supercommittee will not do that. I ask for support of the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my colleague from New York that I have no requests for time. I do have some more comments that I will make that I am reserving until a little bit later in the time.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am prepared to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, although I'm encouraged that we were able to reverse some of the most severe cuts proposed, I am disappointed that our budget process has come to this, $100 billion packed with provisions that the House has never considered. Therefore, on process, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today allows us to proceed to the general debate of a bill that encompasses three major appropriation measures. I want to thank the conferees for their work on this agreement.

As we move forward with the debate, we must keep in mind the dire fiscal situation that our country is in, and we must continue to work in a fiscally responsible manner.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule. 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 466

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of November 18, 2011, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Debate on such a motion shall be extended to five hours.

SEC. 2. The Chair may postpone further consideration of a motion considered pursuant to this resolution to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule, House Resolution 466. The rule provides for consideration of what may be the very single most significant piece of legislation that I've had the opportunity to vote on since coming to this body over 10 months ago.

This rule is what allows the House of Representatives to move forward and vote on H.J. Res. 2, a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution.

My resolution that we're considering here today suspends the rules and allows the House to vote on H.J. Res. 2. I'm sure that some of my colleagues may be concerned we're moving to consider the balanced budget amendment under suspension of the rules for fear it would somehow limit debate.

I agree with them. Amending the United States Constitution is not to be taken lightly. This is why the rule provides for 5 hours of debate on this vital issue, because, you see, Mr. Speaker, what we're doing here today is something that should be discussed, something that must be discussed.

We're fundamentally challenging the way Washington works. And you know what? It's about time. It's about time we had real conversation about how our Nation spends its money. It's about time that we made the Federal Government budget the way I did when I was a sheriff of a county in Florida.

It's about time that we balance the Federal checkbook the way American families do every day. It's about time. That's what I think and, more importantly, that's what the majority of the American people think.

The mere fact that we're here today is a failure of leadership. For decades, Washington politicians have kicked the can down the road, choosing deficit spending over fiscal responsibility, choosing frivolous pork projects, wasteful programs, and easy answers over making tough decisions and cutting back. Republicans did it when they were in power, and Democrats did it when they were in power too. Nobody is blameless in getting us to where we are today.

But the days of finger-pointing are over. We don't have the luxury of time to look back and play the blame game. We need to move forward and find a solution to get us out of the hole that we're already in. A balanced budget amendment is a vital part of doing just that.

Yesterday, the United States surpassed $15 trillion in debt. Let me say that again: we're now $15 trillion in debt. While recognizing this sad landmark, I can't help but think about the fact that this didn't have to be the way it is.

In 1997, the House of Representatives passed a balanced budget amendment. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to pass this amendment by one vote. One vote, Mr. Speaker, one vote that would separate us from a road towards fiscal responsibility to where we are today. So here we go again, 14 years later, having the same debate.

I can't stand here today without thinking about my three sons. With a debt of $15 trillion, each of my boys owes over $48,000 in national debt. It means the children and grandchildren of each and every person in this room owes $48,000 to the Federal Government, $48,000 that they didn't spend, that they didn't ask for, and that they now are saddled with by a government of excesses.

Only one Senator stood between where we are now and $15 trillion in debt and where we could have been. So today I stand up in support of this rule and support H.J. Res. 2. I stand up for my kids, my future grandkids, and for all Americans who are saddled with that $48,000 in debt from the day that they're born.

□ 1310

I stand up for giving Congress a second chance, a chance to get it right this time. Unfortunately, I understand the Democratic leadership is whipping against this.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how else to say this. This simply baffles me. Thanks to the whipping efforts of the Democratic leadership, there are Members in the House who voted for the balanced budget amendment in 1997 who now say they're going to oppose it. In fact, two members of the Democrats' three-person leadership team voted for the 1997 amendment.

I've only been here in D.C., like I said, for a little over 10 months, but of all of the inexplicable things I've seen since coming to Congress, this just stumps me more than just about anything else I've seen here. What could these Members have been seeing between 1997 and today that makes them say, Yeah, you know what? Spending is right on target. Let's just stick with the status quo. It's dumbfounding.

It's often said the definition of insanity is to do the same thing over and over and over again and expect a different outcome. I don't understand how anybody can argue that we can continue to spend the way we do and expect to free ourselves from this monstrous, burdensome debt. We need to break the cycle. We've got to hold Congress' feet to the fire now and into the future. A balanced budget amendment

is the change away from the status quo and back to sanity.

I don't think I can say it better than Congressman DEFAZIO said in his letter to his Democratic colleagues when he wrote that Democrats who walk away from sincere bipartisan effort will have let the American electorate down. If any of us walk away from this effort, we will have let all Americans down.

We've been working without a budget, this greatest Nation, for over 900 days now. Continuing resolutions and debt ceiling increases are not the answer. Supercommittees and sequestration is not the answer. Enough's enough.

Today we have a clear choice: whether you want to change the status quo or you don't; either you believe that the government must operate responsibly on a balanced budget or you don't; either you want to rescue our Nation, ourselves, our children, and our children's children from crippling debt or you don't.

I would like to close with the words of Ronald Reagan, who once said this: ''The congressional budget process is neither reliable nor credible. In short, it needs to be fixed. We desperately need the power of a constitutional amendment to help us balance our budget.''

Now, that is presidential leadership.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule, ''yes'' on the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

What we have before us today should not be called the balanced budget amendment. What it should be called is the unbalanced budget amendment because that is what this bill is—unbalanced. It upends prudent fiscal policies, makes a mockery of congressional authority, and does nothing to address the economic struggles of millions of Americans.

This proposed amendment no more balances the budget than passing legislation to declare the tooth fairy as real. Saying it out loud doesn't make it true. What this proposal says, instead, is that Congress needs to enact legislation that balances the budget. It doesn't tell us how to do it, just what we must do.

Well, if we could do that, Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't need a constitutional amendment telling us to do it, would we? If Congress could enact legislation that balanced the budget, it could do that without a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. Merely imposing a mandate within the Constitution does not mean that Congress will be able to fulfill it.

With this kind of circular reasoning, we could go back and forth until the next election and never have to spend one more minute on creating jobs to improve the economy. But that is exactly what my colleagues on the other side want.

They've been in the majority for nearly a year now in the House of Representatives and have failed to put forth any kind of plan to create jobs and improve the well-being of millions of Americans, unless you count reaffirming ''In God We Trust'' as the national motto, weakening the Environmental Protection Agency, or watering down gun safety laws.

I was here in 1995 when this body passed a balanced budget amendment. And let us not forget that under President Clinton and, yes, Speaker Newt Gingrich, we did manage to balance the Federal budget and leave a hefty surplus for President Bush. But then President Bush and the Republican Party squandered that surplus on two wars. And people should never forget that. They squandered it on tax cuts for the richest Americans, and they squandered it on unpaid-for prescription drug benefits, leaving a big old doughnut hole that we've been talking about ever since.

Now the Republicans in this body are so extremist that they refuse to consider any tax increases of any kind on even the best off of us in America. Instead, they're leaving it up to the struggling middle class and poor people to bear the burdens of the Republican Party's free-spending ways over the last decade. And I wish I had the time to really lay all of that out.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party's intransigence makes this amendment's voting requirements particularly unbalanced. This proposal requires a two-thirds vote, 290 votes here in the House, to pass an increase in the debt ceiling. Do you know what the definition of insanity is, as said by my friend? Repeating the same thing over and over again. And real crazy insanity is just doing it over and over and over and over again and expecting the same result. Or as Ronald Reagan put it, ''There you go again.''

The Republican majority wants to enshrine in the Constitution a permanent hostage crisis for our economy. This supermajority requirement for basic economic management will ensure that we will, on a regular basis, bring our economy to the brink of collapse. Just look at the Republican's performance over the debt ceiling vote. I don't have any confidence that they'll act rationally just because there's a constitutional amendment telling them to do so. That is why this proposal is unbalanced.

By mandating so many onerous, supermajority votes, this amendment guarantees permanent gridlock in the budgeting process. And without the inclusion of a general emergency waiver, this amendment imperils our national security. Let me repeat that. Without the inclusion of a general emergency waiver, this amendment imperils our national security by creating a scenario in which Congress cannot agree whether or not to vote on funding for national emergencies such as a military conflict.

Mr. Speaker, this unbalanced proposal does not even include a clear enforcement mechanism. I asked about that at the Rules Committee, and I got an answer that I still don't understand.

Making the balanced budget a constitutional requirement means that budget disputes would be solved by America's court system. This body has already failed to pass a balanced budget when the power of the purse is already our constitutional obligation. How can we be expected to pass one when each and every provision is also subject to years of litigation?

The Republican majority wants to hand off our constitutional obligations to the Federal courts that will have the power to raise revenue. No less an authority than Judge Robert Bork made a statement regarding that.

□ 1320

He opposed a balanced budget constitutional amendment, declaring ''the result would likely be hundreds, if not thousands, of lawsuits around the country, many of them on inconsistent theories and providing inconsistent results.''

Celebrated late-Professor Archibald Cox of Harvard Law School predicted ''there is a substantial chance, even a strong probability, that Federal courts all over the country would be drawn into its interpretation and enforcement.''

Since my friend used President Reagan, the former Solicitor General to President Reagan, Professor Charles Fried, has testified ''the amendment would surely precipitate us into subtle and intricate legal questions, and the litigation that would ensue would be gruesome, intrusive, and not at all edifying.''

The former Attorney General to President George H. W. Bush, William Barr, opined that judicial power could be invoked ''to address serious and clear-cut violations.''

The Republican majority wants to hand off our constitutional obligations to these courts that will then have the power to raise revenue, impose taxes, cut spending, and reform major government programs.

I guess, if that's the case, we can all just go home now, Mr. Speaker.

This body has previously considered balanced budget amendments on numerous occasions, initiated by both Democrats and Republicans. The majority party has always ensured sufficient floor time for debate and to allow the minority to offer alternatives; but here we are in a situation where the proposal before us was never marked up in committee, never had a hearing, and, in fact, was drafted late this past Thursday night by some mysterious tweaking of H.J. Res. 1 that became H.J. Res. 2. This version was changed in secret and was filed with last-minute surprises that fundamentally changed the nature of the legislation and will come under a procedure that doesn't even allow a motion to recommit.

This is no way to amend the Constitution.

By all means, Mr. Speaker, if we want to balance the budget, let's not do it on the backs of the hardest hit in America. I don't need a constitutional amendment to tell me that balancing the budget without raising taxes on those of us who are best off in this country is unbalanced.

Where Americans need the Federal Government to support the economy, Republicans are trying to strangle it. Where Americans need us to put politics aside, Republicans are bringing forward legislation written in secret. Where Americans need this Congress to focus on economic issues, Republicans are insisting that we vote on God and gays and guns. We don't need to be voting on God and gays and guns. What we need are some guts to tell the American people that, yes, we can do this and that we can't wait any longer for those who are waiting for us to create jobs.

Now the Republican majority wants to pass a constitutional amendment to tell us that we have to balance the budget every year in a way that no individual, State or local government or business does: no borrowing, no trust funds, no way to plan for long-term projects like highway construction, national defense, and public schools.

This amendment guarantees budgetary gridlock forever and moves budget decisions to the Federal courts, not to Congress. This proposed amendment locks into the Constitution the most far right of the Republican Party's policies, forcing future generations to reap the pain imposed by the callous disregard for the least among us—the ones who need the most help.

Mr. Speaker, as of yesterday, there were 273 national organizations that oppose H.J. Res. 2, the balanced budget amendment. It's too lengthy to place into the RECORD or to put forward, but some of them are among the most celebrated organizations in our country.

I also would recommend to the membership an article written by the American Constitution Society for Law and Policy, a nonpartisan group that discusses how unnecessary this particular provision is, and it ends with the following paragraph:

The threat a balanced budget amendment would pose to our constitutional order is unavoidable. Congress, of course, remains free to enact a balanced budget if it believes this is sound economic policy. It also remains fully equipped to institute effective controls to ensure restraint and balance in the budgeting process. Therefore, there is no sufficient reason to incur the dramatic risks that the balanced budget amendment would entail for our Constitution and our Nation.

This is not a balanced budget amendment, Mr. Speaker—but it is an unbalanced one.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the august Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to both of my friends from Florida who serve on the Rules Committee.

This is a very, very important debate. It's a debate that we haven't had since January of 1995, which is the last time that the House of Representatives had a vote on the issue of a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Back in 1995, when we had just won our majority, Mr. Speaker, I was one of the enthusiastic supporters, one of the two-thirds of the House of Representatives who voted in favor of the constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. I felt very strongly at the time that as we looked at the fiscal challenges that we as a Nation faced that the only thing that we could do to achieve a balanced budget would be to have an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would call for that.

Mr. Speaker, I have changed my mind. I have changed my mind, and I will be voting against the constitutional amendment calling for a balanced budget.

Now, this is not something that I have done lightly. My friend from Spring Hill was absolutely right when he said that looking at the tough challenge of amending the Constitution is something that needs to be addressed; but I will say that I agree with a number of the arguments that were put forward by my friend from Fort Lauderdale and with a lot of the arguments put forward by my friend from Spring Hill. At the end of the day, I concluded that we should not amend the U.S. Constitution in calling for a balanced budget.

I said I've changed my mind, and I am reminded of a statement that was made by our former colleague, the mentor of our friend JEB HENSARLING, who is working tirelessly to ensure that we get our fiscal house in order with the work of the Joint Select Committee. His mentor was Phil Gramm—a Democrat, then a Republican—who served in the House and the Senate. Phil Gramm once said that ours is one job where you can never admit to having learned anything.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I've learned something, and I'd like to take just a few minutes to explain why it is that I've come to the conclusion that I have.

I said at the outset that I believed when I cast that vote in January of 1995 in favor of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that it was the only way that we would be able to achieve a balanced budget. I was wrong. Two short years later, we balanced the Federal budget. We balanced the Federal budget, and that went on for several years. It went on until 2001.

My friend was talking about the fact that we had two wars. We've got to remember that it took literally billions and billions of dollars to deal with national security issues, like establishing the Department of Homeland Security and many other things that were very, very costly; but what I found, Mr. Speaker, is that we were able to balance the Federal budget without touching that inspired document, the U.S. Constitution.

Now, James Madison in Federalist No. 58, I believe, gave the real description of the power that lies here in the House of Representatives. He said that the power over the purse is the most complete and effectual weapon that can empower any group of elected representatives of the people.

We in this institution, Mr. Speaker, have the power of the purse. We have the power of the purse, and we proved in the late 1990s that we have the will to balance the Federal budget without touching that inspired document, the U.S. Constitution. Those were the words of James Madison in Federalist No. 58, that the power over the purse is the most complete and effectual weapon that elected representatives have.

□ 1330

Now some people point to Thomas Jefferson who famously, in a letter to John Taylor written November 26, 1798, talked about how it was essential for us to have a single amendment to the Constitution that would call for a balanced budget. Well, I've got to say, Mr. Speaker, it appears that Thomas Jefferson obviously learned something as well, because 5 short years later, in the third year of the first term of his Presidency, he embarked on the largest deficit expenditure to take place since the Revolutionary War. It was not a war expenditure. It was not any kind of emergency expenditure. It was the 1803 Louisiana Purchase. And that was a decision that Thomas Jefferson made that most of us inferred led to a change in his position from the November 1798 letter that he wrote to John Taylor.

As we look at some of the other arguments—my friend from Fort Lauderdale went through the Fried, Barr, Archibald, Bork arguments on the court. I think it's important for us to look at not just that part of it, but we also need to look at the enumerated powers provision in the U.S. Constitution. I believe that not only could we create, as these brilliant jurists said, a real problem within the court structure, but what we create is a transfer of power from the first branch to the third branch of government, something that is completely contrary to Article I, section 7 of the U.S. Constitution, where the power lies right here in the United States House of Representatives. Why? Because most have said that if we were to get into these protracted legal battles, this could end up in the court, and we could have, several years from now, a court deliberating over a budget that had passed, again, literally years before.

So, as we look at these arguments, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that I will take a backseat to no one when it comes to our commitment to get our fiscal house in order. I do happen to believe that our former colleague Jack Kemp was right when he said we shouldn't have to worship at the altar of a balanced budget; but we all know that with this $15 trillion figure that my friend from Spring Hill pointed to, we need to do everything we can to reduce that debt and our annual deficit. But it's important for us to focus on economic growth. And that's why I congratulate those on the Joint Select Committee who are working on that, and I believe that that's something that we need to do.

But having a balanced budget does not guarantee job creation and economic growth. Yes, of course having a degree of fiscal solvency goes a long way towards generating a climate that can make that happen; but we need to have pro-growth economic policies, and fiscal restraint is only one of those tools. That's why I believe that, as we look at the challenges that lie ahead, I don't want to say to the American people that I'm going to protect you from your future leaders that you are going to elect.

The American people deserve the Congress that they elect. I personally think they deserve better than some of what we have had here over the past several years. Right now we all know we've got a 9 percent approval rating. But the American people cannot have Representatives who say, We are going to say to you that you can't have the leaders that you elect do what you think is right. Maybe there is another Louisiana Purchase out there, and that decision is something that should be made by leaders.

I believe in very carefully amending the Constitution. And I will say that I have always been troubled by some who argue that the level of your commitment to a public policy issue is based only on your willingness to amend the Constitution to implement it. Well, I think that's silly. I think that's ridiculous. I think that someone can be passionately committed to an issue like saying we shouldn't burn the American flag and yet be willing to say it shouldn't be enshrined in the U.S. Constitution. I feel the same way about the issue of a balanced budget.

I'm proud to have voted to bring about these kinds of spending cuts. I'm proud to have done everything possible to try to reduce the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government. I do think that a lot of work has to be done. And my friend from Spring Hill, again, correctly pointed to the fact that both sides have responsibility for increases in spending. But I think we can come together. I think we can have the will to do this.

Even if we pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, we all know very well we're not going to balance the budget overnight with a $15 trillion debt and now multitrillion-dollar deficits. We're not going to do it overnight. But we have to get ourselves on that road, and I'm convinced that we can. And I don't think that amending the Constitution is going to do anything to help us get there.

So I do support the rule, and I think the rule—by the way, I should say to my friend—is one that was used when the Equal Rights Amendment passed the House of Representatives. The argument was made that somehow having this done under suspension of the rules is not fair. There's going to be 5 hours of debate. There's going to be an opportunity to do this.

I've had the opportunity to say my peace. I know that I'm in the minority in my party. I know that there's not a lot of enthusiastic support on my side. I know that there are many Democrats who are going to be supporting the amendment to this. So we are going to have a chance to discuss these as we move through today and tomorrow.

I do support the rule and the work of the Rules Committee. We've worked long and hard on this. But at the end of the day, I have come to the conclusion that I have.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

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

I wish to compliment the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

I don't want to get into any more trouble than I already have. So if the gentleman could withdraw his compliment, I would be very appreciative of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am delighted to withdraw the compliment.

What I wanted you to be able to do, since you had become so enlightened about the balanced budget amendment, was to be equally enlightened with reference to the rules and allow us a motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 639, the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, which will help create jobs in the United States by making American-manufactured products more attractive to Chinese consumers.

At this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from the State of Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today we have another triumph for the Republican public relations office. Their job is to hide the fact that the select committee of 12 isn't going to get anything done and their members are going home for Thanksgiving. But what will they talk about? A failure? No. They want to give them something. So this balanced budget amendment—that's why we're out here debating a rule on a job-destroying, poorly thought-out amendment to the Constitution. This House is considering an amendment to the Constitution that did not go through the regular order, is not even the product of any committee debate. It has not been an open and thoughtful process.

Mr. Speaker, the job of this Congress at this time should be creating jobs. For 11 months, the Republicans have talked about it but have done nothing. Now, instead of wasting the people's time with this doomed and irresponsible constitutional amendment, we should deal with this country's serious economic concerns, one of which is the Chinese currency manipulation and how it hurts American businesses and our workers. It's time for this House to vote on the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act.

The Speaker needs to stop standing in the way of this important legislation. We've been discussing this issue with the Government of China for more than 8 years. American manufacturers should not be forced to compete against a 28 percent discount on imports from China, all because of China's predatory currency practices. This legislation will help to provide meaningful relief to U.S. companies and our workers who are injured by the currency manipulation of China.

This is a bipartisan measure. The China currency bill passed the House last year with a strong majority of Republicans. The majority of the House has cosponsored this bill, including 62 Republicans, and we can't get it up.

□ 1340

The Senate has already passed a similar bill with a strong bipartisan vote. The Speaker is the one who has his foot on it because he's got his foot on the Rules Committee, and they won't bring it out.

American workers expect every one of us on both sides of this aisle to fight against China's predatory trade policies and to fight for American workers. We should be fighting for the American economy rather than pandering to the Republican base with this terrible attempt to use the Constitution as a partisan playground and a way to hide from the American people that we're not doing what they sent us here to do, which was to create jobs.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), a Rules Committee member.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Let me first thank Sheriff NUGENT from Florida. Sheriff, you're doing a fantastic job with this rule, and I thank you for leading this important debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a simple question of my friends who oppose the whole concept of a balanced budget amendment: What makes us, the Federal Government, any different than the State and local governments

who have to abide under a simple balanced budget concept? But more importantly, what makes us any different than the 74 percent of Americans in a CNN poll who simply say a balanced budget amendment is in the best interests of the citizens of this country?

Simply put, Washington needs to stop this runaway train of spending. So often, too often even, it seems that this town has lost sight of the fact that taxpayer dollars don't just appear from some magical piggy bank but rather are paid by hardworking American families. We have a duty to spend these dollars wisely. And, unfortunately, in this town that simply doesn't happen very often at all. The last 3 years, not the last 30 years, not the last three decades, but the last 3 years we have seen the largest increase in the debt of this Nation, in the history of this Nation, and it is very clear that a constitutional amendment is the strongest option we have today to ensure that this doesn't happen again.

How can we expect to create a proper environment for job creation when we can't even keep the Federal Government's checkbook in balance? How does the current administration think we can continue to force small businesses to completely revamp their budgets under an onslaught of burdensome regulations while Washington does not have to do the same thing?

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

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. It simply doesn't make sense. We should get this work done. We should get this fixed today. I will say as part of the majority-making class of 2010, with 86 out of the 87 freshmen on the Republican side supporting some form of the balanced budget amendment, we should move forward now. The American people demand it, and they should get it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my friend on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), I'm sure has views that are similar to mine. I yield to him 3½ minutes at this time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle claim to be about fiscal prudence; that they are here to get our fiscal house in order; that a balanced budget amendment is the only way to do so. Once again, Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle are wrong. The right way to balance the Nation's budget is by making good, solid, smart policy, something the Republicans have proven to be incapable of over the past decade.

President Bush was handed a gift by President Bill Clinton. He was given a budget surplus. And instead of crafting a smart, long-term fiscal plan, he blew it in a couple of big spending sprees in the first few months of his term, with a lot of help from congressional Republicans. Let me be as clear as I can be. You don't squander a surplus on tax cuts for the rich, and you don't put two wars on your credit card. You certainly don't do those two things at the same time. But that's exactly what the Republicans did, and they drove this economy into a ditch with unpaid tax cuts and unpaid wars. And now they want to amend the Constitution with a balanced budget amendment. You've got to be kidding.

What's worse, the Republican leadership has decided to break their transparency pledge. Not only are they thumbing their nose at their own rules, they are actually bringing a bill to the floor that has never been read, amended, or voted on in a committee. That's right, Mr. Speaker. Despite all of their rhetoric, this balanced budget amendment was never marked up in committee. And, even worse, it was changed without a vote before it came to the Rules Committee. Even though there has been no official consideration of this specific bill by the Judiciary Committee, something this new Republican Congress promised to do, the sponsor of this bill had the audacity to say that this bill and the changes made in the dark of night were supported by the committee.

And if this process weren't bad enough, these changes actually allow war funds to be exempt from the balanced budget amendment. These wars have gone on too long, and they should be paid for. They should have been paid for from day one. That's a mistake we should learn from instead of repeating. We have already spent $1.3 trillion on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. That's $1.3 trillion that's unpaid for, $1.3 trillion on our grandchildren's credit cards.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose these wars. I want them to end now. But if you support them, the least you can do is pay for them. And yet the Republicans are repeating their same mistakes. And I shouldn't be surprised. This is the party that decries government spending, but turns to FEMA with outstretched hands in times of need. This is the party that says the Recovery Act doesn't work, but shows up at ribbon cuttings for projects paid for by the Recovery Act. And now this is the party that says we should balance the budget, but we shouldn't pay for the wars that increase our debt.

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal hypocrisy takes my breath away. This is a bad bill being brought up under a bad process. Vote ''no'' on the rule and vote ''no'' on the bill.

Mr. NUGENT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. HASTINGS has indicated that if we vote down the previous question, we will bring up H.R. 639.

It's a fact that China's currency manipulation is hurting U.S. businesses and workers. According to a recent study, imports from China account for 25 to 50 percent of the manufacturing jobs we have lost over the past decade. That's 1 million to 2 million jobs, and our trade deficit with China continues to grow.

An important factor in this picture is currency manipulation. American manufacturers are forced to compete against an estimated 25 percent discount on imports from China due to that manipulation. That's on top of China's massive subsidies and other policies.

Dr. Fred Bergsten, who heads the Peterson Institute, says that elimination of China's undervalued currency would create a million jobs mainly in manufacturing, and that manipulation is by far the largest protectionist measure adopted by any country since the Second World War—and probably in all history.

Meanwhile, the Chinese government is pushing production of high-end manufacturing products that compete head on with American products—high-tech products, solar panels, wind turbines, automobiles, aircraft, and others.

This is a bipartisan measure. A majority of the House, 230 Members, have cosponsored the bill, including 62 Republicans. The time has come for action. Eight years of talk have yielded meager results. American workers and businesses cannot wait any longer, and the U.S. economy cannot wait any longer. The time is now for action.

Defeat the previous question.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell me how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) also has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

□ 1350

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank my able colleague from Florida, Congressman HASTINGS, for yielding and rise in support of Congressman CRITZ's effort here to focus attention on this whole issue of Chinese currency manipulation. When Congress passed permanent most-favored-nation status with China over my objection, we were told by supporters of the agreement that trade with China would create jobs, more economic opportunity and trade surpluses for our country. Well, if you look at the numbers, you'll see since that was passed what's happened is we've got more and more and more and more trade deficits every year, totaling in 2010 over $273 billion. With Chinese

currency manipulation, that's almost an inflated number because it would be cut in half, it would be cut substantially if goods were marked to their true value, not their inflated value.

China has never opened up its market. That's why we get these huge trade deficits. And they aggressively use government intervention through currency manipulation to rig the markets. We know they're the largest intellectual property thief, they counterfeit their goods, and they use industrial policy to promote and protect Chinese industries at the expense of American jobs and factories. Some call these tactics market Leninism because we see state-managed capitalism in China locking down on industry after industry.

Regions like the one I represent in northern Ohio have been especially hard-hit as production shifted from the coasts of the Great Lakes to the shores of China. We can see this draining of wealth from the United States. Last year, our trade deficit again was over a half-trillion dollars globally, and with China, they had over half of that trade deficit.

If you look at the trade data, we're on track to send at least as many jobs to China this year. You can see the jobs being shipped to China in every community in this country. Even scrap metal is being sent over there, for heaven's sake.

Economists tell us that every trillion dollars in trade deficit translates into 14,000 lost American jobs. If we could get the currency manipulation issue solved, we could bring some of those jobs back to this country.

It's time for China to play on a level playing field.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that everybody that may be watching this at home understands we are talking about a balanced budget amendment.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would have my friend to know that we also are talking about the previous question, for which at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ).

Mr. CRITZ. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I had prepared remarks that I was going to talk about to defeat this previous question so that we could bring the Chinese currency manipulation bill to the floor. But we've been talking about this on a weekly basis. We've been talking about this on the floor of the House on a weekly basis. And I think back to 10 months ago when Speaker BOEHNER made the statement that the House works best when it's allowed to work its will.

This same bill passed the House last year overwhelmingly. A similar bill passed the Senate earlier this year overwhelmingly. This bill has broad bipartisan support. Sixty-two Republicans are cosponsors of this bill. Four months ago, I brought a discharge petition, which is now just 30 signatures shy of forcing this bill to the floor. It needs Republican help. I'm imploring the Speaker to bring this bill to the floor of the House.

This is so important. As Congressman LEVIN said earlier, we're talking about jobs. I did a telephone town hall last evening. The topic of discussion was jobs. Everyone wants to know when are we going to put our heads together and work to get this country back to work? Milling jobs. Manufacturing jobs. This is an issue that everyone knows about and everyone can agree on. We just want to level the playing field. This is giving this country the teeth it needs to go after countries such as China that manipulate their currency and hurt American manufacturing companies.

This is about locking arms with the American public and moving forward. So I urge those Republicans, those 62 that are on H.R. 639, anyone can see those names, anyone can call and say, you need to support this bill. You need to support the discharge petition, get on it, let's talk about this. You can't hide behind the Speaker any longer. We're going to continue this fight day in and day out, week in and week out. I urge defeat of the previous question so that we can talk about jobs for the American people.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying resolution has to do with a balanced budget amendment, which most Americans might say ''yea'' to, but this is a deja vu because we debated this so many years ago, and it was found that a balanced budget amendment for the Federal Government will not work with all of the restraints and necessities of serving the American people.

But Mr. CRITZ's bill and the idea of correcting the currency manipulation of China will work. It will create jobs. The World Trade Organization cannot help. All the negotiations with China will not help. I would love for them to stand up and be counted in the world family so that we can continue to churn the economy, which all of us would benefit from. But as the euro crumbles and possibly the dollar will step in—I opposed the euro many years ago—we've got to get a currency that responds to all of us. Decent pay for a decent day's work—that does not happen when you have a manipulation of product cost so that some products are so much cheaper than the ones made by Americans.

We are not envious, and we are not jealous, but this resolution or Mr. CRITZ's bipartisan effort can move forward if we vote ''no'' on the previous question, and then we can begin to help create jobs. And we might say to the supercommittee that we thank you for your service, but we can go into 2012 deliberatively and thoughtfully looking at a plan that raises revenue and cuts the areas that do not leave the vulnerable along the highway of despair.

I support Mr. CRITZ's effort. I want to move beyond the supercommittee and fund this government and create jobs in the way that the people elected us to do.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from Florida that I am going to be the last speaker, and if he is ready to close, I will go forward doing same.

Mr. NUGENT. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this unbalanced amendment does not belong in our Constitution. It enshrines far-right ideology and makes a mockery of congressional authority to set forth the Nation's fiscal policy. This hardly belongs in the same company as freedom of speech, the abolition of slavery, and a woman's right to vote. This proposal does not balance the budget; it only demands that Congress do so, and yet it does not provide a mechanism to enforce that rule.

So in a situation of partisan gridlock, the Federal budget might very well end up in the courts. This is no way to govern. If this Congress could balance the budget, we wouldn't need a constitutional amendment to tell us to do so. But the fact remains that the Republican majority has steadfastly failed to set forth legislation that will create jobs and grow this economy.

Given their inflexibility, a balanced budget constitutional amendment hardly seems like the magic wand Republicans claim it will be. This Congress needs to be serious about the real causes of economic hardship in this country. Focusing on God, gays, and guns and not having the guts to tell people we're not doing anything to create jobs, that isn't going to keep people in their homes, and it isn't going to help Americans obtain quality health care and education.

These are the critical issues facing our Nation. Wasting our time—and that's exactly what this is, it's going nowhere fast—wasting our time with political gimmicks like an unbalanced constitutional amendment is just that, wasting our time.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so we can debate and pass real jobs legislation today, not little old stuff that is appealing to the right wing of the people who are pushing nothing more than symbolism and talking about it being in our United States Constitution. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Florida for a lively debate. The issue, though, that has sort of gotten muddled is about a balanced budget amendment, not about anything else that you've heard about on the floor. It is about a balanced budget amendment.

But just to remind everybody, when we talk about jobs, we've passed over 21 jobs bills that are currently sitting idle in the Senate. So I don't know what else you can do, except it gets kind of frustrating that we send great pieces of legislation over to the Senate and nothing happens.

We've heard a lot of debate here about a balanced budget amendment, pros and cons. You're going to hear 5 hours of debate in the very near future about the pros and cons of a balanced budget amendment.

This Congress has done things that are amazing. We used emergency funding to fund the census. Now, I know the census probably snuck up on everybody around here, but I don't understand why you had to use emergency funding to do that.

You know, we talk about the Clinton years. We talk about budget surpluses and how quickly they disappeared. But remember one thing: Part of the Clinton surpluses also hollowed out our force, which required us to put our servicemen and -women at risk for way too long. Some of them weren't allowed to retire through stop-loss, and others had to serve 15 months in combat positions because we had hollowed out our force.

Patrick Henry once said the Constitution is not an instrument for the government to restrain the people; it's an instrument for the people to restrain the government. Today we start building upon those restraints. A balanced budget amendment is more of an instrument to check bloated government, a government that wants to be everything to everyone.

Today we're borrowing 40 cents on every dollar we spend. We're writing checks that we can't cash, hoping future generations will be able to figure out how to get out of this mess on their own. This spending is just unsustainable.

I wasn't happy with the Budget Control Act, but I voted for it simply so we could vote today on a rule to allow us to vote on a balanced budget later this week so we can fundamentally change where we're going.

After 10 months in Congress, I'm convinced that there are not enough people in Washington with the determination, the dedication, nor the fortitude to make the tough decisions for the good of this country. The Constitution has saved us in the past, and it can save us in the future. A balanced budget amendment would give Americans a reason to believe that more efficiently and effectively than any other proposal I've heard of.

One of the things I hear consistently back home is that you all have made decisions in Congress that have put us so far into debt. Our unborn children are facing a debt of $48,000 for every child who's born this year. How can we stand up and look at people and say this Congress can fix it on its own? How can we look people in the eye and say, You know what. Just give us another chance; we've done so well over the last 30 years.

I don't believe that the American people believe that we can do that, and I think that's why they're asking for fundamental changes. I think it's why they're asking us to step forward and do the right thing, Mr. Speaker, not kick the can down the road anymore.

I have the utmost respect for our chairman and for my good friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), but I adamantly disagree. I think that we've had a change in government because there's a necessary need for a change in government. I think that you can't continue to do the status quo, because if we do, we're just going to wind up $15 trillion in debt today, $20 trillion in debt 2 years from now. When does it end, Mr. Speaker?

So I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this strongly bipartisan legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 466 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 639) to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify that countervailing duties may be imposed to address subsidies relating to a fundamentally undervalued currency of any foreign country. 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 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 legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee

on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). 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 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the adoption of House Resolution 466, if ordered, and adoption of House Resolution 467.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 173, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 854]

YEAS—243

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

NAYS—173

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
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
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Bachmann
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Conyers
Courtney
Gardner
Garrett
Giffords
Hirono
Lucas
Manzullo
Napolitano
Paul
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Roskam
Shimkus

□ 1430

Messrs. HEINRICH, ROTHMAN of New Jersey, CLARKE of Michigan, and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. HULTGREN, PETERSON, and Mrs. NOEM changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 854, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 854 in order to attend an important event in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 169, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 855]

YEAS—248

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

Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
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
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
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
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
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)

NAYS—169

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
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
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—16

Bachmann
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Courtney
Gardner
Garrett
Giffords
Gohmert
Hirono
Lucas
Manzullo
Napolitano
Paul
Roskam
Shimkus
Yarmuth

□ 1439

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 855, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 855 in order to attend an important event in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on H. Res. 466—Rule providing for consideration of motions to suspend the Rules.

CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 467) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, 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 262, nays 156, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 856]

YEAS—262

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
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
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
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)

NAYS—156

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter