

you might have some loans that perform and some loans that don't perform. The vast majority of these loans perform very, very well, and America is better off for it.

I was at the Israeli Embassy last night speaking to a group of scientists. They've been so far ahead of us on renewable energy it's a shame. We have seen what Germany's done on wind.

This party that is in the majority here, that wants to do away with the wind energy credit, I don't know what the notion here is that somehow we, as a country, are not prepared to pay the price for progress. We have not won every battle in wars that we've been in, but we've won the war.

And so this a company in which things, the numbers didn't add up for us. It's like one of our rockets or satellites not performing properly. But the head of NASA says that we're not in a business in which we cannot take risks. We have to take risks. And when it comes to energy, our country has to be prepared to take risks.

Now, it was Albert Einstein who said we cannot use the same level of thinking to solve problems that we used to create these problems.

This country and our status as the leading Nation in the world requires us to take risks. And if this majority is so unimpressed with the ability of Americans and Americans to innovate and to compete in the renewable sector like others around the world who are also getting help from their governments, that is unfortunate. But, for me, I believe that America has to take risks. We're going to lose, we're going to win, but at the end of the day, as we learn and go forward, it will allow us to continue to be number one.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I have no additional speakers and reserve the balance of my time.

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

We ought to have a debate in this Chamber on energy, on an energy policy, whether or not we should invest in innovation, whether or not we should invest in renewable, green, clean energy. I believe we should.

My friends on the other side believe not just in the status quo, they believe in going backwards. They believe in investing, not in new technologies, but in the old technologies.

□ 1310

But we should have that debate here.

This bill really is not that debate, because this bill is a political stunt. It is not anything real. It is not anything that is going anywhere. This is just politics as usual, and that's what makes this so frustrating.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to end where I began in my opening, which is to say we're only here for a few days. I mean, I've never been part of a Congress that has worked less than this Congress and that has produced less than this Congress. Today's Roll Call has a great piece: "Congress on Pace to be the

Least Productive." Is that what my friends on the other side of the aisle are aspiring to—to be known as the least productive Congress?

We're back for these few days. We ought to do something meaningful for the American people. We ought to be debating a jobs bill. We ought to bring the President's jobs bill to the floor. If you don't want to vote for it, vote against it, but at least we'd be doing something of substance. We ought to be extending tax breaks for middle-income Americans. Why would you leave town without making sure that middle-income Americans continue to get their tax breaks?

We ought to have a responsible farm bill passed and signed into law. As we're running out of time, we're told that's probably not going to happen at all. We ought to be talking about legislation that will actually strengthen this country, that will help improve the quality of education and give more access to education for our young people.

We are doing none of those things. We are squandering this opportunity. With the exception of passing a continuing resolution, which is tantamount to kicking the can down the road, these 8 days that we have been back in session have been useless. They have just been about politics. That is why the American people are so sick and tired of this Congress. That is why the approval rating is so low. They want us to come to Washington to legislate and deliberate on issues that will make a positive difference in their lives. Instead, what we have is the same old, same old—politics as usual. There has to be some common ground between Republicans and Democrats on energy. Let's find that common ground and move forward. Enough with the political stunts. It is time to start doing the people's business, and this is not it.

So I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to vote against this, again, restrictive rule that denies a multitude of amendments, including an amendment that would make sure the jobs that we are talking about are in America. Buy American. What is so wrong with even debating that? We're not even given that opportunity. So vote against this restrictive rule, and vote against the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, we can see that today's legislation answers the question. It ends the debate about Solyndra. Taxpayers know the committee did its work. It held a Rules Committee hearing. Half a billion dollars was lost by Solyndra. We're not down here jumping up and down. We haven't even raised our voices. We simply said that we think that a better process could have taken place, and they're arguing we never should have even had this on the floor—that we don't need any feedback, that everybody already knows. Here is what they know.

We lost half a billion dollars by one company. At least two others had the same outcome where they did not produce anything. They went belly up—bankrupt. We just think that the administration—government—is really not in the business and shouldn't be in the business—despite what we've heard—of pushing the envelope. Let's go out and invest whether it makes sense or not.

Losing money is still a bad proposition. Republicans think it's a bad proposition. There have been lots of arguments today that the government did the right thing, that this administration did the right thing. I think that the facts of the case say that half a billion dollars in a process that didn't work—we need to hear the feedback, and we need to close the books on it. The rule is here to do exactly that—to place on the floor the opportunity for us to debate now the facts of the case, which is exactly what will happen.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 117, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6365, NATIONAL SECURITY AND JOB PROTECTION ACT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 778 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 778

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 117) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6365) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to replace the sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011. All points

of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. House Resolution 778 is a closed rule for the consideration of two bills, H.R. 6365, which is the National Security and Job Protection Act, and H.J. Res. 117, which is the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for FY13.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a freshman on the Rules Committee. It's a good committee to be on. I enjoy it. I get to work with learned Members like my friend from Florida, who is across the aisle, but it falls to me to handle continuing resolution bills. As you'll remember, when we showed up at the beginning of 2011, there was a lot of unfinished business from 2010, and we went right into continuing resolution act to continuing resolution act to continuing resolution act—sometimes 2 and 3 weeks at a time. That's no way to run a government. It's no way to have a Congress.

My friend from Florida and I disagree on a great deal of policy, but we believe that a deliberative process yields better results than the "right here, right now, hurry up and wait" kind of mentality that this body so often adopts. So what we've done here today with this bill, with this H.J. Res. 117, is to say we understand that the appropriations responsibilities of this Congress have not yet been completed. The Constitution gives this Congress—not just this body, but this Congress—the responsibility of providing appropriations for this Nation.

Now, as the Speaker knows full well, this House has set about getting its business done. We divided those appropriations bills up across a number of bills. The Commerce-Justice-Science bill passed this House with a bipartisan majority. It went to the Senate, and the Senate had no floor action whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, you know that the Energy and Water bill passed this

House with a bipartisan majority. It went to the Senate, and the Senate did nothing with it whatsoever. You know that the Homeland Security bill passed this body—again, with a bipartisan majority. It went to the Senate, and the Senate took no action. I can go on and on and on. There is the leg branch bill, the military construction bill, the defense bill, on and on and on.

So here we are. We don't have control over the Senate. We only have control over what goes on here in this body, and I've got to tell you that I'm proud as a freshman that we've set about getting our business done. With one deliberative bill at a time and one open rule on appropriations bills at a time, we allowed every Member of this body to come to the floor to offer their amendments and to have their voices heard in order to produce the very best work product that we could produce. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we did that at a funding level even lower than what the American taxpayer asked of us in the Budget Control Act. I'm very proud of that work.

□ 1320

But in the absence of the Senate taking action, Mr. Speaker, we have to move on. The American people are going to have a referendum in this country. They're going to have a referendum on what fiscal responsibility means.

We're going to have an election in November, and new House Members are going to come and new Senate Members are going to come. The administration may change. We're going to have that opportunity for all of us as citizens to speak out in November and choose a path for 2013. But our business today, Mr. Speaker, is making sure the doors stay open moving into 2013.

As my colleagues know, in the absence of action, Mr. Speaker, government offices begin to close on October 1 of this year, one by one—national parks, veterans services, Social Security services, Medicare services. That's not the kind of governing responsibility that we all swore an oath to uphold.

So I'm pleased to be here today, Mr. Speaker, to bring this rule to the floor to say, yes, we have gotten our work done in this House, but we've been stymied by the leadership in the Senate that has not scheduled votes on these bills, but we will not allow the American taxpayer and American citizens to pay the price of inaction by the United States Senate. We will make sure that government services continue with this great referendum that this great Republic will have in November. It's a 6-month continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker, and it will solve that need.

This rule also, Mr. Speaker, provides for consideration of H.R. 6365. It's called the National Security and Job Protection Act, but what it is is a sequester replacement bill. Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I've ever been more disgusted in my 18 months in this body.

We came together here in this House in a bipartisan fashion. We passed the Budget Control Act, which gave six House Members and six Senate Members—six Republicans, six Democrats—12 Members of this Congress, esteemed Members of this Congress, talented, bright, conscientious, American-loving Members of this Congress, an opportunity to look at our entire budget. They didn't just look at the \$3.8 trillion that we'd spend this year, Mr. Speaker, not just that \$3.8 trillion, but next year, and the year after that, and the year after that, well into the three-generational window. It was hundreds of trillions of dollars these 12 men and women had an opportunity to look at to find bipartisan agreement.

About 4 months they worked on that project, Mr. Speaker, and you know how that story turns out. After 4 months of labor by 12 of the brightest, most conscientious Members of this body—six Republicans, six Democrats, six House Members, six Senate Members—looking at hundreds of trillions of dollars in tax expenditures in social programs, in taxes and tax cuts, they agreed on absolutely nothing. Not one dollar out of hundreds of trillions did they come together on. That was a tremendous disappointment.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, in order to try to bring agreement to that body, we passed legislation that implemented what they called the sequester, to say, if against all odds this joint select committee were to fail—candidly, it was not on my radar screen that they would. This was a solemn responsibility. These were talented Members who were assigned to it. But if they were to fail, we would implement automatic spending cuts that would achieve the kind of budget reductions that every American knows that we need. The problem in this town is spending, and the sequester said we will not fail on this opportunity to address it.

Well, that sequester goes into effect in January of next year, and hardest hit will be the United States military. Again, this was a device that was put into place not because folks thought it was the best policy in the room, but to be there as the hammer to say surely this 12-member committee, this joint select committee will come to the agreement that will bring us back from this fiscal cliff. They didn't. Now this sequester hangs over the head of not just the United States military, but over Medicare, over social programs.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I'm just so proud to be a freshman Member of this House. This House said back in the spring that is an unacceptable outcome. It was never intended to be the outcome. No one ever desired that it be the outcome, and we can change that outcome.

So we passed a sequester replacement right here in this House that went into mandatory spending programs, which is where the real problem is in the budget, as we all know, and said let's replace the sequester that may harm

defense—cuts that are going to deal with our military, that are going to put our national security at risk, and let's replace those with spending reductions that make sense.

Again, we passed that in the House. The Senate has taken no action whatsoever.

I don't mean to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they've taken no action on our bill. They most certainly have not. They're under no obligation to. It's the right thing to do, but they're under no obligation. They are under an obligation to do something about it. They are under an obligation to stand up and listen to the same constituents that my colleague from Florida and I listen to to say there must be action. We must prevent this tremendous threat to our readiness, to our troops, and to our troops' families.

This bill, introduced in this body by Colonel ALLEN WEST of Florida, gives us an opportunity to do just that in the bipartisan, open-minded way that I think has characterized the 18 months that I've served in this House because of the leadership of folks like you, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't say you have to use the House-passed bill already.

Was it a good bill? Absolutely. Was it the right answer? I believe that it is.

But what it says is use the House-passed bill or use something like it. If you can find a better plan, if the Senate, in its wisdom, can find a better plan, that's going to work, too. It's not our way or the highway. It's that we know that there's a right way and a wrong way to deal with our budget challenges, and we want to do it the right way.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. I rise in strong support of the two underlying provisions, as well. I look forward to the debate on that this afternoon. We're going to be able to debate these individually, which I believe is the right way to handle questions of this magnitude and this importance.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from my neighboring State of Georgia, whom I consider to be one of the most conscientious, hardworking individuals in the Congress, and I appreciate the fact that he's 18 months here in the Congress. He and I know that he understands this institution considerably, having worked here for a number of years, and I'm grateful the process allows and he has allowed that I receive the traditional 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides, as has been said, for consideration of two bills. To identify them again, H.J. Res. 117 is the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, and H. Res. 6365 is the National Security and Job Protection Act.

When my colleague began his remarks, he said the magic words, "This

is a closed rule." When I was, as he, 18 months in the House in 1992 and I would be on radio, people were talking about how awful it was that the Democrats had so many closed rules. The Democrats lost the election that following year in 1994, and one of the leading reasons was closed rules. Yet we find ourselves on something as important as the financial circumstances of this country coming to the floor at the 11th hour with a closed rule, and, in fact, not having many more days that we are scheduled to be here, but having absolutely no reason why we could not be here at any point in time between now and the time that our financial circumstances would begin to be, as they are, much worse. Maybe the Republicans should have added a third entitled resolution. I would call it the "No More Getting Anything Done in This Congress Act," because that is the message of this particular package.

This continuing resolution is merely a reminder that my friends in the majority were unable to complete work on the regular appropriations bills.

□ 1330

Instead of devoting congressional time to tackling the needs of essential government programs, Republicans have spent the summer trying to repeal the health care law, giving away benefits to the oil and gas industry, and chipping away repeatedly at women's rights.

Now, my colleague is correct in many respects to point out that the other body presents us with challenges, but it is not as if the other body has not done something. Let me tell you one of the measures that I have a continuing interest in because of my constituency, and that is that the Senate has passed a farm bill for a 5-year extension.

What my colleagues or leadership on the Republican side will not do is put that farm bill here on the floor even though we are faced in this country with a residual from one of the worst droughts that America has ever experienced. Even though food prices for all of the people in this country are continuously rising, here we are with this time that the chair of the Agriculture Committee and the ranking member begging the leadership, cannot find time for it to be on this floor. Instead of devoting our time to tackling the needs of essential government programs, we decide that we're going to attack women's rights.

Now, suddenly, you seem to have awakened to the looming, described, fiscal cliff. It's kind of good that you've noticed; but rather than address this challenge head on, the Republicans are pushing a bill that doesn't do anything. The sequester replacement does not actually prevent the sequester with a prudent mix, and every panel that has looked at this says that we have to have a prudent mix of spending cuts and revenue increases. What the Republicans simply do is kick the can down the road, which is no surprise.

I said in an earlier Rules meeting, and it was during the Olympics, that if kicking the can down the road were an Olympic sport, then Congress and the Republican majority would win gold, bronze, silver, and tin. This poor can doesn't have much more space to be kicked on, and I can tell you it places the burden on someone else to deal with this in the future. And this is what my Republican colleagues would call fiscal responsibility?

We got into this mess because of the massive deficits the Republicans piled on this country. Two wars in the Middle East not paid for, huge tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans—for those among us that are in a high-paying position—and huge, unpaid prescription drug benefits are all things that Republican Members in this House voted for despite the huge costs that would be imposed.

In fact, just 61 bills have been signed into law this year, the fewest in more than 60 years. In all of 2011, only 90 bills were signed into law. When Democrats controlled both Chambers in 2010, 258 bills were signed into law.

Now, I don't want to sound like I'm the only person who is making this observation that is being made. Let me cite two people, especially here inside the Beltway, that have made this observation, and that are generally respected as nonpartisan and accepted as experts by Republicans and Democrats.

We on this side are not the only ones who have noticed the lack of productivity that I just identified with the 61 bills. Norman Ornstein and Thomas Mann wrote in a Washington Post column, the two gentlemen, and I am quoting them:

We have been studying Washington politics and Congress for more than 40 years, and never have we seen them this dysfunctional. In our past writings, we have criticized both parties when we believed it was warranted. Today, however, we have no choice but to acknowledge that the core of the problem lies with the Republican Party.

That's from two particularly nonpartisan observers that everybody around here recognizes as experts. Now we are asked to support the Romney-Ryan vision of America, which ignores any responsibility for today's economic difficulties and instead demands that those who have the least in this great country should sacrifice the most. While Republicans last year were fighting tooth and nail to default on our debt obligations and crash the economy, millions of Americans were fighting to keep their jobs and millions lost them.

Millions of Americans were fighting to pay off their mortgages, and millions could not pay them. Millions of Americans were seeking access to quality health care, and they could not afford it. Millions of children of parents who wanted them to go to college are finding themselves without the capacity to get a decent education largely for the reasons that I have suggested.

But under the Romney-Ryan vision those priorities should take a back seat

to increase defense spending, and yet give more tax cuts for the wealthiest among us in our society. When it comes to Medicare and Medicaid, student loans and public safety, the Republicans are quick to dismiss billions of dollars in essential funding with a wave of their hand and the crocodile tears of deficit reduction. But when the defense contractors stand to lose just \$1, Republicans suddenly find their fighting spirit and cry about a weakening America.

It's a shame, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans can't shake off their do-nothing indolence to fight as hard for all Americans as they do for the richest.

We have a long list of programs, tax cuts, and activities set to expire at the end of this year; but rather than confront those challenges head on, Republicans are wasting our time with do-nothing bills. I suppose that when you have absolutely no ideas to offer besides tax cuts for those that are better off among our society, you may as well campaign on a platform of "we have no ideas or even a plan to offer." But the American people need and deserve much more.

Mr. Speaker, I reject the Republican notion that a do-nothing Congress can help grow our economy, create more jobs, and address the many challenges facing this Nation from crumbling infrastructure to the impossibly high cost of education; and I also reject the Romney-Ryan vision that the only solution, at least that they have offered to these challenges, is tax cuts that help the rich and increase military spending.

My Republican colleagues paint a very pessimistic vision, Mr. Speaker, of a country where it appears to them that we have given up on trying to better everyone's lives and instead use the public's resources to enrich those who have already made it.

But I believe differently. We can afford to invest in our future. We can afford to create jobs. We can afford to make the choices now that will reap benefits for future generations—right now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1340

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, before I yield to my freshman colleague from Pennsylvania, to say to my friend from Florida, I don't think you heard the word "Democrat" come out of my mouth during my presentation except to talk about those things on which we cooperated together. There are absolutely challenges in this Chamber, but the challenges I'm talking about are challenges with the United States Senate.

Democrats and Republicans in this body came together to pass 7 of the 12 appropriations bills this cycle. We began back in April. Far from being an 11th-hour solution, we began, as the Constitution requires us to begin, one piece of legislation at a time in the

most open process this body can implement, Mr. Speaker, where every Member of this body gets to offer any amendment that they desire. Seven appropriations bills we've moved through this body, Mr. Speaker. And then it became apparent, as the Senate has moved not one of 12 bills, that that process was going to be fruitless—fruitless.

Again, is that what the American people want from us? Absolutely not. Are we doing what the American people deserve in this body? Absolutely we are. In my 18 months, I have not found it to be a Republican-Democratic problem. I've found it to be a problem of ideas.

I said to my friend from Florida, I know that he believes in his heart every single word that he has just enunciated. He speaks for inspiration, Mr. Speaker. I have the great pleasure of sitting behind him on the dais in the Rules Committee, so it's always his words that inspire me before it's my turn to take the microphone.

My constituents back home, they say, ROB, what have you learned in 18 months with a voting card? I said, What I have learned is it's not theater on the other side of the aisle. Folks aren't taking to the microphone for their 15 seconds of fame on television. They're taking to the microphone with heartfelt beliefs that they know in their heart to be a reflection of their constituents back home.

And so as we hear two different presentations about what it is we're doing today—a presentation that suggests it's an 11th-hour, last-minute process versus that presentation that says we've done it all right in the openness of day, and here, 4 weeks before the deadline approaches us, we are going to take action to make sure that uncertainty does not further slow this economy.

I'm told, Mr. Speaker, that the fewer days Congress is in session, the higher the stock market goes because at least nothing bad happens here. We're the problem, Mr. Speaker. Government is not the solution. Government is too often the problem.

The last Congress that passed as few bills as this Congress has passed, it was the 104th Congress, when Republicans took control of this House for the first time in over 60 years, because they were elected then not to expand the size and scope of government but to improve the size and scope of government, to reform those processes.

What my friend from Florida says about 2005, 2006, unfunded priority after unfunded priority, I'd love to tell him he's wrong, but he's absolutely right. He's absolutely right. The American taxpayer knew it, and Republicans in this Chamber paid the price for it in the very next election. That's the ace in the hole for America, Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer. They're paying attention to what happens here.

My colleague may believe that we're on the wrong track. I'll tell you, in 18

months, I've never been more proud for what this institution has done. We're going to find out when the American taxpayer speaks out in that referendum November 6.

With that, Mr. Speaker, there are 87 new freshmen in this freshman class and two more added. I yield 2 minutes to a freshman colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding the Continuing Appropriations Resolution.

This week's violent ambush at the United States Embassy in Cairo and the brutal attacks against U.S. diplomats in Benghazi serve as a blunt reminder that countries in the Middle East have been increasingly unstable and anti-American. The brutal attacks also emphasize the fact that the United States cannot continue to use taxpayer dollars to bankroll countries, with no conditions. We should immediately suspend all funding for those countries that refuse to meet strict conditions and fail to take adequate measures to prevent the loss of American lives.

Egypt has been one of the five top countries receiving the most U.S. aid over the past decade, and President Obama said he doesn't think we would consider Egypt an ally. Certain countries continue to serve as a safe haven for those who wish to cause harm to Americans and tear down our fundamental principles of freedom and liberty. Such actions merit repercussions, not a continued free flow of American tax dollars.

When our Nation has a debt of more than \$16 trillion and people in my district in Pennsylvania are struggling to find jobs to support their families, it is past time that we reconsider funding to people that wish harm on the United States. It is time to end the practice of appeasement and take a staunch position regarding Libya, Egypt, and others in order to ensure a more calculated, tactful approach.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to my good friend and colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, I would just urge my colleague from Pennsylvania to know that all of us are mindful, and rightfully should be concerned, about what's transpired in the Middle East. But he cites to one set of finances, and I would urge that he look at how and why the United States is involved in a compact with the Egypt military for the moneys that are distributed there, and not base it on what is happening today but look at what has happened throughout the years to assist in stabilizing that area. It didn't just happen overnight. It happened as a result of a serious compact in peace negotiations.

I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my colleague for the time, and I rise in very strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if I could create a rule that would best sum up the Republican

leadership of this House over the past 2 years, this would be it, because this rule represents everything we have seen over the length of this Congress. It's a closed rule that stifles debate, and it's a rule that makes in order partisan, meaningless legislation that will do nothing—absolutely nothing—to address the real issues facing the American people.

I voted against the sequester because it was a lousy idea and a terrible way to run a government.

But let's be clear: This bill does not stop the sequester. It simply kicks the can down the road once again and prohibits any effort to address our fiscal situation that raises a single dime of revenue. The Republican approach is not fair, it is not balanced, and it stands no chance of becoming law.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, the American people are wondering why Congress isn't focused on their concerns. Where is the comprehensive jobs legislation, like the Make it In America plan? Nowhere to be found. Where is the middle class tax cut bill that passed the Senate? Not on this House floor. Where is the bipartisan farm bill and drought relief bill that passed the Senate, or the Violence Against Women Act or postal reform? Not here on this floor. Where is the big, bipartisan, balanced plan to reduce the deficit? Not here. And where—and this one really bugs me, Mr. Speaker—where in the world is a full and fair debate on the war in Afghanistan?

It's absolutely stunning to me that Governor Romney accepted the nomination of his party and asked the American people for their votes to be Commander in Chief without even mentioning the longest war in U.S. history, a war that continues to do this and continues to claim the lives of American servicemen and -women, a war for which we are borrowing tens of billions of dollars every month.

Apparently, the Republican leadership of this House would like to ignore these big issues and instead focus on meaningless sound bites for their 30-second political commercials. It is no wonder that the public has the lowest regard for Congress in history. I guess the Republican plan is to do next to nothing and to get out of town as quickly as possible—even though we just got back from a 5-week recess—and hope that the American people don't notice we were even here.

It's a sad day for the people's House, Mr. Speaker. And let me remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House. It is not the House of Big Oil, it is not the House of Big Banks, Big Business, or special interest super PACs. This is the people's House, and I hope the people take it back.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule.

□ 1350

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

I'd just like to remind my colleague from Massachusetts how we ended up

here; and, again, we ended up in a way I think that we can all be proud of.

Take ourselves back to April of this year. Again, this is the 2013 funding bill we're talking about. We sit here in September of 2012, we're talking about funding 2013 spending. We began this process back in April on the floor of this House, bill after bill after bill passing in a bipartisan way.

The Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs bill, Mr. Speaker. What could be more important and what could be more bipartisan? Passed this House 407-12. We went through that bill, Mr. Speaker. We went to every single Member of this Chamber. Not just 435, Mr. Speaker. We went to every delegate as well and said do you have a voice that needs to be heard on this floor on this issue and gave every Member that opportunity.

At the end of that, Mr. Speaker, which was just a free-for-all of democracy right here—it was our Republic at its best—this House came together, 407-12, to pass that bill. Mr. Speaker, 226 Republicans, most of our number, 181 Democrats, most of their number, passed that bill—407-12 for our military and our veterans. That bill didn't see the light of day on the Senate side, Mr. Speaker.

Our failure to pass this continuing resolution today sees those dollars go to zero. Far from being an abdication of responsibility, this is the height of taking responsibility. Abdication of responsibility has already happened. I can't fix it. I can't change it. We did our business here in this House. But we are being held hostage. And by "we," I mean we, the citizens of this country. I mean "we," the voters of this country. Those with the priorities of this land, we are being held hostage by a Senate that is finding other priorities, priorities other than military construction and our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't end there with Military Construction. It goes on. It goes through Leg Branch appropriations, Homeland Security appropriations, Energy and Water appropriations, Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations.

How about Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Speaker? I mean, when you listen to some of the voices on this floor, there's a reason, there's a benefit to being a Southerner and talking slow. It gives your blood pressure time to come down just a little bit before the words begin to come out of your mouth, because Transportation, including mass transit, Housing and Urban Development, those programs for the neediest among us, passed this House 261-163 in a huge bipartisan majority; 182 Republicans, 79 Democrats came together to say let's focus on the priorities of our constituents back home.

Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. Let's move that bill through this body. Again, Mr. Speaker, in the most open process this institution can imagine where every

single Member has a chance to be heard, where every single Member can offer their amendments right here in the well.

There are no voices that are being quieted here. We all represent American citizens back home. It's their voices that get shut out.

Do we have a closed rule today on this continuing resolution? We do.

I think back, Mr. Speaker, I know you do, too, to H.R. 1, back in the spring of 2011. It's the only continuing resolution I've ever known of that came under an open rule, and boy did we have a show of democracy here.

It began on a Tuesday, Mr. Speaker. Congress was supposed to adjourn by Thursday afternoon; but by early in the morning on Thursday, it was clear we were nowhere near done. As a freshman, I was a little cynical about this process. I had a suspicion the leadership was going to close that process down because Members had planes to catch and events to go to, and after all, all it was was a continuing appropriations bill.

You know what this leadership said, Mr. Speaker? They said not on our watch. We're going to go into Thursday night. And I don't mean Thursday night at 9. I mean Thursday night past midnight. We're going to go all night long. We're going to go all night long into Friday. We're going to go Friday to noon and Friday through dinner and all night long on Friday night. We finished at 5 a.m. on Saturday morning.

Mr. Speaker, I jumped on the first flight out of National. Flew home. Did a town hall meeting no later than 3 hours after we adjourned that Saturday morning. I was on fire because this House gave every single Member a chance to offer every single amendment that their constituents would have them do. That was extraordinary.

We can't do that every day. We can't go marathon sessions 5 days, day and night. I'm young and vigorous, Mr. Speaker, but I've got to tell you, some folks may not be able to handle it. I'm with you, Mr. HASTINGS, if you're ready to go those days and nights. I'll do them with you.

But we did that, those 12 appropriations bills. We did that in this body. Not all in one package, but one at the time, at the time, and the Senate said no.

Our choice here today is do we close the doors at these agencies? Do we close the doors on these social services? Do we go through another one of those government shutdown scenarios that benefit absolutely no one, or do we do the right thing which is observe our budget caps, continue to reduce spending? That's right, Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I do on these appropriations bills, on this discretionary spending we spent less in 2011 than they spent in 2010. We spent less in 2012 than we spent in 2011. And if we pass this bill, we'll spend less in 2013 than we spent in 2012.

It hasn't happened since before World War II. Three years in a row, Mr.

Speaker, of this body coming together and telling the American people we can do better with less. That's what this bill is about today, Mr. Speaker.

Again, strong supporter of this rule. Strong supporter of the two underlying measures.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My good friend from Georgia speaks out of both sides of his mouth. On the one hand, you're saying that we began this process open and this democracy flourished, and you were so passionate about it until when we left at 5 a.m. in the morning you rushed home and you were on fire.

I'm curious to know when we finish up here, ostensibly tomorrow afternoon, what is it that would cause us not to be able to be here and allow, as you put it, every Member to have his or her say for their constituents on this measure?

But, no, we're here on a closed rule.

I understand that the government has to continue and that's why we are doing a continuing resolution, but I also know we could have done an omnibus bill, and I also know that my colleague and others were the ones that caused this country to come to the brink and our credit rating to be assaulted; and you are going to tell me that we can't stay here tomorrow, that we can't come back here after the holidays or tomorrow and stay here if need be to get this done?

But, no, we're doing it now before April so that when we come back, we will be faced with the same crisis, and the only thing that's going to change is the faces and the places that the people come from, and all I'm saying is let's do it now. Let's do those things that you were talking about. And if it requires 5 a.m. in the morning, let's do it at 5 a.m. in the morning. I'm 76 and I'm still staying up. I don't know about you.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I'm grateful to my friend for yielding.

I'd say to the gentleman, I think we would be here until 5 a.m. yet again. But our experience, as was our experience on H.R. 1, is time and time again we do the people's work here and the Senate says, no. I have had no indication from the Senate that they will accept anything in that body except this continuing resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, first I ask my colleague. You know and I know you have farm interests in Georgia the same as I do, not necessarily the same, but we have farm interests in Georgia and farm interests in Florida. The Senate did pass the farm bill.

Can my colleague tell me why we don't have the farm bill on the floor during all of this period of time? We

could at least do that in light of the disaster relief that took place.

Mr. WOODALL. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to my friend.

Mr. WOODALL. I'd say that I regret I'm not high enough up the chain to know all the strategic decisions, but I will tell you that the bill that came out of the Senate is a sad 2-year bill that provides absolutely no certainty to any of the farmers in my district. It spends more and provides less certainty.

□ 1400

The farmers in my district say, ROB, we need a farm bill, but why can't you do it right? And I know my colleague would agree with me.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Where did you get the number 2-year rather than 5-year bill from? Because the 5-year proposal is what the chair of the Agriculture Committee, your and my colleague, Mr. LUCAS, is seeking to offer. But I don't want to get us caught in the weeds.

Let me go ahead and yield 2 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Could I inquire of the Chair how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 10 minutes remaining for the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank Mr. HASTINGS for the opportunity to rise in opposition to the rule for the CR.

The continuing resolution contains \$99.9 billion in the Overseas Contingency Operation funds to continue the war in Afghanistan and to fund other operations in the so-called "war on terror." This is on top of over \$1.3 trillion we've already spent in waging war abroad.

This is a war that costs U.S. taxpayers \$2 billion a week. It's a war that, according to the Congressional Research Service, has cost the lives of nearly 2,000 U.S. servicemembers and has resulted in another 17,519 being injured, yet the war seems to have fallen from headlines and our national conscience, and this is wrong.

We cannot afford another \$100 billion on a war that will never result in stability in Afghanistan or the region. This war against Afghanistan boomeranged against the Soviet Union; it's boomeranging against our country.

When you look at the amount of money that is being spent—not just for the war, but for the United States Pentagon, we're looking at a fiscal '13 budget of \$613 billion, spending more money than every other country in the world almost combined for so-called "defense."

Now, we have an obligation to defend our country, but we also have an obligation for housing, for health care, for education, for retirement security. If you're concerned about Congress regaining authority under article I, section 8, then we should be voting to end

this war right now by striking the money for it. If you're concerned about the debt, then we should be voting to end this war by taking money away from funding and then you could contribute that to resolving the debt. If you're concerned about emboldening radicals in other countries who are following in on the wake of our invasions, then we should be taking the money out of this for more war. If you're concerned about the budget, that it doesn't have enough for jobs and housing and health care and education and energy and the environment, then end the war now, vote against it. If you're concerned about America taking steps to create peace, then we should get this money out of this budget which creates more war.

This is time for us to reclaim our country, which we're losing not just to war, but to a national security state like yesterday when we voted as a House—I voted against it—to empower security agencies to be able to intercept the phone calls of anybody in the United States who makes calls internationally.

We have got to reclaim our Nation. This CR doesn't do it. This is the same old, same old, same old war, national security state, forget the real needs of the American people. I'm going to vote against this rule and I'm going to vote against the underlying bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I'd say to my friend from Florida that I have no further speakers remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I also have no further speakers and I'm prepared to close, and I thank the distinguished gentleman.

I also would like to offer an apology to my colleague. I committed a parliamentary faux pas when I said you speak out of both sides of your mouth. In the heat of the moment, I guess what I was trying to say is you said one thing one way than you said at another point in time, so I offer you my deepest my apologies.

Mr. Speaker, we will soon start another long district work period even though we haven't given the middle class an extension of tax cuts for the next year. If we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that the House won't leave town until middle class tax cuts are signed into law. The first step is to give this House a vote on the middle class tax cut, introduced by Mr. LEVIN, which is the same proposal the Senate has already passed and the President is eager to sign.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is an upside to the Republicans' "do-nothing" Congress.

First, it creates a clear contrast between the Republicans and Democrats.

Democrats want to press forward with meaningful ideas to create jobs, improve access to affordable health and education, and invest in the kinds of programs that bring about progress and prosperity for all Americans. I believe that my friends in the majority want to push legislation that either cuts taxes for the wealthiest among us, or increases spending on the military, or does nothing more than pay the bills today—play politics while accomplishing nothing.

This is not about the deficit. The United States doesn't lack the money to prioritize our future. What we do lack is the political willpower and leadership necessary to set gainful priorities.

The Romney-Ryan vision for America is nothing more than a reckless sellout to the ideological extremes of the Republican Party, a party that is utterly dominated at this point in our history by a Tea Party dogma which cares more to preserve tax cuts for the rich than to be about the business of ensuring the well-being of our entire society.

The so-called "sacrifices" continually demanded by the Republican majority in order to provide ever more money for foreign wars and tax cuts for the wealthy are shortchanging the future of this Nation. Continuing to move further to the right—or to the left—does not constitute progress. Furthermore, the closed-door negotiations and closed process is truly disheartening and does not reflect the democracy that is supposed to be the hallmark of this institution.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate my colleague for his words. A lot of folks, Mr. Speaker, have the burden of working with folks whose motives they question. I have the great benefit of working on the Rules Committee with a team of folks whose motives I absolutely never question because I know folks are operating from their heart and from their constituents' best interest.

Let me say, because we talk so much about productivity down here on this floor, Mr. Speaker, The Washington Times did an article earlier this year on productivity in the House and the Senate. They called it "the futility index"—the futility of all the efforts in the body. They said the Senate ranked number one of all the years that they've been keeping records; less activity going on in the Senate by a large margin than ever before. Then they came to the House and they said, you know what, it's true the House hasn't passed a lot of bills. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we outlawed all of those silly commemorative bills that were not about the people's business but were

about folks and their campaigns. Those no longer come to the floor. We eliminated a whole portion of that that was not about the people's business. What The Washington Times said was this: that we had more time in this House in session than all but 10 Congresses since they began keeping records and that we had more debate in this House, Mr. Speaker, than all but two Congresses on record; more debate, more discussion about those ideas and those priorities that are important to the American people.

Now, I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, there's not a man or woman in my district that defines success by how many bills the President of the United States will sign; or if they do, they find those things to be inversely proportional. They don't want us to take over any new industries; they don't want us to regulate any new industries; they don't want us to pick any more winners and losers. They want us to stop. And even better than stopping, they want us to roll those things back.

We're having that debate in America, Mr. Speaker: Who are we? Who are we as Americans? Who are we as a people? And what is so wonderful about this country, despite all of our differences there has always been more that unites Americans than that divides us, always. You can't pick up a newspaper today, Mr. Speaker, without them talking about the ideological divide in this country being as stark as it has ever been, but there is still more that unites us than divides us.

I believe, when we come into this election in November, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have the largest voter turnout in American history. I have no idea what they're going to conclude. But I believe in this country, and I believe that if more of us are at the ballot box participating in this Republic—as we are required, duty bound to do—we're going to end up with a better result.

□ 1410

I look at the young faces in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. I like to think of myself as young, but I'm in my forties. The gentleman from Florida expressed his age, despite his youthful vigor. It's about the young people, Mr. Speaker.

And when the gentleman says America is strong enough that we can handle all of these growing debt challenges, I say to the gentleman, I admire his optimism but I disagree with his conclusion. The numbers I look at tell me, if I take everything from everybody, if I take everyone's house, everyone's car, everyone's bank account, if I nationalize every single company in this country, if I take it at all and put it in a bank account today, I still can't pay the hundreds of trillions of dollars in promises that this Federal Government has made to generations to come.

We don't have a problem in this country, Mr. Speaker, that we're not

taxing people enough. Our problem is that we're spending too much.

I serve on the Budget Committee as well as the Rules Committee, and we took that challenge on head-on, head-on, Mr. Speaker. They call some things the third rail of politics. We said, in this House, in a bipartisan way, the third rail of politics is failing to deal with these challenges. Failing to deal with these challenges is the problem; dealing with them is the solution.

This wasn't a solution that everyone agreed with. It was a solution that got the only bipartisan majority in this entire town. And we did it not once, but twice, Mr. Speaker.

This is not a happy day. I usually come to the floor; I talk about how excited I am to be here because we're going to do an open rule and we're going to have the Republic at its best. That's not today.

That day was May 10 on the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill, where we had every voice heard. That day was July 19 on the Defense Department bill, where we had every voice heard passing those bills in huge bipartisan fashion. That day was June 6, when we did it with the Energy and Water bill, huge bipartisan majority; and again on June 7 with the Homeland Security bill, and the Legislative Branch bill on June 8; May 31 on Military Construction, on and on and on, Transportation, HUD, June 29.

We've done those things, and the silence on the Senate side is deafening. We could do all those bills again, but this House has already spoken. The people have already spoken. And this continuing resolution gives this body and the American people 6 months for that referendum in November, for every voting-age man and woman in this country to come out and have their voice heard.

We've done all we can do in this body, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I just want to ask, 6 months from now, when we come back, if you and I are here, will you commit that we would have that debate 6 months from now under an open rule?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I have had no prouder moment than our debate on H.R. 1—no prouder moment.

Though I will say to the gentleman, as the gentleman knows quite well, it is frustrating that we can't do the business today. We tried.

As the gentleman from Florida knows, we tried all of these appropriation bills. They weren't 6-month bills. They weren't 2-week bills. They were entire FY13 bills, and we did them right. We did them the way they were supposed to be done. Some people won, some people lost, but, in the end, a bipartisan majority came together and passed every single one. That's what

we should be doing here, Mr. Speaker, and we have.

The American people are going to decide in November: Is the problem the House? Is the problem the Senate? Is the problem the executive branch? I have my own suspicions, but I trust the American people more than I trust any other vote that we make in this House, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I rise in strong support of this rule. I rise in strong support of the two underlying bills, the continuing resolution bill and our opportunity job protection sequester replacement bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule. I urge my colleagues to support the two underlying bills.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 778, the Rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 117, making further continuing appropriations for the beginning of the 2013 Fiscal Year. This measure will continue to assure funding for all federal government agencies and allow the government to continue its day to day operations through March of 2013.

I am quick to note Mr. Speaker the attempt by the Rules Committee Ranking Member, Ms. SLAUGHTER to amend the rule for H.R. 6365 to make in order and provide the appropriate waivers for amendment #1 offered by the Budget Committee Ranking Member Mr. VAN HOLLEN, which would have replaced the entire sequester for 2013 with savings from specific policies that reflect a much-needed balanced approach to deficit reduction. The entire House should have been allowed to debate Mr. VAN HOLLEN's measure even though I had serious concerns about the substance. Nevertheless, the debate is one that we should have.

I rise in support of making further continuing appropriations for the beginning of the 2013 Fiscal Year. This measure will continue to assure funding for all federal government agencies and allow the government to continue its day to day operations through March 27 of 2013.

I am also rising in support of helping families in Houston cope.

I am rising in support of Texans who need critical Federal Government goods and services.

I rise in support of people who are clinging to their jobs—the working poor.

I rise in support of those on Medicaid who are beholden to the governor of Texas who is in the business of rejecting federal funds and then using them to prop up his budget numbers.

I rise in support of the elderly.

I rise in support of military veterans.

I rise in support of children.

Today, the House will consider H.J. Res. 117, Six-Month Continuing Resolution. This Continuing Resolution will fund the government through March 27, 2013. The Senate is expected to consider the House-passed Continuing Resolution next week.

The Continuing Resolution reflects a bipartisan agreement between Congressional Republicans, Congressional Democrats, and the White House—and will prevent a government shutdown and maintain the programs and services critical to the American people.

The Continuing Resolution ("CR") ensures a total rate of operations for FY 2013 at \$1.047

trillion—the level for FY 2013 discretionary spending that was agreed to as part of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (PL 112–25).

As a starting point, the CR continues funding at the current rate of operations for federal agencies, programs and services. To meet the agreement to ensure the rate of operations at \$1.047 trillion, a government-wide, across-the-board increase of 0.6 percent over the base rate is also included.

The CR caps funding for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) for FY 2013 at the President's FY 2013 request of \$88.5 billion—which is \$26.6 billion below the FY 2012 OCO funding level. OCO is not included under the \$1.047 trillion cap.

The CR continues funding for the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund at last year's level, with this disaster relief funding also not included under the \$1.047 trillion cap.

The CR includes a clean, six-month extension of TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families). Without this extension, cash assistance and work support for working families would stop in FY 2013.

The CR extends the current pay freeze for federal employees, which includes Members of the House of Representatives and Senators, as requested by the President.

The CR also includes various provisions, often needed in a longterm CR, to ensure adequate funding of certain key government operations and services through the six-month period, including provisions allowing additional funding for such things as:

The Veterans Administration to meet an increase in the disability claims workload.

The Interior Department and the Forest Service for wildfire suppression efforts.

The FCC to conduct spectrum auctions.

Nuclear weapons modernization efforts, to ensure the security of our nuclear stockpile.

Sustaining Homeland Security cybersecurity efforts.

I urge my colleagues to pass this Rule and the underlying Continuing Resolution.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 778 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 3. Upon completion of consideration of House Resolution 746 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 15) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief to middle-class families. 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 Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legisla-

tive day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 3 of this resolution.

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 746) prohibiting the consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment or adjournment sine die unless a law is enacted to provide for the extension of certain expired or expiring tax provisions that apply to middle-income taxpayers if called up by Representative Slaughter of New York or her designee. All points of order against the resolution and against its consideration are waived.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. 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 on House Resolution 778 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 778, if ordered; adoption of House Resolution 779, by the yeas and nays; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1775.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 178, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

YEAS—235

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

Kinzinger (IL)	Noem	Schock	Van Hollen	Wasserman	Welch
Kline	Nugent	Scott (SC)	Velázquez	Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Labrador	Nunes	Scott, Austin	Visclosky	Waters	Woolsey
Lamborn	Nunnelee	Sensenbrenner	Walz (MN)	Watt	Yarmuth
Lance	Olson	Sessions		Waxman	
Landry	Palazzo	Shimkus			
Lankford	Paul	Shuler			
Latham	Paulsen	Shuster	Akin	Jackson (IL)	Schweikert
LaTourette	Pearce	Simpson	Berg	King (NY)	Sires
Latta	Pence	Smith (NE)	Broun (GA)	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Smith (NJ)	Cleaver	Nadler	Towns
LoBiondo	Pitts	Smith (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Ross (AR)	
Long	Platts	Southerland	Herger	Ryan (WI)	
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Stearns			
Luetkemeyer	Pompeo	Stivers			
Lummis	Posey	Stutzman			
Lungren, Daniel	Price (GA)	Sullivan			
E.	Quayle	Terry			
Mack	Reed	Thompson (PA)			
Manzullo	Rehberg	Thornberry			
Marchant	Reichert	Tiberi			
Marino	Renacci	Tipton			
Matheson	Ribble	Turner (NY)			
McCarthy (CA)	Rigell	Turner (OH)			
McCaul	Rivera	Upton			
McClintock	Roby	Walberg			
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Walden			
McIntyre	Rogers (AL)	Walsh (IL)			
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Webster			
McKinley	Rogers (MI)	West			
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland			
Rodgers	Rokita	Whitfield			
Meehan	Rooney	Wilson (SC)			
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman			
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Wolf			
Miller (MI)	Ross (FL)	Womack			
Miller, Gary	Royce	Woodall			
Mulvaney	Runyan	Yoder			
Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Young (AK)			
Myrick	Schilling	Young (FL)			
Neugebauer	Schmidt				

NAYS—178

Ackerman	Eshoo	McDermott
Altmire	Farr	McGovern
Andrews	Fattah	McNerney
Baca	Filner	Meeks
Baldwin	Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)
Barber	Fudge	Miller, George
Barrow	Garamendi	Moore
Bass (CA)	Gohmert	Moran
Becerra	Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)
Berkley	Green, Al	Napolitano
Berman	Green, Gene	Neal
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Olver
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez	Owens
Blumenauer	Hahn	Pallone
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Pascarelli
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Heinrich	Pelosi
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Himes	Peters
Butterfield	Hinchee	Peterson
Capps	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Capuano	Hirono	Polis
Carlahan	Hochul	Price (NC)
Carney	Holden	Quigley
Castor (IN)	Holt	Rahall
Castor (FL)	Honda	Rangel
Chandler	Hoyer	Reyes
Chu	Israel	Richardson
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Clarke (MI)	(TX)	Rothman (NJ)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Clyburn	Jones	Rush
Cohen	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Connolly (VA)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Conyers	Kildee	T.
Cooper	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Costello	Kissell	Sarbanes
Courtney	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Critz	Langevin	Schiff
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Levin	Scott, David
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sewell
DeGette	Loebach	Sherman
DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Deutsch	Lowe	Smith (WA)
Dicks	Lujan	Speier
Dingell	Lynch	Stark
Doggett	Maloney	Sutton
Doyle	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	Matsui	Tierney
Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Engel	McCollum	Tsongas

Van Hollen	Wasserman	Welch
Velázquez	Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Visclosky	Waters	Woolsey
Walz (MN)	Watt	Yarmuth
	Waxman	

NOT VOTING—16

Akin	Jackson (IL)	Schweikert
Berg	King (NY)	Sires
Broun (GA)	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Cleaver	Nadler	Towns
Diaz-Balart	Ross (AR)	
Herger	Ryan (WI)	

□ 1436

Messrs. CAPUANO, FARR, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. WELCH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. HARTZLER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 232, noes 182, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

AYES—232

Adams	Dreier	Issa
Aderholt	Duffy	Jenkins
Alexander	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (IL)
Amash	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	Ellmers	Johnson, Sam
Austria	Emerson	Jordan
Bachmann	Farenthold	Kelly
Bachus	Fincher	King (IA)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Kingston
Bartlett	Flake	Kinzinger (IL)
Barton (TX)	Fleischmann	Kissell
Bass (NH)	Fleming	Kline
Benishek	Flores	Labrador
Biggert	Forbes	Lamborn
Bilbray	Fortenberry	Lance
Billirakis	Fox	Landry
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Lankford
Black	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Blackburn	Gallely	LaTourette
Bonner	Gardner	Latta
Bono Mack	Garrett	Lewis (CA)
Boustany	Gerlach	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Long
Brooks	Gibson	Lucas
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Bucshon	Goodlatte	Lummis
Buerkle	Gosar	Lungren, Daniel
Burgess	Gowdy	E.
Burton (IN)	Granger	Mack
Calvert	Graves (GA)	Manzullo
Camp	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Campbell	Griffin (AR)	Marino
Canseco	Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (CA)
Cantor	Grimm	McCaul
Capito	Guinta	McClintock
Carter	Guthrie	McHenry
Cassidy	Hall	McKeon
Chabot	Hanna	McKinley
Chaffetz	Harper	McMorris
Coble	Harris	Rodgers
Coffman (CO)	Hartzler	Meehan
Cole	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Conaway	Hayworth	Miller (FL)
Cravaack	Heck	Miller (MI)
Crawford	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney
Culberson	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Denham	Huizenga (MI)	Myrick
Dent	Hultgren	Neugebauer
DesJarlais	Hunter	Noem
Dold	Hurt	Nugent

Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns

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

NOES—182

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

NOT VOTING—15

Akin
Berg
Broun (GA)
Cleaver
Diaz-Balart

Herger
Jackson (IL)
King (NY)
Michaud
Miller, George

Nadler
Ross (AR)
Ryan (WI)
Towns
Welch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1443

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6213, NO MORE SOLYNDRAS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 779) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6213) to limit further taxpayer exposure from the loan guarantee program established under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 182, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

YEAS—232

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishak
Biggett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson

Denham
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon

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

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

NAYS—182

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

NOT VOTING—15

Akin
Berg
Broun (GA)
Buchanan

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

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