Cooper Hanabusa
Barrow Costa Hastings (FL)
Bass (CA) Courtney Heinrich
Becerra Critz Higgins
Berkley Crowley Himes
Berman Cuellar Hinchey
Bishop (GA) Cummings Hinojosa
Bishop (NY) Davis (CA) Hirono
Blumenauer DeFazio Hochul
Bonamici DeGette Holden
Boren DeLauro Holt
Boswell Deutch Honda
Brady (PA) Dicks Hoyer
Bralley (IA) Dingell Israel
Brown (FL) Doggett Jackson (IL)
Butterfield Donnelly (IN) Jackson Lee
Capps Doyle (TX)
Capuano Edwards Johnson (GA)
Carnahan Ellison Johnson, E. B.
Carney Engel Jones
Carson (IN) Eshook Kaptur
Castor (FL) Farr Keating
Chandler Fattah Kildee
Chu Frank (MA) Kind
Cicilline Fudge Kissell
Clarke (MI) Garamendi Kucinich
Clarke (NY) Gonzalez Langevin
Clay Green, Al Larsen (WA)
Cleaver Green, Gene Larson (CT)

Lee (CA) Pascrell Scott, David
Levin Pastor (AZ) Serrano
Lipinski Pelosi Sewell
Loeb sack Perlmutter Sherman
Lofgren, Zoe Peters Sires
Lowey Peterson Smith (WA)
Lujan Pingree (ME) Speier
Lynch Polis Stark
Maloney Price (NC) Sutton
McDermott Ross (AR) Towns
McGovern Rothman (NJ) Tsongas
McNerney Roybal-Allard Van Hollen
Meeks Ruppertsberger Velazquez
Michaud Rush Vislosky
Miller (NC) Ryan (OH) Walz (MN)
Miller, George Sanchez, Linda Wasserman
Moore T. Schultz
Moran Sanchez, Loretta Waters
Murphy (CT) Sarbanes Watt
Nadler Schakowsky Waxman
Neal Schiff Welch
Olver Schrader Wilson (FL)
Owens Schwartz Woolsey
Pallone Scott (VA) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Akin Filner Napolitano
Andrews Fincher Pitts
Cardoza Gallegly Rangel
Cohen Lewis (GA) Slaughter
Costello Marino Walsh (IL)
Davis (IL) McIntyre

□ 1455

Messrs. SCOTT of Virginia, CLYBURN, and Ms. BERKLEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 155, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 155 due to a family health emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on Ordering the Previous Question of H. Res. 614, the resolution providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4089, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting, and for other purposes.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 184, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

AYES—228

Adams Benishkek Brady (TX)
Aderholt Berg Brooks
Alexander Biggert Broun (GA)
Amash Bilbray Buchanan
Amodoi Bilirakis Bucshon
Austria Bishop (UT) Buerkle
Bachmann Black Burgess
Bachus Blackburn Canseco
Barletta Bonner Cantor
Bartlett Boustany Capito
Barton (TX) Brady (TX) Carter
Bass (NH) Brooks Cassidy
Benishkek Broun (GA) Chabot
Berg Buchanan Chaffetz
Bucshon Coble

Cantor Huizenga (MI) Posey Kind Olver Scott, David
 Capito Hultgren Price (GA) Kissell Owens Serrano
 Carter Hunter Quayle Kucinich Pallone Sewell
 Cassidy Reed Langevin Pascrell Sherman
 Chabot Issa Rehberg Larsen (WA) Pastor (AZ) Shuler
 Chaffetz Jenkins Reichert Larson (CT) Pelosi Shires
 Coble Johnson (IL) Renacci Lee (CA) Perlmutter Sires
 Coffman (CO) Johnson (OH) Ribble Levin Peters Smith (WA)
 Cole Johnson, Sam Rigell Lipinski Peterson Speier
 Conaway Jordan Rivera Loeb sack Pingree (ME) Stark
 Cravaack Kelly Roby Lofgren, Zoe Polis Sutton
 Crawford King (IA) Roe (TN) Price (NC) Thompson (CA)
 Crenshaw King (NY) Rogers (AL) Quigley Tierney Thompson (MS)
 Culberson Kingston Rogers (KY) Rahall Tierney
 Davis (KY) Kinzinger (IL) Rogers (MI) Tonko Towns
 Denham Kline Rohrabacher Markey Richardson Towns
 Dent Labrador Rokita Matheson Richmond Tsongas
 DesJarlais Lamborn Rooney Matsui Ross (AR) Van Hollen
 Diaz-Balart Lance Ros-Lehtinen McCarthy (NY) Rothman (NJ) Velázquez
 Dold Landry Roskam McCollum Roybal-Allard Visclosky
 Dreier Lankford Roskam McDermott Ruppertsberger Walz (MN)
 Duffy Latham Ross (FL) McGovern Rush Wasserman
 Duncan (SC) LaTourette Royce Ryan (OH) Schultz
 Duncan (TN) Latta Meeks Sánchez, Linda Waters
 Ellmers LoBiondo Ryan (WI) T. Watt
 Emerson Long Scalise Miller (NC) Sanchez, Loretta
 Farenthold Lucas Schilling Sarbanes Waxman
 Fitzpatrick Luetkemeyer Schmidt Moore Schakowsky Webster
 Flake Lummis Schmitt Moran Schiff Welch
 Fleischmann Lungren, Daniel Schweikert Murphy (CT) Schrader Wilson (FL)
 Fleming E. Scott (SC) Nadler Schwartz Woolsey
 Flores Mack Scott, Austin Yarmuth
 Forbes Sensenbrenner Sessions Neal Scott (VA)
 Fortenberry Manzullo Akin Fincher Pitts
 Foxx Marchant Andrews Gallegly Pitts
 Franks (AZ) McCaul Burton (IN) Lewis (CA) Rangel
 Frelinghuysen McClintock Cardoza Lewis (GA) Slaughter
 Gardner McCotter Smith (NE) Lewis (GA) Terry
 Garrett McHenry Smith (NJ) Marino Young (AK)
 Gerlach McKeon Smith (TX) Costello McIntyre
 Gibbs McKinley Southerland Filner Napolitano

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—410

Ackerman Davis (KY) Israel
 Adams DeFazio Issa
 Aderholt DeGette Jackson (IL)
 Alexander DeLauro Jackson Lee
 Altmire Denham (TX)
 Amodei Dent Jenkins
 Austria DesJarlais Johnson (GA)
 Baca Deutch Johnson (IL)
 Bachmann Diaz-Balart Johnson (OH)
 Bachus Dicks Johnson, E. B.
 Baldwin Dingell Johnson, Sam
 Barletta Doggett Jones
 Barrow Jordan
 Bartlett Donnelly (IN) Kaptur
 Barton (TX) Doyle Keating
 Bass (CA) Kelly
 Bass (NH) Duffy Kildee
 Becerra Duncan (TN) Kind
 Benishek Edwards King (IA)
 Berg Ellison King (NY)
 Berkley Ellmers Kingston
 Berman Emerson Kinzinger (IL)
 Biggert Engel Kissell
 Bilbray Eshoo Kline
 Bilirakis Farenthold Kucinich
 Bishop (GA) Farr Labrador
 Bishop (NY) Fattah Lamborn
 Bishop (UT) Fitzpatrick Lance
 Black Flake Landry
 Blackburn Fleischmann Langevin
 Blumenauer Fleming Lankford
 Bonamici Flores Larsen (WA)
 Bonner Forbes Larson (CT)
 Bono Mack Fortenberry LaTourette
 Boren Foxx Latta
 Boswell Frank (MA) Lee (CA)
 Boustany Franks (AZ) Levin
 Brady (PA) Frelinghuysen Lewis (CA)
 Brady (TX) Fudge Lipinski
 Braley (IA) Garamendi LoBiondo
 Brooks Gardner Loeb sack
 Broun (GA) Garrett Lofgren, Zoe
 Brown (FL) Gerlach Long
 Buchanan Gibbs Lowey
 Bucshon Gibson Lucas
 Buerkle Gingrey (GA) Luetkemeyer
 Burgess Gohmert Luján
 Burton (IN) Gonzalez Lummis
 Butterfield Goodlatte Lungren, Daniel
 Calvert Gosar E.
 Camp Granger Lynch
 Campbell Mack
 Canseco Graves (GA)
 Cantor Graves (MO) Mack
 Capito Green, Al Manzullo
 Capps Green, Gene Markey
 Capuano Griffin (AR) Matheson
 Carnahan Griffith (VA) Matsui
 Carney Grijalva McCarthy (CA)
 Carson (IN) Grimm McCarthy (NY)
 Carter Guinta McCaul
 Cassidy Guthrie McClintock
 Castor (FL) Gutierrez McCollum
 Chabot Hahn McCotter
 Chaffetz Hall McDermott
 Chandler Hanna McGovern
 Chu Harper McHenry
 Cicilline Harris McKeon
 Clarke (MI) Hartzler McKinley
 Clarke (NY) Hartzler McMorris
 Clay Hastings (FL) Rodgers
 Clay Hastings (WA) McNerney
 Cleaver Hayworth Meehan
 Clyburn Heck Meeks
 Coble Heinrich Mica
 Coffman (CO) Hensarling Michaud
 Cole Herger Miller (FL)
 Conaway Herrera Beutler Miller (MI)
 Connolly (VA) Higgins Miller (NC)
 Conyers Himes Miller, Gary
 Cooper Hinchey Miller, George
 Costa Hinojosa Moore
 Courtney Hirono Moran
 Cravaack Houchul Mulvaney
 Crawford Holden Murphy (CT)
 Crenshaw Holt Murphy (PA)
 Critz Hoyer Myrick
 Crowley Cuellar Neal
 Culberson Huizenga (MI) Neugebauer
 Cummings Hultgren Noem
 Davis (CA) Hunter Nugent
 Davis (IL) Hurt Nunes

NOT VOTING—19

Akin Fincher Pitts
 Andrews Gallegly Rangel
 Burton (IN) Lewis (CA) Slaughter
 Cardoza Lewis (GA) Terry
 Cohen Marino Young (AK)
 Costello McIntyre
 Filner Napolitano

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1505

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:
 Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 156, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, April 17, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 156 due to a family health emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on agreeing to the resolution of H. Res. 614, the resolution providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 4089, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing and shooting, and for other purposes.

LENA HORNE RECOGNITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1815) to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Lena Horne in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

NOES—184

Ackerman Clay Garamendi
 Altmire Cleaver Gibson
 Baca Clyburn Gonzalez
 Baldwin Connolly (VA) Green, Al
 Barrow Conyers Green, Gene
 Barton (TX) Cooper Grijalva
 Bass (CA) Costa Gutierrez
 Becerra Courtney Hahn
 Berkley Critz Hanabusa
 Berman Crowley Hastings (FL)
 Bishop (GA) Cuellar Heinrich
 Bishop (NY) Cummings Higgins
 Blumenauer Davis (CA) Himes
 Bonamici Davis (IL) Hinchey
 Boren DeFazio Hinojosa
 Boswell DeGette Hirono
 Brady (PA) DeLauro Houchul
 Braley (IA) Deutch Holden
 Brown (FL) Dicks Holt
 Butterfield Dingell Honda
 Capps Doggett Hoyer
 Capuano Donnelly (IN) Israel
 Carnahan Doyle Jackson (IL)
 Carney Edwards Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) Ellison (TX)
 Castor (FL) Engel Johnson (GA)
 Chandler Eshoo Johnson, E. B.
 Chu Farr Jones
 Cicilline Fattah Kaptur
 Clarke (MI) Frank (MA) Keating
 Clarke (NY) Fudge Kildee