United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 2011 No. 46

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, April 4, 2011, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 2011

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, to Whom we are all accountable, You are also our source of freedom since we are created in Your image.

We praise You and thank You for the blessing to work here in Congress and serve You, Your people, and this Nation.

During this weekend, help us to enjoy the new life of spring and the gifts of family and friends. By drawing closer to beauty and love, mold us by Your spirit to be more fully Your free people and so a blessing to others both next week and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HEINRICH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

AMERICA IS READY FOR TOUGH SPENDING DECISIONS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the work ethic of the people of my district gives me great optimism despite the daily reminders that our Nation teeters on the edge of bankruptcy.

Individual Americans are rich in spirit, tradition, and innovation; but as a country, we're broke, all because the Federal Government has maxed out its credit card. This House is listening to the American people, and we have passed legislation representing significant spending cuts of historic proportions.

But HARRY REID and the President are not listening. Instead, they are threatening to shut down the government. Now they'll try to shift the blame and deny that America's economic problems are the result of their failed policies.

I believe America is ready for some tough spending decisions. We must give Americans the tools to grow the economy instead of growing government. I hope my fellow colleagues will join me in asking two questions when any spending bill comes before this House: How much is it going to cost? And who is going to pay for it? And if we can't afford it, and if the American taxpayer is going to foot the bill, we should be voting a resounding ''no.''

HONORING LIEUTENANT CANDICE KILLIAN

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Women's History Month and to honor a very special hero stationed at Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque.

First Lieutenant Candice Killian, of the 58th Training Squadron, is our Nation's first female pilot for the CV–22, also known as the Osprey. It is an elite honor for any pilot to fly the CV–22, and it's particularly unique to be the first woman in history to do so.

Unfortunately, the contributions that women make to our military and our Nation don't always get their due recognition; so it's a very special honor for me today to recognize First Lieutenant Killian as part of Women's History Month. I continue to be inspired by the great sacrifices made by leaders like First Lieutenant Killian in service to our Nation. Congratulations to First Lieutenant Killian on her distinguished service and sacrifice.

Printed on recycled paper.

THE RESTORING ECONOMIC CERTAINTY ACT

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

Mr. RIBBLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1281, the Restoring Economic Certainty Act of 2011. This bill places a 24-month moratorium on the majority of new regulations promulgated by agencies, giving small businesses the certainty required to create jobs. The goal of this bill is to provide confidence to small businesses, which create the overwhelming majority of jobs in America. I am calling on Congress to enact a regulatory cooling off period. Let's give America's small businesses a chance to catch their breath from the over 23,000 rules and tens of thousands of pages of regulations that have been enacted since 2004.

As a business owner myself, I have seen firsthand the harmful impact that government regulations and uncertainty can have on job creation. Job creators have to know that they won't be punished by unelected Federal bureaucrats with additional rules, regulations, and redtape. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1281 today. Let's send job creators a clear signal that we are not going to allow government to be an impediment to business growth.

HOW SOON WE FORGET

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, how soon we forget. During the last congressional session, then-Minority Leader BOEHNER called deem-and-pass bills ''a scheme and a plot,'' one that he has employed immediately upon assuming the Speakership.

It's doubly ironic because this particular deem-and-pass bill is blatantly unconstitutional, as it eliminates the Senate and President from the legislative process. Article I, section 7, clause 2 of the Constitution reads, ''Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approve he shall sign it; but if not, he shall return it . . . ''

This deem-and-pass spending bill would eliminate the inconvenience of the United States Senate passing or the President signing H.R. 1, the radical Republican proposals to eliminate 700,000 to 900,000 jobs. Whether or not Republicans ram it down our throats today is probably irrelevant since it is clearly unconstitutional, but we should vote it down as a matter of constitutional principle.

CONSERVATIVES WON THE ELECTION

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Democrats in the Senate should work with the Republicans to act on the continuing resolution. House Republicans successfully passed a bill over 40 days ago, and Senate Democrats have still not acted. Liberals in the Senate claim to have a plan of their own. Rather than voting on this plan, Senate Democrats have resorted to petty political gamesmanship.

Conservatives won the election in November. The American people spoke clearly, they want to put a halt to reckless spending. This is the conservative position in Congress. Any compromise should incorporate views of the American people. The Tea Party has made a difference. While liberals are encouraging a government shutdown, conservatives in Congress have passed a bill that would avoid this event. Leaders are expected to make tough decisions in difficult times. Continuing with one-line gimmicks to curry political favor is another political ploy in Washington that shows liberals are just out of touch with America. The American people know that reckless borrowing is a threat to American families. Young people know that debts are being passed to them.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

PARTISAN EXTREMISM REACHES A NEW LOW

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning in objection to the Republican leadership's blatant disregard for the Constitution.

Republicans' partisan extremism reached a new low this week with the willingness to ignore some of the most basic fundamentals of our Constitution. They have come up with a scheme called ''deem and pass.'' I am outraged that the Republicans could believe that their job-killing budget could become law with just the approval of the House of Representatives. Every American should be offended by such an extreme, reckless, and clearly unconstitutional scheme.

Madam Speaker, Americans want Congress to move beyond the partisan extremism and political theater. It is time to negotiate a budget in good faith that invests in our future, protects our families, and helps move America toward greater economic recovery and prosperity.

□ 0910

HONORING THE LIFELONG ACHIEVEMENTS OF FOUR NAVAL ACADEMY GRADUATES

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

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, this past Friday I had the privilege to attend a ceremony before 4,000 Midshipmen at Annapolis honoring four distinguished graduates of the Naval Academy for their lifelong achievements and dedication to the United States Navy, Marine Corps and, indeed, to our Nation.

Dr. Bradford Parkinson, class of 1957, dedicated his life and effort to develop the Global Positioning System.

Lieutenant General Matthew Cooper, class of 1958, served two tours in Vietnam as a Commander in the Marine Corps Ground Reserve in Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm, and turned around the Toys for Tots Foundation.

Mr. Corbin McNeill, class of 1962, served for over 20 years in the submarine service, and later became the chairman and co-CEO of Exelon Corporation, headquartered in Illinois.

The fourth honoree holds a special place in my heart and in the heart of my family, Rear Admiral Robert Harper Shumaker, class of 1956, my Uncle Bob.

Madam Speaker, upon graduation from the Naval Academy, my uncle attended flight school and began his service in the United States Navy. On February 11, 1965, flying his F–8 Crusader, he was shot down over North Vietnam and was taken prisoner by the North Vietnamese. For over 8 years he was held prisoner, many of those years in the Hanoi Hilton, a name which he actually dubbed that prison camp.

Madam Speaker, my Uncle Bob has always served as an inspiration to me and to countless others. I was honored to see this special award bestowed upon him this past week, and I want to take this time to thank him and his fellow award recipients for their service not only to the Naval Academy and the Marine Corps but to our Nation.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. BARROW. Madam Speaker, I rise today to encourage the President and leaders of the House and Senate to work together to craft a long-term spending plan to prevent a government shutdown and get our Nation's finances back on track.

No business can thrive without a stable, long-term financial plan. The Federal Government can't either. The uncertainty we're operating under is costly to taxpayers, and it threatens the health of both the public and the private sectors.

As I travel around my district, I hear time and again from constituents who are tired of the heated political rhetoric. We can cater to political extremes or we can work together to resolve pressing issues.

Let's move beyond the weekly battles on discretionary spending and

start an adult conversation about the real structural issues that plague our Nation's fiscal health.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL SELMON WILLARD ''JIM'' WELLS

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of one of America's great military heroes, Lieutenant General Selmon Willard Wells, or Jim as he was known to his family.

General Wells passed away in December at the age of 94 after a lifetime of distinguished service to his country. Today, his friends, family, and loved ones will gather to celebrate his amazing life in a special service near his home in California. Among those will be his children, three grandchildren, and six great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, there's no way I could do justice to all the achievements of this amazing man in the time I have here.

Jim first earned his wings in 1941 and went on to log over 12,000 hours of flying time as a command pilot, with over 700 hours of combat time. He flew hundreds of missions during three wars—World War II, Korea, and Vietnam—and has been honored with almost every medal imaginable.

After commanding forces all over the world, he culminated his military career as an inspector general of the Air Force here in Washington.

Today, I would like to join with my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives to express to Jim's family and loved ones our heartfelt sympathy on his loss and our sincere gratitude for his service to the Nation he loved.

Mr. Speaker, during his service today, it was the hope of many that General Wells would be honored by a military flyover. I am disappointed to say that the Air Force was unable to accommodate this wish, but I know there's no military airman in America who does not join us in honoring the memory of this hero. And if anyone would understand the logistical challenges of command, it would be Jim.

A PENDING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, well, here we go again. We're 1 week away from a government shutdown. I, for one, wish we could focus on creating jobs and growing the economy. But, instead, the majority can't even agree on how to keep the doors open.

In fact, unwilling to compromise and unable to break free of the clutches of the tea party, they have tried a stunt that is beyond belief. It's altogether fitting that we are debating this absurd measure today on April Fool's Day. Why? Because after reading the Constitution on the floor of this body just weeks ago, they are ignoring our founding document, mocking its principles, and attempting to circumvent 222 years of history.

What do they want to do? Say that any bill, any bill that passes this House is good enough. No need for the Senate or President. It should just become law, like magic.

This country was founded on checks and balances and limited government. Instead of desperate attempts to ram through job-destroying legislation to appease the extreme wing of their party, perhaps the majority in this House could try negotiating in good faith with the Senate and our President to keep the lights on. After all, that's the least the American public expects of their elected officials.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1255, GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 194 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 194

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1255) to prevent a shutdown of the government of the United States, and for other purposes. 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 to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 194 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from Minnesota makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I raise this point of order, not necessarily out of concern for unmet, unfunded mandates, although there are likely many in this bill; I raise the point of order because it's the only vehicle we've got to actually talk about this rule and this bill and how we're being denied the ability to actually offer the amendments that we would like to to illuminate what's actually in this bill.

Republicans are playing partisan political games with America's future, America's seniors, and Americans veterans with the following: with America's government.

Since taking control of Congress over 13 weeks ago, Republicans have failed to introduce a single bill, not one single bill to create one single job. Instead, the Republican majority has hatched an unconstitutional scheme to fire nearly 1 million Americans and foreclose on the middle class.

Madam Speaker, I think it's ironic that today is April Fool's Day, because the Republican majority is playing an April Fool's joke on the American people. This unconstitutional Washington ''tricknology'' and ''trickeration'' reflected in the underlying bill would destroy at least 700,000 jobs according to the Economic Policy Institute, Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Economics, and even Goldman Sachs.

Let's be clear. The underlying bill of which Mr. WOODALL is a cosponsor implies that the Senate has passed a bill which has already failed there. It assumes or deems that the President has signed a bill which he threatened to veto.

□ 0920

April Fool's, America. There is no Senate or Office of the Presidency today under the Republican majority bill. The Republican spending bill badly damages our fragile economic recovery, according to 300 economists of all political stripes, and threatens to send us spiraling into another Republican recession. And as we have heard earlier this week, the Republican answer to 14 million Americans who lost their jobs and can't find new ones is: Stop talking about jobs.

At this time, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) a simple question: How many jobs does this bill create?

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would be happy to answer that question.

By eliminating the crushing Federal deficit that we have today? By taking the first steps we have seen in a generation to take the government out of the capital market and put the private sector back in?

Mr. ELLISON. Reclaiming my time, I do appreciate the gentleman's decision not to answer my question.

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to try again, Mr. ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. I have the time and I have reclaimed it. I do appreciate the gentleman's decision not to answer how many jobs this bill is going to create because it certainly creates none. In fact, it destroys jobs. And it is really a shame. And I think that if the gentleman wanted to give us a number, even an estimate, just some sort of an estimate as to how many jobs this bill is going to create, we certainly could have a good dialogue about how America goes forward.

But unfortunately, Madam Speaker, the gentleman cannot answer that question because the Republican majority has been exposed. They have a no-jobs agenda. And this bill they propose to deem and pass today would cut upwards of 1 million jobs and as low as 700,000. This is a no-jobs agenda.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman.

This Republican April Fool's resolution on the House floor today seems to look for a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes the waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation, we believe, of section 426(a).

I am not sure if the rules of the House are declared null and void on any April Fool's Day, but I have a feeling that we are about to see that happen today on the floor. Apparently, the new Republican leadership and their majority believe that they can take control of the parliamentary system. Unfortunately for them, we still have a bicameral legislature, including a United States Senate and a Constitution that requires the President of the United States to sign legislation.

So the rules seem to be changing every day around here. I thought we were going to see bills 72 hours in advance. The bills would have to be paid for under the Republican cut-go measure, and all bills—again, all bills would have to meet a constitutional test before the floor considers it. In the last 2 weeks, we have violated every one of these principles.

There are likely some unfunded mandates in this measure. I raise a point of order because this is the only way that we have to debate this bill and we are being denied the ability to actually offer the amendments that we would like to, to illuminate what is actually in this legislation and how this is a break again from the hallmark and tradition of this great House, which is to allow open debate on appropriations bills.

So, in conclusion, we simply cannot trash the rules of the House like we are doing here today and, ironically, on April Fool's Day.

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

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, it appears that this is going to be an April Fool's theme day, and I suppose I should have known that when I woke up this morning.

I am a little surprised that it begins with folks claiming a point of order against unfunded mandates that they are not sure at all exist in the bill; that they claim a point of order against unfunded mandates in a rule that waives those points of order if they did exist.

I want to say, Madam Speaker, I'm a big proponent of regular order. A big proponent of regular order. And the prophylactic waiver that is in the rule is designed just in case there was something that we missed.

But what is important is that we had the largest and most open debate we have had in this House in a decade on H.R. 1, the only provision that could possibly have an unfunded mandate in it and does not.

This bill does two things, the underlying legislation does two things: It both gives the Senate an opportunity to come out from under its paralyzing inaction and pass H.R. 1; and, it says that if the Senate does not, if the Senate fails to act—we are not asking the Senate to do exactly what we want them to do. We are asking them to act. If they fail to act, that Congress will not get paid. Congress will not get paid. My colleagues on the left won't get paid, my colleagues on the right won't get paid, and my colleagues in the Senate won't get paid.

I would ask my good friend Mr. ELLISON, do you believe that this provision that will prevent us from getting paid for not doing our job is the unfunded mandate in that provision?

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. I believe that the Republican no-jobs agenda is a serious affront to the American people.

Mr. WOODALL. Well, let me reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, to say that I appreciate the gentleman's support for making sure we don't get paid if we are not doing our work.

There is a divide in this town, Madam Speaker. There is a crowd that believes that government creates jobs, and the more government activity that takes place the more jobs there are. There is another crowd in this town that believes that only the private sector can create jobs.

As this bill will put more capital into the private markets, it will create jobs. As this bill will provide much-needed certainty that we cannot have under these continuing resolutions, this bill will create jobs. As this bill goes to complete the work that should have happened last Congress but did not, this bill will create jobs.

It is a cruel April Fool's Day joke on the American people, Madam Speaker, that instead of debating the underlying resolution—and I have a rule that I am prepared to bring to the floor that will allow time to debate the underlying resolution—we are instead focused on points of order that even my colleagues on the left don't believe exist.

They accuse us of perverting the process, Madam Speaker, and we have had the most open process in the first 90 days of this Congress than this Congress has seen in a decade. And, in doing so, they pervert the process, raising points of order that they do not believe exist and they know in their hearts do not exist.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland, Ms. DONNA EDWARDS.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for raising this point of order. I join in support of the point of order.

First of all, it is time for us to create jobs, and we haven't created jobs and we are 13 weeks into this Congress and we are not debating jobs today.

Second, as to the underlying resolution, I will speak to that later, Madam Speaker, but today we are sitting here with a bill that violates the rules of this House. The Congress said when they took on this new leadership that they were going to come into the Congress open and transparent and without hypocrisy, and not following the kind of rules that they railed against during the previous Congress, and yet here we are today with a rule that doesn't allow us to really consider appropriations in the way that this Congress—not the last Congress, but this Republican Congress—established. We are neither open, we are not transparent. And this point of order raises a question as to whether the Republican majority is going to operate according to the rules that it set. Not the rules that Democrats set, but the rules that Republicans set.

And so, Madam Speaker, I am really troubled today both by the underlying resolution and by the fact that we have here perhaps a bill that has unknown, unfunded mandates that we aren't able to look at and for which there won't be any amendments. So I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for raising the point of order, and I would urge strong consideration by my colleagues to make this process, as the leadership has committed, to make it open, to make it transparent, and to make it without hypocrisy.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, would he be amenable to stripping out all but the Member pay issue that's contained within the bill? Would he be willing to do that?

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WOODALL. You want to remove the most debated provision we have

had in this entire Congress? You feel that hasn't been debated enough?

□ 0930

Mr. ELLISON. We will deal with the Member pay issue. Are you willing to do that?

Mr. WOODALL. The Member pay issue is critically tied to the inaction of the folks on the funding bill. The answer is no, Mr. ELLISON, I cannot agree to that.

Mr. ELLISON. Reclaiming my time, thank you for finally getting around to that ''no.''

Well, I think that makes the point here, Madam Speaker. The fact is that this particular Republican action is yet another opportunity to degrade and take away the basic social safety net of America while doing nothing to get Americans back to work.

Americans deserve to work. Americans thought that they were going to get a majority that would help them get back to work back last November, but they were sorely surprised when the Republican majority got in and decided to do nothing to help Americans get back to work. All the majority has done is strip away programs and things that will help Americans do better, to take programs and money away from police officers, to fire public employees. This has been their agenda, and this is too bad. I think that this is a shame, and it certainly is an abandonment of what people thought they were getting in November.

So, Madam Speaker, this particular point of order raised today does address the critical issues that must be addressed. But, at the bottom, we are still looking at 13 weeks with no jobs and Republicans offering legislation that literally would put nearly 1 million people out of work.

So I ask my colleagues to stand with the American people. Let's move America forward. Let's reject the rule and the underlying bill by voting ''no'' on this motion to consider this unconstitutional Washington trickery.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a gentleman who is making sure we do keep our promises on Capitol Hill, the gentleman from California, Chairman LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to the question that has been raised during this discussion, and that is the provision dealing with the pay of Members of Congress and the President of the United States.

The Senate has sent over to us a bill which purported to deny pay to the President of the United States and to the Congress on a permanent basis for any time that lapsed during which there was not authorization for appropriations for the conduct of government activities. It is on its face blatantly unconstitutional, violating the section of the Constitution that deals with the Presidential pay and, specifically, the 27th Amendment to the Constitution, which does not allow us to do that.

The intent, as expressed by the author of the bill before us in the statement of the constitutional authority, makes it clear that we recognize the limits of the action that we can take, and instead we would in this way command those payments not to be made during the period of time in which there is inaction by the President and the Congress of the United States, thereby making a very serious and good faith attempt to put that pressure on Members of Congress and the President of the United States, but in a constitutional way.

So Members should be aware of the difference between the language contained in this provision before us and that which was sent over here by the Senate, which on its face constitutional scholars have looked at it here on the House side and the Senate side and the White House and have suggested that bill that came over from the Senate would not stand up to constitutional examination. This is an attempt on our side to try to provide that action, if demanded by Members of Congress, in a way that would be rendered constitutional.

So at least I wanted to make sure that as we debate this point of order, the rule and the bill, that it is clear what the intention of the author is in this case and why we are attempting to follow constitutional procedures.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the chairman for that explanation, because constitutional principles are paramount, are absolutely paramount on this side of the aisle, and so is accountability, so is accountability for our actions here in this body and our actions across the way. And I could not be more pleased to be a cosponsor of the underlying resolution because it does hold us accountable and says no work, no pay. No work, no pay.

This is April Fool's Day here in the House of Representatives and across the country. We are talking about jobs every day. Every day in this body we are talking about jobs, and yet the debate this morning is focused on are we doing enough debating about a bill that already has been the most aggressively debated bill this Congress has seen in over a decade.

I want to invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in the United States Senate to join me as a cosponsor of H.R. 25. H.R. 25 is the Fair Tax Act. It is the only bill in Congress that eliminates every single corporate loophole, exception, lobbyist-inserted provision. Not a one survives the Fair Tax. It is the only bill in Congress that eliminates the payroll tax, that largest tax that 80 percent of Americans pay.

Do you want to talk about American families and their pain? Let's talk about the largest tax that American families pay. It is the payroll tax, and H.R. 25 is the only bill in the United States House of Representatives that eliminates the payroll tax in favor of a flat rate personal consumption tax that ceases to punish productivity and begins to reward those activities that build jobs in this country. It is the only bill in Congress that puts American manufacturing on a level playing field with the rest of the world.

Do you want to talk about jobs or do you not? Do you want to get America back on track or do you not? Because this is a point of order that we know doesn't exist. It is a point of order just designed to fill the airwaves first thing in the morning. If you want to fill the airwaves, fill it with promises of jobs. Fill it with promises of ending the Tax Code that drives jobs out this country and bringing in that capital that we so desperately need.

Again, Madam Speaker, there are no unfunded mandates in this bill. This has been the most aggressively debated bill that this Congress has seen in a generation, I would argue. The only two things the underlying legislation does, it forces the government to stay open with funding levels, those funding levels provided in H.R. 1 if the Senate passes this bill, and it insists that no work in Congress receives no pay.

Forty days we have waited on the Senate to act. They have defeated two bills, but they have passed nothing, Madam Speaker. They have passed nothing. If you want to talk about jobs, if you want to talk about certainty, you have to bring a proposal to the table. This is a freshmen proposal that reaches out to try to do something to make things happen.

I don't know how you guys break logjams in this city. Clearly, it is not easy. Last year there was a Democratic House, a Democratic Senate, and a Democratic White House, and you still couldn't get a budget passed. You still couldn't get appropriations bills passed. So, clearly, logjams are complicated things. I am not here to assign blame for those logjams. I am here to offer solutions. Over and over and over again you see folks rising here to offer solutions.

Madam Speaker, with that, I ask that you overrule that point of order and allow us to get to the underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). All time for debate has expired.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 172, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—219

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NAYS—172

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
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
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—41

Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Boustany
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Campbell
Cantor
Cardoza
Clarke (NY)
Conyers
Costa
Culberson
Duncan (TN)
Filner
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hunter
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Langevin
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Moran
Owens
Paul
Payne
Peterson
Platts
Richardson
Rogers (AL)
Royce
Sarbanes
Stark
Stutzman
Sullivan
Waters
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1003

Mr. SHULER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I missed a vote earlier today because I was inadvertently detained. If I had been here, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 213.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 213, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, 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. Madam Speaker, this rule that we have today provides for an hour of consideration on a bill that would do two very simple things.

First, it would provide that, if the House and the Senate fail to do their business, they fail to get paid. It's a pretty basic principle in America: no work, no pay. If the House and the Senate fail to get together and solve this budget crisis, no pay. All the underlying resolution asks is that the Senate act—Senate act. They don't have to agree with the House. They just have to act, act, and send something to the House for negotiation and consideration.

The second thing this bill does—and it's every bit as important as no work, no pay—is that this bill says, for whatever reason, if the Senate cannot act, if the Senate cannot pass something—they've defeated two things but they have passed nothing—then the text of H.R. 1 will control the appropriations of the United States of America and the government will not shut down, will not shut down because we will continue to operate under H.R. 1 funding levels until such time as the Senate can affirmatively pass yet a different bill.

I rise in strong support of that underlying legislation, Madam Speaker.

For the opening of this debate, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and as a fellow freshman and colleague of his in this remarkable new class, I value his friendship and his sense of purpose.

Madam Speaker, that is precisely why I rise today in support of my bill to prevent a government shutdown. I have a unique background, having helped a family start a broadcasting company that now spans in excess of 30 years, served my country in uniform for more than 30 years, spent a little time in the financial services sector, and finally, for the last 12 years, having served as mayor of one of Arkansas's most dynamic cities and one of America's most livable cities, Rogers, Arkansas, and clearly, one of our Nation's most dynamic and fastest growing regions.

Madam Speaker, it was there I had the privilege of working side by side with executives from some of our leading corporations: Walmart, Tyson Foods, J.B. Hunt Trucking, all startup companies once upon a time and now leaders in their trade and with a global reach. These industry giants did not get where they are by ignoring their challenges. They confronted them. It's part of their genius.

It is in this context that I share with my colleagues my greatest frustration: having been elected by the citizens of Arkansas's Third District to come to Washington, D.C., and help deliver our

country to a better future, only to find myself and my colleagues mired in the muck of Beltway politics.

We have a crisis on our hands: unsustainable deficits as far as the eye can see, a national debt nearing statutory limitation, and overreaching government bureaucracy intruding into the lives and businesses of every sector of society, people struggling to find work so they can pursue the American Dream. And, Madam Speaker, they've elected this Congress to face our Nation's toughest issues head-on, and that's what House Republicans have been doing.

We were 3 months into this fiscal year when we took our oaths of office, and, without a budget, we went straight to work on the most pressing issue upon arrival: funding government for the rest of this year. And it is sad that, as I make these remarks, all we have been able to show for our work now into the month of April are temporary measures that continue to distract us away from the real work ahead: the 2012 budget.

Madam Speaker, this has to stop. The political gamesmanship going on in the upper Chamber might make for good headlines in the capital press, but it is hurting our Nation. That's why I've offered this bill to self-impose a deadline on Congress, and I'm asking my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1255 to start the clock on the Senate to pass something we can agree to in funding government for the remainder of this year by April 6, or assuming a government shutdown, expect to have our pay withheld until we can reach agreement.

□ 1010

Every time we fail to address these issues, Madam Speaker, we add to the uncertainty now plaguing America, we contribute to the decline of our economy, we add to the burden of future generations, and we dash the hopes and dreams of millions of people who count on us every day.

Madam Speaker, the time is now to act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, over 200 years, the House of Representatives has seen almost everything. From the days as a young nation, to modern day America, the exchange of ideas and the debate of legislation is a rich and proud tradition that moves our country forward. Unfortunately, today's legislation abandons this proud history and marks a new low in the United States House of Representatives. As you know, the new majority started off the session with reading every section and every piece of the Constitution of the United States to show our reverence for it, but this morning that Constitution has been kicked under the couch out of sight, lest its presence in the room restrict what is attempting to be done here today. Indeed, this legislation proposes that we throw away 200 years of legislative history and upend the fundamental process of how a bill becomes law.

Despite the urgent and dire issues facing our constituents, here we are, the U.S. House of Representatives, considering legislation that has no chance of becoming law. Today's legislation would ''deem'' a bill that the Senate has already voted down as passed by that very Senate. It would take a remarkable mind to even come up with such an idea. This notion, while clever, will never pass through the U.S. Senate. And let me remind you that what we're doing this morning, saying that we're going to bypass the Senate, would not do anything at all unless the Senate passed it of themselves saying, forget about us. It's simply not going to happen.

The Republican majority claims this bill is a solution to a government shutdown. I hope that discussions regarding the solution to a government shutdown are taking place in offices between Senate and House Members and representatives of the administration as we speak. They are the people who can avoid that. The majority claims this bill is a solution, as I said. If this is their only solution, America is in big trouble. The solution to a government shutdown is to meet the Democratic Party at the negotiating table, not to propose scrapping the entire legislative process simply because the majority party refuses to tell the right wing of their party ''no.''

I am sad to say that today's legislation is more befitting an entry to Grimm's Fairy Tales than to this august body. I think it demeans the House to pretend to do the impossible, to pretend to do what we can't. Does the majority believe that majority confers supernatural powers upon them to bypass the United States Senate?

In the House of Representatives, there are written rules for how the legislative process proceeds, rules that were crafted by Thomas Jefferson, rules that have been tried and true since the founding of this legislative body. These rules have helped lead our country through debates much more fractured than this. From civil war to civil rights, the rules of the House have seen us through struggle and strife and kept our country strong. Today's bill would throw away these rules and very much upset Thomas Jefferson.

Every one of us knows as schoolchildren that there is no way for a bill to become law without both chambers acting on it, a conference committee to meet if necessary, and the signature of the President of the United States. I wish that I were not standing here having to explain to my colleagues how a bill becomes law. I said yesterday, and I must say it again, that I hope we have warped no children's minds. Anyone who may be watching the perversion of the process today and any teachers who are guiding children through this process, take courage, because you can see the video that will explain once again, ''I am a bill.'' Never before has anyone seriously considered the idea that one House can pass a bill and decide it will be the law of the land. Hopefully no party will ever try such a far-fetched tactic again.

Just last year, the procedure to ''deem and pass'' legislation through the House was derided by Republicans as the ''Slaughter Solution,'' a procedure we ultimately chose not to use. At the time, Speaker BOEHNER called the deem and pass process ''an affront to every American.'' Now he brings his own ''dream and pass'' legislation to the floor.

Finally, I want to speak to the process that leads us to the floor today. The proposed bill has seen no committee consideration of any kind, there has been no opportunity whatever for public input, it required an emergency meeting of the Rules Committee last night to rush it to the floor today, and no chair or ranking member of the four committees responsible for this legislation even came to the Rules Committee; with the Democrat ranking members saying they had never heard of the bill. They certainly did not want to come up and debate it.

We are now considering another closed rule. A process such as this is far from ''the most open and transparent Congress in history'' that we were promised. If we are moving forward with emergency legislation under a closed rule, it should be for one reason: to create jobs. We've gone 13 weeks without a single jobs bill brought to the House floor by the majority. In fact, all of us know that that is the overriding fear in the United States today. Instead, we debate legislation so far-fetched that it will never proceed beyond this House floor.

We should not waste another minute ignoring the needs of millions of Americans, those who have no job and are losing their homes, while debating fantastical legislation that will never become law. This is a bad joke on the American people and not a serious solution to our problems.

I urge my colleagues to think again about the proud tradition of the House of Representatives and how proud each of us are to be able to represent constituents here and to try to do it in a sensible way that can really move the country forward and not, as we are doing today, simply again wasting time.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's rule and ''no'' on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to apologize to the gentlelady from New York. I am told by my team here that normal order would have been to yield to you before I yielded to my colleague. I'm new, and I apologize for going out of order in that way.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. There is no need to apologize. That is perfectly all right.

Mr. WOODALL. I would just say, as I beg the gentlelady's forgiveness, that as a freshman, I'm just trying to get things done. I'm trying to make things happen. This bill is one of those steps along the way.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. We all were freshmen once. We understand.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentlelady.

Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my good friend and leader, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to my friend from Lawrenceville for not only managing this rule but as one of the lead cosponsors of this legislation.

I hate the fact that we are doing this bill. I don't like it at all, Madam Speaker. But I like even less the prospect of a government shutdown. We are determined to do everything we possibly can to ensure that we don't shut down the government and potentially create a scenario whereby our men and women in uniform are not compensated and all the other things that we have talked about that would be serious problems that we would face if a government shutdown would take place. We want to prevent that. That's the reason that we are here dealing with this very, very unpleasant situation.

Now why is it, Madam Speaker, that we are here today? We are here today because for the first time since passage of the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act, we saw a United States Congress fail to pass a budget. That's what happened last year. We also for the first time saw the failure to pass appropriations bills. There was an attempt to do it under a closed process, and we know we're in the process of changing that, but the bills weren't passed. And so the last Congress dumped in our laps, in December, a continuing resolution which extended the operations of the Federal Government to March 4 of this year.

□ 1020

Well, Madam Speaker, we know that there was a new Congress elected on November 2 of last year. I am very happy about that. Mr. WOODALL, Mr. CANSECO, other new Members are here. There are 87 new Republicans, nine new Democrats who have joined the 112th Congress. For my party, it's the largest gain that we have had in nearly three-quarters of a century, since 1938. And it's not simply a gain for my party, Madam Speaker. It was a message that was sent by the American people. All across this country, the American people said, We've had it. We're up to here. We need to create jobs, get our economy growing, and we need to reduce the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government.

We constantly hear this argument from our friends on the other side of the aisle that we are not creating jobs, that we are not taking action to create jobs. Well, Madam Speaker, as we know, the Joint Economic Committee has just come out with a study looking at nations around the world. And it's very clear: everything we do to reduce government spending has, based on empirical evidence that we have, worked to grow economies and create jobs; and that's exactly what we are going to be able to do here.

Now the other thing that's very sad is that 41 days ago, we passed the measure that we are debating here. Forty-one days ago, we had, as my friend from Lawrenceville said, a virtually unprecedented debate of 90 hours. Democrats and Republicans, for the first time in decades, had an opportunity on a continuing resolution to debate and pass their amendments. Members on both sides of the aisle had amendments that succeeded during those 90 hours of debate, which was a challenge for all of us, but we went through it. That's the work product that we have before us. This House worked its will, and that's what we were able to achieve. Forty-one days ago, we did that, Madam Speaker. And the other body, our colleagues in the Senate, have done absolutely nothing, other than defeat two measures—this one, H.R. 1, and they defeated their Democratic proposal. So no action has been taken.

Speaker BOEHNER has consistently been saying not only where are the jobs—and we're all gratified that the positive signs of our getting our fiscal house in order has played a big role in creating 216,000 nonfarm payroll jobs last month and brought the unemployment rate from 8.9 down to 8.8 percent, positive indications that have come about because we're starting to get our fiscal house in order.

But, Madam Speaker, our friends in the other body have failed to act on dealing with this issue. So that's why we are here today as we look, April Fool's Day, everyone has been talking about that. But 1 week from today, it's not going to be a joke at all if we face the prospect of a government shutdown, and we do, 1 week from today. And that's why we feel that it's very important for us to pass this measure again, remind our colleagues—some of whom may have become a little forgetful. They may not know that it was 41 days ago that we sent this measure over to them. So, Madam Speaker, we want to do that again. And I hope very much that we'll be able to do it. Again, I don't like a lot of what's in here. I don't like the fact that we're here. But it's because of this crisis that we're here.

Now we're dealing with very serious international challenges around the world. Madam Speaker, I am particularly proud that the House Democracy Partnership, which my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and I have the privilege of leading, has had a group of newly elected parliamentarians from Indonesia, Pakistan, Lebanon, and Iraq visiting us this week, observing this institution. And I heard an interview this morning with one of our colleagues in the other body who said, What kind of signal does it send to people who are working to develop democratic institutions, political pluralism, the rural rule of law, self-determination in their countries? What kind of signal does that send when the United States of America can't even come together and keep the Federal Government going? Now many of those people happen to be here right now with us, Madam Speaker, and they are observing what is taking place. We need to show them that we can get our work done. And we need to show the American people that the message that was sent to us last November 2 is one that has been heard.

So, Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and in favor of the underlying legislation so that we will be able to take an unpleasant situation, ensure that the government doesn't shut down a week from today, and ensure that we can get back to the work that we're supposed to be doing this year, not cleaning up last year's work. And we should do that as expeditiously as possible. I thank my friend, again, for his thoughtful leadership on this very important issue and his management of the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the ridiculous, meaningless, and unconstitutional underlying legislation.

Today the Republican leadership has brought forward a bill that they call, without any apparent trace of irony, the Government Shutdown Prevention Act of 2011. This bill was introduced on Wednesday and rushed to the floor without the 72 hours of notice that the Republicans promised. Even though the bill was referred to four different committees, not a single hearing has been held, not a single markup has taken place. Where is the openness? Where is the fairness? This process is lousy.

This bill would not only have no practical effect, it's not even remotely constitutional. If my friends on the other side of the aisle want to put out a press release or issue a series of talking points, hey, it's a free country. But to waste the time of the House on something this ridiculous is an insult to the American people. We should be talking about jobs and the economy, not debating silliness that is supposed to appeal to the GOP's right-wing base. If my friends want to avert a government shutdown—and make no mistake, because of your intransigence, because of your insistence on cutting everything from Pell Grants to the National

Institutes of Health, this is in your hands. This is in your hands. But if you want to avert a government shutdown, I have an idea. Pick up the phone. Send a note. Or, better yet, engage in meaningful negotiations with the Senate and the White House. Enough pontificating, enough polarization. Do your job.

My Republican colleagues like to talk a lot about the sanctity of the Constitution. They made a big display of reading the entire document on the floor of the House at the beginning of this Congress. Apparently they weren't paying very much attention. For the benefit of my Republican colleagues, let me read from article I, section 7:

''Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States. If he approve he shall sign it; but if not, he shall return it . . . ''

Instead, what this bill says is that if the Senate hasn't passed a continuing resolution by April 6, then H.R. 1 would be deemed as passed by the Senate, signed by the President, and enacted into law.

You have got to be kidding me, Madam Speaker. If this is the new standard that the Republicans are going to use, I have a few ideas of my own. I would like to introduce a bill that says that the House deems the Red Sox to have won the 2011 World Series. It wouldn't mean anything. It wouldn't be constitutional. But it sure would be popular in Massachusetts.

Madam Speaker, this would be laughable if it weren't so outrageous. I urge my colleagues to reject this closed rule and the underlying legislation, and I urge my Republican friends to go back to the negotiating table and negotiate in good faith with the other body.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to a freshman from Texas (Mr. CANSECO), my very good friend.

Mr. CANSECO. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Madam Speaker, the House of Representatives is attempting to prevent the government from shutting down. We have to do so because the Senate, under the leadership of Senator HARRY REID, hasn't passed a bill to fund the government for the remainder of the year. It has now been 41 days since the House passed our bill, H.R. 1. The lack of Senate action certainly isn't because they haven't had the time. Since the passage of H.R. 1, the Senate has had time to pass legislation like the bill designating March 11 as World Plumbing Day.

Senator REID's excuse for not passing the bill: House Republicans passed ''extreme'' spending cuts. Despite the $61 billion in spending cuts in H.R. 1 being the largest spending cut since World War II, it amounts to approximately a 2 percent cut of what the CBO projects the Federal Government will spend in 2011.

□ 1030

That's cutting spending by approximately 2 cents for every dollar we are projected to spend. Given that the Federal Government is borrowing approximately 40 cents out of every dollar we spend and sending the bill to our children and grandchildren, cutting 2 cents out of every dollar hardly seems extreme or excessive.

The only thing that is extreme and excessive is the desire of Washington liberals to spend the hard-earned money of the American people on the Federal Government's priority, leaving the American people unable to spend on their priorities.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, you know, we do face a real issue here before us today, a government shutdown in a week that could hurt our security and safety as a nation, and hurt our recovery and job growth. And this real issue deserves a real discussion, a discussion and agreement between the House and the Senate and the President.

We have 6 days left to negotiate, and yet here today, instead of contributing to a solution, the House Republicans are bringing about a constitutional crisis on top of the funding crisis. That's the last thing that our fragile economy needs.

Madam Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee, and I think this might very well be the first time that this has occurred on the Rules Committee in my just over 2 years, every witness that came to visit our committee was opposed to what we're doing here today. The witnesses were unanimous that this approach is unconstitutional and that this approach is ill-advised. Now, in my time on the Rules Committee I don't think we've ever had such unanimity among the witnesses that have come before us.

Madam Speaker, Article I, section 7 of the Constitution, which I will include in the RECORD, clearly states that ''Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States.''

Now, what's being done with this bill is entirely different. I'd like to show our friends a very basic lesson in how a bill becomes a law.

This is our friend, a bill. For a bill to become a law, it needs to pass the House and the Senate before it goes to the President. Now, we all know if there are differences between the House and the Senate version, they can be resolved through a conference committee, or it can be sent, with an amendment, back to the other body to accept that, as we routinely do.

What is being done in this case is this little guy, this little guy is deeming from the House that it has passed the Senate. Now, this is particularly unusual because, not only has this bill not passed the Senate, it's actually specifically been rejected by the Senate. And now, a bill is going to the Senate asking them to deem that they have passed something that they have actually rejected. It's some sort of Orwellian doublespeak of conforming some sort of alternate version of reality with regard to this deem and pass measure.

Now, there are some things we could be doing in this House and I hope we do. In addition to the good faith negotiations which this constitutional crisis undermines, we could be taking up Senate Bill 388. Senate Bill 388 would make sure that Members of Congress don't get paid during the government shutdown. Now, this is news to most of the American people because, you know what? Most Federal workers, they're not going to get paid if the government shuts down.

But you know who does get paid? Those of us who are speaking here before you today. That's the current law. We can change that law today.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. The Senate sent over a bill that passed unanimously that would make sure that Members of Congress didn't get paid if the government shut down. We can take up that bill today. It's been sitting here at the House desk because Republican leadership has not taken up that bill. We can send it on to the President of the United States who could sign that bill, make sure that the incentive of Members of Congress is to come to the table, and we are in the same boat as the other Federal workers with regard to a government shutdown.

It's time to get serious about solving how we're going to fund the operations of government and not put a constitutional crisis on top of the funding crisis.

ARTICLE. I.

SECTION. 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

SECTION. 2.

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be

made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

SECTION. 3.

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof for six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the first Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year, so that one third may be chosen every second Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.

No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall chuse their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

SECTION. 4.

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

SECTION. 5.

Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.

Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

SECTION. 6.

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

SECTION. 7.

All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States: If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten Days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return, in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

SECTION. 8.

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

SECTION. 9.

The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or

enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another; nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

SECTION. 10.

No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing it's inspection Laws: and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

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

I would like to ask my good friend Mr. POLIS if he would be kind enough to lend me his chart for a moment.

Mr. POLIS. I would be happy to.

Mr. WOODALL. I want to say—and I thank my friend for sharing with me—that's the kind of thing that goes on. I mean, folks often see the frustration on the House floor. You often see the tempers at their height. But the kind of thing that goes on behind the scenes that you don't usually see is exactly the kind of thing I grew up with on TV. And I thank the gentleman for bringing this chart this morning.

Our colleague, Mr. HASTINGS, actually sang this song for us yesterday. And it was a wonderful treat in the Rules Committee, I think we would all agree. But as you know, when you listen to this song, Madam Speaker, once the bill passes the House, it goes to the Senate and the Senate acts. The Senate acts.

There's all these pleas for negotiation, the suggestion as if we're not doing enough on the House side. Longest debate this House has had, most amendments, more amendments, in fact, on H.R. 1, the bill that's contained in this underlying resolution, than we had on all appropriation bills combined over the past 4 years. This is the proud work product of the House, H.R. 1.

Here's the work product of the Senate, Madam Speaker. It's right here. As my colleague asks, pleads, in fact, that we negotiate with the Senate, here's what the Senate has offered.

How do you negotiate with that, Madam Speaker? How do you negotiate with that?

This is what we learned about. This is what our students are studying across the Nation. This is what the Senate has given us to work with.

Now, you tell me, as a freshman, what is it that I'm supposed to do? What it is that I'm supposed to do when the Senate fails to act?

And what we have done is to say, if the Senate fails to act: You can't pass anything; I don't know why. So just go ahead and fund the government, prevent the government shutdown, fund the government at H.R. 1 levels, and let's continue that negotiation.

I look forward to the day when we don't have a blank sheet here.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Yes, you are correct that the House has passed a continuing resolution; however, that specific resolution has actually failed in the United States Senate. It's actually a rejection. On top of that, the third body, the executive, has threatened a veto of that.

What this calls for is some sort of deal that everybody can do to ensure the government continues to operate.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I thank my friend. Because he's absolutely right, and that's critically important. There are those who would have you believe that the House is insisting that it's its way or no way at all, but that's not the case at all. We just did our job here, and we're waiting for the counteroffer.

How do you negotiate with this? You can't, Madam Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I know it's April Fool's Day, but I still am amazed by the jokes or the myths that are being relayed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. And I like my colleague from Georgia, but I just want to say three things.

First of all, I heard the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) get up and say that the Republican policies with this CR were creating jobs. And he cited the fact that the unemployment numbers went down from 8.9 to 8.8 in March. If anyone thinks that by passing 2- or 3-week CRs that you're going to create jobs and somehow improve the economy and lower the unemployment rate, you know, I've got a bridge to sell you.

The fact of the matter is that every economist is telling us that this Republican CR kills jobs. Economic Policy Institute shows that the Republican CR would destroy more than 800,000 jobs. And I could go through the list.

□ 1040

So the myth that they are creating jobs and helping the economy with this is simply not true.

The second thing is, the gentleman keeps talking about Congress not getting paid if there is a shutdown. Well, S. 388, to stop Member pay during a shutdown, passed the Senate unanimously over 1 month ago with Republican leader MITCH MCCONNELL's support. It has been sitting right here at the House desk because the Republican leadership refuses to take it up. That bill could become law today if they wanted to bring it up. Simply bring it up. Don't mask what you are doing with the CR by talking about Members getting paid. You can bring that bill up at any time.

Now, the third myth is this idea that the Republicans are not preventing a government shutdown. They are the ones that are preventing the government shutdown because they refuse to compromise. There are negotiations going on with the Senate, but it is the tea party and the right wing of the Republican Party that keeps insisting that ''it is my way or the highway.'' Pass H.R. 1, pass their CR, or do nothing. Yesterday was a rally on the Mall. What did the tea party cry out? They said cut it or shut it. Either go along with my bill, or shut the government down.

So don't say you are trying to prevent a government shutdown. You are doing just the opposite. Let's not continue with all these myths today, April Fool's Day.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

Mr. MCCOTTER. I rise in support of the rule that I think for two reasons that are very important. The first is so that we can continue to discuss what happens when you bury prosperity beneath Big Government. But second is because we also need to be reminded that the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

It seems to me that when you have an impasse on the budget, it is borne of the difference very fundamentally that one side wants less spending and one side would like more spending, and there are a bunch of Members who wind up in the middle.

Now, I think we can all concede, whatever our positions, that reducing Federal spending is hard. Certainly past precedent proves that. Past precedent also proves something else: that, historically, the way you break a log jam in Congress is to logroll. That is the process whereby Members who have differences split that difference and

spend more money to make each other happy and to serve their constituents as they think best.

What we have done in this bill is to incentivize spending, because I want you to think of the situation we are in. You are now telling a politician that you will get no money in your pocket until you spend money from someone else's pocket. You are telling them that the fastest way to end an impasse is to settle. And you are making it harder for those who would seek more spending reductions to stand their ground and fight for it.

So that is why I support the rule and why I oppose the underlying bill, because I will not pave the fiscal road to hell with good intentions or your money.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I am really dumbfounded as to why we are here today.

I sat back and I closed my eyes, and I remembered that my favorite grade was fifth grade, and now I remember why my favorite grade was fifth grade: because, as my colleague from Colorado has pointed out, I remember in fifth grade playing how a bill becomes a law, and I was the House and somebody else was the Senate and another set of our fifth graders were the Constitution. And what we learned is you have to pass a bill out of the House, it goes on to the Senate, it goes on to the President, he signs it, it becomes a law. Pretty simple. Well, here we are in fifth grade yet again.

What I want to say here, Madam Speaker, is that I oppose the rule, I oppose the underlying bill. And I am recollecting that just over 1 year ago, we had this exact discussion about deem and pass. And so while an elephant never forgets, it seems that the party of elephants is just forgetting every day. And if this were only about mascots, forgetting would be okay. But it is not okay because it is not just about mascots; it is about the American people.

So I want to remind the American people about the words of some of our leaders here in this House when deem and pass was put on the table just 1 year ago.

Our now Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, called it a ''scheme and plot'' that set a precedent that was ''one of the most outrageous things that he had seen since he had been in Congress.'' That was on March 19, 2010.

MIKE PENCE said it is a ''trampling on the traditional rules of the House and Senate, even on the Constitution of the United States.'' That was on March 16, 2010.

ERIC CANTOR termed it a ''malfeasance manner,'' and those who might support it as having ''discharged the duties of their offices.'' That was on March 18, 2010.

And here we are, the elephants never forgetting, but the elephants repeating.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to associate myself with the gentlewoman's remarks. Those comments on the bottom of the board are as true today as they were a year ago.

There is no deeming in this bill. And I give my colleagues on the other side of the aisle the benefit of the doubt that they know that and that is just the spin for today.

There is no deeming in this bill. This bill says one thing and one thing only about H.R. 1, and that is, that if the Senate cannot act, we are going to give the Senate some cover. If the Senate doesn't want to commit to H.R. 1 for the remainder of the year, we give them the opportunity to incorporate the language of H.R. 1 into this bill, send it to the President's desk for his signature, make it the law of the land, while we continue to work to sort out our budget differences.

Now, that is critically important; one thing and one thing only this bill does: gives the Senate the opportunity to say, you know, for whatever reasons—and the reasons are still a mystery to me—we can't pass legislation in the Senate. We can defeat things all day long, but we can't pass anything. I'm not sure why that is. This bill says: but none of us want a shutdown.

Now, I have got to be honest, Madam Speaker. I am beginning to wonder if ''none of us want a shutdown'' is actually a true statement, because there are some folks who seem to be driving us right down that road.

This is a bill that just gives us another option, another arrow in our quiver to say, if you cannot act, Senate, if you are paralyzed by inaction, pass this bill, and we will continue those negotiations while H.R. 1 is the law of the land.

And I would like to say to my friend from Michigan, I thank him for his support of the rule. I hope I can persuade him to support the underlying resolution. He suggested that by penalizing Members of Congress for failure to act and curbing our salaries, that would somehow encourage a compromise that would spend more out of other people's pockets. I certainly share that fear if that is what this bill does, but it does not.

What it says is the very best deal we have been able to negotiate among ourselves here in the House was H.R. 1. The most conservative and the most liberal, the work product of all 435 of us, is what came out of this House in H.R. 1. And it says, let's fund at those levels that we are already agreed on, that has already been the work product of the people's House, the most responsive body in politics. Let's incorporate that as our baseline while we continue to discuss.

So it is not going to spend an additional nickel out of anyone's pockets, Madam Speaker. It is only going to say to the Congress and the Senate, if you do not work, you do not get paid. And I cannot think of a constituent back home who would disagree with that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1255. And I say to my friend from Georgia that no matter how he slices it, if you are saying in this bill that if the Senate fails to act, then H.R. 1 becomes law, check Webster's. That's deeming.

This is blatantly unconstitutional deem-and-pass legislation offered by Representative WOMACK, and it makes me wonder what sort of April Fool's Day joke is being played on the American public.

To be sure, Congressman WOMACK cited constitutional authority for his bill. First, he cites clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution for the concept that Congress has the authority to spend money by passing laws. He then cites clause 1 of section 8, article I for the idea that Congress shall have power to lay taxes and pay the debts.

But what my Republican colleague fails to cite is clause 1, section 1, article I for the fundamental concept that Congress shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives. As much as we don't like that much of the time, that is what the Constitution says.

I also refer him to clause 2, section 7 of article I that lays out the basic constitutional construct that a bill becomes a law if, and only if, it is passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President.

The House has no magic wand to do this all on its own. Glinda, the good witch of the north, is not coming to save you. H.R. 1 is more like a product of the wicked witch of the west. Perhaps at the start of the next Congress we should show the ''Schoolhouse Rock'' video ''I Am Just a Bill,'' as a refresher on how a bill really becomes a law. It appears reading the Constitution on the floor hasn't stuck so well.

Now, while today is April Fool's Day, it also feels a bit like Ground Hog Day because here we are again deeming to pass the majority's job-killing spending bill, H.R. 1.

□ 1050

In case anyone has forgotten, that job-killing spending bill would destroy 700,000 jobs and threaten the economic recovery now underway.

The Democratic minority remains committed to our goals for the 112th Congress to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, and responsibly reduce the deficit. I say defeat this misguided legislation and make sure that Members of Congress aren't paid when government employees aren't.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, as the week ends, there is the welcomed news that American employers added 216,000 jobs. But this is still a night for 15 million people where they didn't get one of those jobs, and it is going to be another sleepless night, another Friday without a paycheck. And what did the majority in the House of Representatives do about that this week?

Well, early in the week they took a bill to cancel out a program that helps people that are trying to keep their homes and pay their bills out of foreclosure. Then we spent a day pretending we were the District of Columbia board of education debating about how the D.C. schools should be organized. Today is going to be capped off by debating a bill that any fifth grader would understand is unconstitutional because it does not require the House and the Senate to act.

There are serious discussions going on about what we ought to do in this country, but the most serious thing we ought to do is work together to create an environment so that entrepreneurs, large and small, could create jobs. Instead, what we are doing is wasting yet another week, this is week 14, yet another day, yet another session, having a fairly superficial political discussion about a bill that simply isn't constitutional and doesn't make any sense.

Why don't we put on the floor a bill that reduces the deficit, cuts the subsidies to the oil companies, and puts some of the money into putting Americans back to work building clean water systems and roads and schools? Why don't we do that?

At a minimum, what we are going to do today is vote for something I do support. If there is a government shutdown, and I sure hope there isn't, we shouldn't get paid either. We can agree on that. Let's put that on the floor. But, for goodness' sake, can't there come a day in this House when we actually work together on a jobs bill, instead of another week of failure?

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that one of the great joys of serving in this body is when you get to take a stand on something you really believe in. And while I have great respect for my friend from New Jersey and I know he represents his constituency well, my constituency does not believe that the government has the power to create a single job. Not one.

In fact, my constituency believes that every single person that the United States Government hires is a job that would have been done in the private sector. It would have been done better in the private sector. It would have spurred the private sector economy, but, instead, we suck that into the Federal Government.

We understand that entrepreneurs create jobs. Entrepreneurs create jobs. And I will say as we continue to count the days since the House has passed H.R. 1 and the Senate hasn't acted, it is the same number of days, Madam Speaker, since I came to this floor, probably shortly after my friend from New Jersey spoke on the H.R. 1 rule, to say if you want to do away with those tax subsidies, if you want to go after the oil companies, if you want to go after the lobbyists, if you want to go after the special exceptions, join me on H.R. 25, the Fair Tax. Not one new friend of mine from the other side of the aisle has joined me since that speech, the only bill in Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would love to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend, and I thank him for his passion.

I thought I heard the gentleman say a minute ago that every job created in the public sector sucks away money that could create a private sector job. Did the gentleman say that?

Mr. WOODALL. To be clear, Mr. ANDREWS, I absolutely said that the government cannot create jobs. It can hire people that would otherwise have been hired in the private sector.

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, if the gentleman will yield, I would ask him if he would apply that definition to our people in the military.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I am so thankful to you for bringing that up, because I actually intended to speak to that.

That is critically important, Madam Speaker, and it has been ignored throughout this whole debate.

Do you know what happens in a government shutdown? Those heroes of this country do not get paid. Now, understand that. In a government shutdown, this is a bill to provide a special rule so that we don't get paid, but by the ordinary function of law, our men and women who serve this country at home and abroad in uniform do not get paid. Do not get paid.

Now, it is alarming to me, because I know you share my passion for that, that this is the only solution that has been brought to the floor. I am one of the cosponsors who brought it to the floor, and we have had nothing but contempt for this effort. I am not saying this is the end-all, be-all of good government. In fact, I would associate myself with Chairman DREIER's remarks. I hate that we have to do this.

I have been in Congress for 90 days, Madam Speaker. I haven't gotten to work on the new agenda yet. My time has been wholly consumed with trying to sort out the problems from last year, and it is frustrating to me as someone who wants to look to the future and not look to the past.

But I thank the gentleman for bringing up our men and women in uniform, because they are outrageously disadvantaged by a government shutdown. Say what you want to, because I know my friend would agree with me; when we have a tea party rally on The Mall, they are 100 percent supportive of our men and women in uniform and want to see those folks get paid. This is the only bill to do that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would the gentleman say that people who are FBI or DEA agents are sucking money out of the Treasury that could be used for private sector jobs?

Mr. WOODALL. Again, I want to point out, Madam Speaker, one of the great joys of the job is being able to work with colleagues across the aisle. I think Mr. ANDREWS is 100 percent right, 100 percent right, because what he struck on is one of those narrow opportunities where the Constitution actually gives the government the responsibility to act. And that is one of the wonderful things, Madam Speaker.

I may be new here on Capitol Hill, but the job came with an instruction book. It is kind of neat. It came with an instruction book. It is the United States Constitution, and it tells us what it is we should and shouldn't be doing, what it is we should and shouldn't be funding.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. While I would love to yield to the gentleman, I suspect what I would hear, if I can presume, is a discussion of the constitutionality of this provision that's here before us today. The good news is I read the instruction book before I came to the floor today and I'm very comfortable with where we are headed.

I would encourage my friends to support us on this resolution. Again, it is not the end-all, be-all of government. It's a step in the right direction. And if you are going to have an all-or-nothing attitude, I'm not sure that we are going to get things done. I wish you would work with me incrementally to make this happen.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. To respond, I would like to yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I appreciate my friend. I would just, with all due respect, say it is not an instruction book; it's an owner's manual. And the owner's manual, the Constitution, says for a bill to become law, the House has to pass it and the Senate has to pass it. That is why this bill is unconstitutional.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), who has helped create a few jobs while he has been here.

Mr. DEFAZIO. That was pretty astounding. Apparently the gentleman is unfamiliar with the portions of the Constitution referring to what were then post roads.

The government can't create a job? We create incredible wealth, millions of jobs, by facilitating the infrastructure of this country, which is paid for

by the taxpayers. And those are all private sector jobs. They are contracted out to the best bid. So the gentleman has a little bit to learn.

I realize he is new here and he has been sent here on a fool's errand: Let's keep the Republican freshmen busy while behind closed doors your Speaker is cutting a deal.

Things haven't changed around here all that much. And you are down here pretending that somehow we have become the omnipotent, unicameral legislature and the rulers of America, the President and the Senate be damned.

Now, I am pretty fed up with the Senate, too, and I share your low opinion of them. They are a problem.

Let's kind of think this through. We can pass a bill here that becomes a law. Now, in the last Congress, the House passed 300 bills that never came up in the Senate. Are those all laws today? Boy, we have got some catching up to do here. There were a lot of good bills that died in the Senate, 300 laws. Great.

But what if the Senate passes a bill and the House doesn't? Does that become a law? Well, I guess, you know, they could deem themselves the unicameral, omnipotent legislative branch, which I think they feel like they are all the time anyway. So then anything they pass we don't take up becomes law.

What if the President takes a bill that someone has introduced here but hasn't been debated and voted on by either House and he signs it? Does that become a law?

□ 1100

What a brave and wonderful new, efficient world we have. We can have two branches and three competing places passing what they deem to be laws. Now, come on. Let's get real here. We read the Constitution on the second day of this Congress, and, in fact, JOE WILSON—we all remember JOE WILSON, ''you lie''—he read article I, section 7, clause 2 on the floor. But apparently he and many others on that side didn't take it to heart. It's pretty darn specific. It's got to pass the House and the Senate in identical form and be agreed to by the President of the United States. We cannot deem anything. In your fantasy world, we can deem everything.

If the Constitution is a little too technical, I would recommend what I give out to schools kids: ''How our Laws are Made.'' It would be a good primer for the Republican freshmen who are being duped.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in improper references to the Senate.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 6¼ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to one of our freshmen, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

I have been listening to this debate about the Constitution. I am proud to serve in a body that has such respect for the Constitution. Yet I couldn't find this provision that was applicable today until just a moment ago. Apparently, my friends on the other side of the aisle are using a special April Fool's edition of the Constitution that has the following provision in it. It says: When a majority party in the House of Representatives is immovably committed to shutting down the government unless the President of the United States and the United States Senate get on board with their plan to destroy 700,000 jobs and cripple the Nation's economic growth, that House majority can simply deem their plan the law without a vote by the Senate or the signature of the President, as they are null and void.

There you have it, Madam Speaker. What we've clearly seen here is that my colleagues are so bent on adding 700,000 Americans to our unemployment lines that they can simply declare the Senate of the United States and the President of the United States null and void. This bill tramples on our Constitution. It is bad political theater. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say what I fear will fall on deaf ears, and that is that H.R. 1255 will not become the law of the land until the Senate passes it and the President signs it. The Senate passes it and the President signs it. That is the only thing we're talking about doing here today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I quarrel with the understanding of the gentleman on the other side of the aisle about the Constitution. There are three branches—the judiciary, the legislature, and the President. Thank God there are because that means that we have the ability to be reasonable and practical, recognizing we have a responsibility to reduce the debt but not killing off seniors and those in classrooms.

I just came from speaking to Spelman College, a group of women in a Historically Black College. Women who are ready to go out and serve America, and they realize that their education is a gift. But they want to give back to America. This ridiculous $61 billion in cuts wants to make sure that we don't have the American Dream.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I sit and listen to those voting the war of drug cartels on the border, but $400 million is going to be cut out of the Homeland Security funding so that it impacts ICE agents, it impacts Border Patrol agents, it impacts intelligence gathering. These kinds of nonpractical ways are undermining America and America's dream; 700,000 jobs is just the beginning. It's the floor, not the limit.

For those of you who seek a single tunnel view of how we run this country, have mercy on those who are in need. This is the wrong direction. Sit down at the bargaining table. Let's reassess what we need to do and stop putting your ideas on the back of Americans who need to be able to have the American Dream.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 16 seconds to point out the irony of being lectured on job creation by the crowd that left us $14 trillion in debt and mortgaged our children's future.

This bill is about responding to our children's needs. This bill is about providing a better day tomorrow than we have today. I stand proudly in support of it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to a former member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady.

The House passed H.R. 1 with the Republican majority. It can't get it through the Senate. They're frustrated. Their responsibility is to be direct with the people who supported their passage of H.R. 1, and being direct with those folks is telling them they have a problem in the Senate. The reason they have a problem in the Senate is because the Senate has a problem with the bill.

Coming into this House of Representatives as a political gambit to pass a ''let's pretend'' bill: let's pretend if the House passes it, it becomes law, without Senate action; let's pretend that if the House passes it, it becomes law without the Senate or the President signing it. That is misleading and not being straight with the folks who supported H.R. 1. Tell them the truth. They have a problem with the Senate.

Now, there's a reason they have a problem with the Senate. H.R. 1 is a bill designed to fail. It will not address the deficit. It will reduce spending in some areas. If you're low income and getting heating assistance, you will lose some money. If you're an oil company that's making $55 billion in tax breaks from people, you will continue to receive it. If you have the practice of putting our two wars, Afghanistan and Iraq, on the credit card, that will continue. What H.R. 1 did was target low-income folks, middle class folks, and it left all the other aspects of the budget off the table that have to be on the table if we're going to get the fiscal balance.

Number two, H.R. 1 was loaded with political hand grenades that were designed to make this thing blow up. And

that's what's happening in the Senate: things like ending National Public Radio or Planned Parenthood; getting into a debate about choice and abortion. All of those are issues that are vitally important and legitimate to be debated. But why put them on a bill where the objective of the bill is to help bring us into fiscal balance? That's a self-conscious decision, it's a willful decision, and a decision that has implications. And you're seeing it played out in the United States Senate.

H.R. 1 will not succeed in the challenge we face getting us the fiscal balance. And that is the problem that the majority in the House is having with that bill. Coming in here with a bill that's flatly, explicitly unconstitutional by its own language, not what the sponsors say the bill does, but what the bill says it does. Allowing the House by its unilateral action to pass legislation is unconstitutional, it has no merit, and it is simply a way of trying to avoid responsibility.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds, and I wish I had more time to refute that misdirection.

What we're asking here is that we pass the only bill that has been passed in either house of Congress. I don't care if the Senate passes H.R. 1 or not. Pass something. Do I need to bring the chart back up of what the Senate has done already? They have done nothing. They need to do something. This bill prods them to do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I'm just totally confused. I was in New York a couple of weeks ago and I saw a play called ''The Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo.'' Robin Williams was the star. I wrote him a letter and said, ''Reality, what a concept. It even exists in Congress.''

Robin, I'm sorry. I was wrong. It doesn't exist today.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide immediately after the House adopts this rule and brings up S. 388, a bill to prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during government shutdowns.

As we face the possibility of a shutdown and to discuss how to prevent and deal with it, there's one point on which we all agree—that Members of Congress should not be paid during a government shutdown. The Republican bill we're about to bring up ties this bipartisan pay proposal to a partisan bill that isn't going anywhere. We could pass the Member Pay bill today and clear it for the President and simply take the Senate bill from the desk.

Madam 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so we can debate and pass a bill that actually does something useful, and that is deal with the pay of the President and the Congress and actually has a chance, because it has already passed the Senate, of being enacted into law.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1110

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

Madam Speaker, this has been an interesting experience for me as a freshman Member of Congress and as a cosponsor of the underlying legislation. I haven't had my motives impugned quite as much in the previous days as I've had them impugned today.

We're trying to make a difference. We're trying to move the ball forward. I wish our ''I'm just a bill'' song went on to talk about what you do when you have an intransigent Senate that can't act, a Senate that's paralyzed with inaction. I wish that were part of a song, but it's not.

In 7 days, Madam Speaker, the United States Government shuts down. I just want to make that clear. In 7 days, the United States Government shuts down if the Senate can't pass a bill and if we can't get together and define a solution. That means our men and women in uniform don't get paid. That means our USDA inspectors, who inspect all the meat and the chicken that we eat, won't go to work, and those products won't go to the grocery stores. It's not a little deal. It's a big deal. It's a big deal, and this is a step in the direction towards finding a solution. Now, this rule provides for debate on that underlying resolution. We'll get to that this afternoon, and I look forward to that.

I would ask all my colleagues on the left and the right, the conservatives and the liberals of all stripes, to support this rule so that we can move forward and debate in an open fashion the underlying resolution.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY REP. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

''That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 388) to prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during Government shutdowns, if called up by the Minority Leader or her designee. 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 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 House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of S. 388.''.

(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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam 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.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 189 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 658.

□ 1114

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 658) to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, March 31, 2011, amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 112–46 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112–46 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 27 by Mr. PEARCE of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio.

Amendment No. 24 by Mr. SHUSTER of Pennsylvania.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 215, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

AYES—207

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boren
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—215

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Roby
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Barton (TX)
Butterfield
Campbell
Chaffetz
Filner
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Heller
Johnson (GA)
Young (FL)

□ 1140

Messrs. FATTAH, CAMP, ISSA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. BOUSTANY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CRAWFORD, BARTLETT of Maryland, JONES, REYES, ROKITA, SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Messrs. GUTHRIE, BRADY of Texas, WEST, LANDRY, and CALVERT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 214, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 243, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

AYES—178

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rigell
Ross (AR)
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
Shuler
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—243

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
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
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Barton (TX)
Campbell
Chaffetz
Filner
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Herger
Richmond
Smith (NJ)
Visclosky
Young (FL)

□ 1146

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 215, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 238, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

AYES—183

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heller
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—238

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu

Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Herger
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hultgren
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Barton (TX)
Campbell
Filner
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Honda
Polis
Sullivan
Visclosky
Young (FL)

□ 1154

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 216, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 220, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]

AYES—206

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—220

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
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
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Barton (TX)
Campbell
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Visclosky
Young (FL)

□ 1200

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 209, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

AYES—215

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—209

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stivers
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Akin
Barton (TX)
Bilirakis
Campbell
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Visclosky
Young (FL)

□ 1207

Mr. CARDOZA changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 658) to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 189, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. In its present form, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 658 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment.

At the end of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE XIII—SECURITY OF HIGHEST-RISK AIRLINE PASSENGER FLIGHTS

SEC. 1301. DEPLOYMENT OF FEDERAL AIR MARSHALS ON ALL HIGHEST-RISK AIRLINE PASSENGER FLIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to the authority provided by section 44903(d) of title 49, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall work to ensure that Federal air marshals may be deployed on all highest-risk passenger flights of air carriers in air transportation or intrastate air transportation.

(b) RISK-BASED ANALYSIS.—A risk-based analysis shall be used to determine highest-risk passenger flights under subsection (a). At a minimum, the risk-based analysis shall include consideration of the following factors:

(1) THREAT.—Available strategic or tactical threat information related to aviation security.

(2) VULNERABILITY.—The vulnerability of particular passenger flights to terrorist attacks.

(3) CONSEQUENCES.—The severity of the consequences that a terrorist attack would have with regard to particular passenger flights.

(c) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated, for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2014, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section. Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

□ 1210

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, this country is in an unprecedented time with growing threats abroad and intense partisan rancor here in this Chamber. But at this time and at this moment, Mr. Speaker, my final amendment to the FAA authorization offers an opportunity to bridge these divides and to help add one more component to secure our homeland.

I want my colleagues to remember our darkest moment, our very vulnerable moment, the morning of September 11. I know how vulnerable I felt that day with the uncertainty of not knowing where the next plane would hit. Would it be our Capitol? Would it be the Golden Gate Bridge? Would it be the Sears Tower? I also remember the eeriness of 4 or 5 days with no planes in the sky, the uncertainty we all felt. From Richard Reid trying to light a bomb in his shoes, to the Christmas Day bombing attempt just 2 years ago, our skies have long been a target for terrorists.

This final amendment to the FAA reauthorization would ensure that Federal air marshals are deployed on all high-risk flights for U.S. airlines. For the last 20 years, our greatest threats from al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations have systematically targeted our passenger airlines. The fact that only a percentage of the highest risk passenger flights on U.S. airlines have a Federal air marshal shows the amount of work that we still need to do.

If the recent attempted attacks I spoke about earlier haven't changed your mind, then let me remind you about the instability in the Middle East we face right now. The Christmas Day bomber received his training in Yemen, a country now marred with protests that has the potential to become even more unstable and more difficult. Do we want more Christmas Day bombings? I don't believe so.

As we are now all aware, our country is engaged in combat operations over the skies of Libya. No one doubts that Colonel Qadhafi's days are numbered, and we will all be better off when there is one less dictator in this world. Some of the younger Members in this Chamber today may not remember, but Colonel Qadhafi has a history of attacking the United States. Twenty-two years ago, Pan Am Flight 103 took off from London en route to New York, when a bomb exploded and it killed 270 people. 189 of those were Americans. I believe we don't need another attack like that, not now and not ever.

My colleagues, I urge you to join me in voting for my amendment to this bill and to ensure that we have more Federal air marshals on the highest risk flights. This issue has no aisle; it has no lines. There are no party lines about this. This is what we should do together.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I have dedicated most of my years in this Congress to ensure that we protect our borders, that we protect our airspace, and that we prevent attacks like this one.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to make sure that we fulfill that dedication that I know all of my colleagues in this Chamber have. I ask my Republican colleagues to support this amendment that will ensure that we have Federal air marshals on high-risk flights.

When we end our time here in the people's House, when we look back and we ask what did we do, when we ask ourselves what was our purpose, I would like to be able to say we came together and we protected the American people.

It is our solemn obligation in this Congress to do all that we can to defend our country. We owe it to those that we represent, we owe it to those on Pan Am Flight 103, and we owe it to those victims of the attacks of September 11. Especially, we owe it to the 26,000 passengers who fly our American skies every day.

I ask my colleagues on the other side to vote for what is right. Do what is right. We must protect this country's skies. It is up to us, and no one else will do it.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, this is basically a procedural tactic, and I am very opposed to this. I am a Federal flight deck officer. I have served as a Federal flight deck officer flying for the airlines, and if this was truly an important issue—this has been an open process—this would have been brought out way before this time. Furthermore, the Secretary of Transportation has no authority over U.S. air marshals.

The FAA has been and is currently operating under 18 extensions, Mr. Speaker. It is time to get this done. We have come here to make a difference and not to recommit. This is an extension that has not been formally reauthorized since 2003, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this so that we can get the FAA underway and get transportation and business flying again.

The House Republicans have brought a bill here today that reforms the necessary programs, that protects air safety and saves the taxpayer dollars. Aviation accounts for 9.3 percent of our GDP. It is done. There have been 4 years of delays, 4 years of people losing their jobs. Get people back to work, and stop these delays. Vote against the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. 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 the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 194; and adoption of House Resolution 194, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 235, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

YEAS—184

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
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
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko

Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—235

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
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)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
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
Paul
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
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Barton (TX)
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Denham
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gutierrez
Hoyer
Israel
Pelosi
Thompson (CA)
Visclosky
Young (FL)

□ 1234

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 196, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

AYES—223

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
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
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—196

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Barton (TX)
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Cole
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Gohmert
Hinojosa
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Schweikert
Visclosky
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1240

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 220, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1255, GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 194) to prevent a shutdown of the government of the United States, 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 ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 187, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

YEAS—230

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
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
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—187

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
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
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Barton (TX)
Biggert
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Carter
Chu
Duffy
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Landry
Tierney
Visclosky
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1246

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 221 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 221, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 187, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

AYES—229

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

Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—187

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
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
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Barton (TX)
Campbell
Carter
Chu
Duffy
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Kucinich
Landry
Sessions
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Tierney
Visclosky
Young (FL)

□ 1252

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 221 and 222, I stepped outside to discuss issues with a constituent group and completely lost track of the time. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN PREVENTION ACT OF 2011

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 194, I call up the bill (H.R. 1255) to prevent a shutdown of the government of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1255

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Government Shutdown Prevention Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF FISCAL YEAR 2011.

(a) DEADLINE FOR CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF FISCAL YEAR 2011.—If the House has not received a message from the Senate before April 6, 2011, stating that it has passed a measure providing for the appropriations for the departments and agencies of the Government for the remainder of fiscal year 2011, the provisions of H.R. 1, as passed by the House on February 19, 2011, are hereby enacted into law.

(b) PUBLICATION OF ACT.—In publishing this Act in slip form and in the United States Statutes at Large pursuant to section 112 of title 1, United States Code, the Archivist of the United States shall include after the date of approval, if applicable, an appendix setting forth the text of the bill referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 3. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT.

(a) TREATMENT OF MEMBERS DURING A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN.—The Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Administrative Officer of the House, respectively, shall not disburse to each Member or Delegate the amount of his or her salary for each day that—

(1) there is more than a 24-hour lapse in appropriations for any Federal agency or department as a result of a failure to enact a regular appropriations bill or continuing resolution; or

(2) the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, has been reached.

(b) TREATMENT OF THE PRESIDENT DURING A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN.—The President shall not receive a disbursement of basic pay for any period in which—

(1) there is more than a 24-hour lapse in appropriations for any Federal agency or department as a result of a failure to enact a regular appropriations bill or continuing resolution; or

(2) the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, has been reached.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 194, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate the future course of government spending, we need to be honest with the people of this country about the current fiscal state of affairs.

America averages now trillion-dollar deficits. We borrow nearly 40 cents of every dollar we spend. Given the fiscal cloud that hangs over our country, it is reckless to assume we can live pain-free forever. Sooner or later, something has to give.

To give families and business confidence that their future won't be plagued by inflation, higher taxes and higher interest rates, our majority vowed to move forcefully to cut spending. We made clear that only by putting Federal spending on a sustainable trajectory could we create the conditions necessary for growth and job creation.

During our 3 months in the majority, we have delivered on our promise. Six weeks ago, after 47 hours of debate, we passed H.R. 1 to fund the government for the remainder of the fiscal year and save taxpayers $61 billion relative to current spending. In a more open process than the House had seen in 4 years, we allowed the other party to offer countless amendments. And over the past month, we have passed two continuing resolutions that have cut $10 billion in spending. All along, Mr. Speaker, we've practically begged President Obama and Senate Democrats to get serious and come to the table with a legitimate proposal. But we got nothing in return. No legislation. No credible plan to cut spending.

Mr. Speaker, I want to underline the fact that we do not want a government shutdown. Yet as Senate Democrats refuse to pass a bill, that unsettling prospect now looms ever larger, which is why they must act.

Today, we are bringing a bill to the floor that makes clear that continued inaction on the part of the Senate Democratic majority is simply unacceptable.

Finally, this bill also ensures that going forward, should there ever be a government shutdown, that Members of Congress and the President will not get paid. If we can't do our job, why should we get paid?

Mr. Speaker, funding the government at the levels passed by House Republicans might not be what Senator REID wants, but surely even he would agree that it's a better alternative than shutting down the government. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, to begin this debate, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

April fools, America. This is a joke, America. This is not real, America. As a matter of fact, Mr. WOODALL of Georgia says it's not real. It's not going to pass the Senate. He made that very clear. The majority leader just said if the Senate won't take what we give

them, we're going to shut down the government. That's what he just said. And that's what I believe to be the case.

The last time the government shut down was not when we had a Republican President and a Democratic Congress but when we had a Democratic President and a Republican Congress. They shut down the government in 1995 and 1996. They shut down the government over Christmas, as a matter of fact, the Grinch who stole the government's operations for almost 3 weeks. We're about to do it again.

The gentleman from Georgia, who has been here now a few months, was 10 years old when I came to the Congress of the United States. He mentioned something about the debt, this $14 trillion of debt. Well, I've only been here, I tell my friend, 30 years, but during the course of those 30 years, Republican Presidents have signed bills spending $4.8 trillion in deficit spending. During the course of the Clinton administration, we had a surplus, as the gentleman probably knows. Now he will say, presumably, because we had a Republican Congress. But, of course, the Republicans not only took the Congress but they took the Presidency in 2001, and they ran up 2½ trillion dollars of deficit and increased the national debt by 115 percent, notwithstanding the fact that they inherited a projected $5.6 trillion surplus.

And now they pass this April fools joke on America that the gentleman who is one of the cosponsors says won't pass the Senate. We know it won't pass the Senate. But they pretend in their language what is clearly contrary to the Constitution, because they say if it doesn't pass, the provisions of H.R. 1, the bill they have sent to the Senate, passed by the House on February 19, 2011, are hereby enacted into law. In other words, we're going to deem it passed.

Let me tell you what ERIC CANTOR said about deeming it passed:

''Malfeasant manner. Did not discharge the duties of their office.''

Then Speaker BOEHNER said this about these deeming pieces of legislation, which this is. He said it was a scheme and plot that set a precedent and was, quote, one of the most outrageous things that he had seen since he had been in Congress and erroneously claimed that it had never happened in American history. In fact, it had happened before. This has never happened, where the House of Representatives took the position if you don't pass what we want, ours goes into law anyway. I'm sure our Tea Party friends are shocked, because they will find nowhere in the Constitution, my friends, does that provide for.

□ 1300

Furthermore, MIKE PENCE denounced deem and pass as, quote, trampling on the traditional rules of the House and Senate and even on the Constitution of the United States of America.

MICHELLE BACHMANN, who apparently may be a candidate for President, said this, that deem and pass, quote, ignored the Constitution and warranted the impeachment of the House Speaker. Quote, there should be people that are calling for impeachment off of something like this.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. This resolution says, contrary to the Constitution, if the Senate doesn't act, this bill becomes law. Nobody on your side surely believes that that can happen. Nobody believes that that joke that we are trying to play on the American people on April Fool's Day will be believed by any of them.

And, my friends, do not tell me about your concern about the deficit, because the deficit during my period of time, except for the last 2 years, trying to deal with the deep depression in which the last administration left this economy—don't try to tell me that we are responsible for the debt, the $14 trillion of debt. Surely my friend knows that's not the case. And if my friend doesn't know it, I would be glad to set up a time when we can debate that issue in any forum he chooses because the facts belie his representation.

My friends, reject this bill. Reject this bill because it is a fraud on the American public. Reject this bill because it's an attempt to shift blame from the House of Representatives passing a bill that can, in fact, pass; not to say to the Senate, Our way or no way, and we will shut down the government, because that's what this bill says.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to my friend from Maryland, about whom I say regularly back home has a great reputation for fair dealings, that I am tremendously disappointed by that characterization of the bill.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for his observation and regret that he felt it was a mischaracterization because I thought it was accurate. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), the bill's sponsor, to set the record straight on what the bill actually does.

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, there has been a lot of conversation in Washington about the prospect of a government shutdown. And while I realize there are some in this Congress who might prefer that option, I am not one of them; and let me just add, our leader is not one of them. Frankly, we think it's irresponsible. Our constituents did not send us to Washington to shut down the government. They sent us here to make it more accountable to the people, and that is precisely what House Republicans have been doing.

Examine the facts. When the curtain came up on this Congress, we were already 3 months into this fiscal year with no budget and on a temporary spending plan that went through early March. This House went to work crafting legislation that would fund the government for the rest of this fiscal year while delivering on our pledge to cut spending. The response from the Senate? Not so fast.

So we kept government operational with a 2-week continuing resolution in hopes that the Senate would realize the sense of urgency that accompanies our fiscal situation. And in that 2-week span of time, the response? Not interested.

Again, this House went to work crafting another temporary measure that funds government through next week. My friends, patience is wearing thin, not just my patience and the patience of my colleagues, but the patience of Americans. In our collective opinion, time's up.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree that we have some bigger fish to fry. Pressures on the statutory limit on debt and, more importantly, the 2012 budget loom very large right now for this country. Instead of focusing on these issues critical to our struggling economy, here we are, mired in partisan gamesmanship over funding the government for the remainder of this year. Did we come here to fish or did we come here to cut bait? This bill simply puts the clock in action on this process.

I am hopeful my colleagues will agree that the time is now to move beyond 2011 so that we can turn our attention to the bigger challenges of transforming this institution and restoring fiscal sanity. That is what the people sent us here to do; and every day we fail to do this work, the people lose.

We have been called extreme. H.R. 1, which passed in the early morning hours on this floor on February 19, cuts on an annualized basis $100 billion in Federal spending. That's one-sixteenth of the deficit. Is that extreme? I don't think so.

Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that people across America trying to find jobs, trying to pay their mortgages, and trying to have the funds to put their kids through college are victimized by this flawed political process. Instead of removing the uncertainty for small business and job creators by cutting spending and shrinking the size and reach of government, we are playing games with the future of our Nation.

If this is our best, our best falls short of the expectation of those we represent. We can do better. We should do better. And if all we can show for our work is a shutdown of the government, we will have failed our constituency and should not be paid.

The gamesmanship going on right now is gambling with America's future, and it's hard to make progress when

you are playing on House money. H.R. 1255 forces Members to have skin in the game. And if passed by both Chambers and signed by the President, we will have the proper motivation to set aside the rhetoric and actually accomplish something that is good for America: a climate for job creation, not a government shutdown.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill so we can do the people's work.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Let's do a quick review of the year. It's been 13 weeks since the Republicans took over the majority. Leading up to that point, we heard a mantra, ''Where are the jobs?'' So you might expect that on day one of the 112th Congress, they would bring a jobs bill to the floor. But no. What the Republican majority did with great fanfare was to conduct a reading of the Constitution and, as if our oath of office wasn't enough, also implemented a new House rule which required legislation to be accompanied by a ''statement of constitutional authority.'' In fact, my fellow colleague from South Carolina, JOE WILSON, read aloud Article I, section 7. What does it say?

''Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it . . .''

Ladies and gentlemen, we all learn in grade school how a bill becomes a law, but we'll get back to that in a moment.

So 13 weeks ago when the Republicans took the majority, up to that point all we heard from them was ''Where are the jobs?'' So, then, what was the first bill we were asked to vote on? The first bill was to repeal the health care law.

Democratic policies created more jobs in the last year than the Bush administration created in 8 years. Since health reform became law, 1.1 million private sector jobs have been created.

□ 1310

One-fifth of those new jobs, over 200,000, have been in the health care industry. So, repeal of the health care law would end jobs, not create jobs.

Then surely, at some point in the last 13 weeks, the Republican majority would have brought to this floor a jobs bill. Three months and no jobs bill. In fact, we've passed three bills that will destroy more than 1 million jobs, which brings us to this moment, the so-called Government Shutdown Prevention Act of 2011, and article I, section 7 of the United States Constitution. I've read it, but I want to repeat a certain portion of it:

''Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States.''

But the bill before us today, not a jobs bill, says that if the Senate doesn't act prior to the expiration of the continuing resolution, that H.R. 1, a budget bill passed only by the House, will become the law of the land.

It's very simple. That is unconstitutional. We do not have a unicameral legislative body.

Then what did they cite on the statement of the constitutional authority that must accompany each bill? There are a lot of words that only a parliamentary expert could understand.

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

Mr. CLYBURN. I yield myself an additional minute.

But if you ask my daughter's eighth grade class that visited us here earlier this week, they will tell you that that's not how things work under our Constitution.

But don't listen to me or the eighth graders at Dent Middle School. Listen to what some of your colleagues in the other body had to say. So our colleagues in the other body had made it very clear. Senator COATS of Indiana: ''My reaction to that is ultimately the whole body, including the executive branch, has to sign on here or we're just whistling in the wind.''

Senator ALEXANDER of Tennessee: ''To be the law of the land, a bill has to pass the Senate and be signed by the President.''

One of our own, the Appropriations Subcommittee Chair, Representative MIKE SIMPSON, after laughing out loud, said, ''If we can do that, can't we just deem the budget balanced?''

Madam Speaker, I know it's April 1, so maybe that's the point. I ask my colleagues on the other side to let's quit this joke and get serious.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a very serious reform-minded freshman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of this bill, and urge my colleagues to support it. I've worked tirelessly with my colleagues to pass a continuing resolution that saves taxpayers money and keeps the government running, while the other body, as we continue to hear, has done nothing but complain.

Are they blind? Are they deaf? Do they not see, do they not hear what the rest of the people in this country see and here in terms of this country's financial crisis, in terms of this country's debt, in terms of what we're doing to our children and grandchildren by continuing to do nothing?

Madam Speaker, we've waited 41 days for them to send us a funding bill, and we've got nothing. At least the Members who will be voting for this bill, who will be voting in favor of this bill, are showing leadership, are showing the American people that we care about the future of this country and that we do care about jobs.

Show me one country on this globe that can grow its economy, that can grow jobs while having the boot of government on the neck of its people, on the neck of its businesses all the time. And just like the overregulation we do right now through the Federal Government, that debt boot, that debt burden is doing the same thing to job creation.

This is a jobs bill. Get government out of the way and watch this country lead the world again.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, once again, instead of working to create jobs, grow the economy, reduce the deficit and strengthen the middle class, the majority is spending its time engaged in ideological lawlessness disrespectful of the U.S. Constitution, and all because of their political base and to benefit their political base.

This bizarre attempt to deem and pass into law their reckless budget is not only hypocritical and blatantly unconstitutional; where is the statement of the constitutionality of this legislation?

I'll ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, read the Constitution. It calls into question whether the Speaker and the Republican leadership understand how our representative democracy works, and that includes the author of this legislation.

The House cannot simply close their eyes, pretend that the Senate and the President have passed and signed the bill into law. It does not work that way. When a bill actually passes the Senate, the Senate has actually passed the bill. And when the President picks up a pen and puts his name on it, and not a second before, that bill has been signed into law. No amount of magical thinking can change these simple facts.

Even notwithstanding the gall of the Republicans' unconstitutional plan, the very attempt to pass a deem and pass act flies in the face of all of the pearl-clutching we heard from the majority in 2010.

Then, when a simpler version of deem and pass came up during the health care debate, one that did not fly in the face of the Constitution and attempt to speak for the Senate and President, the current Speaker called it one of the most dangerous, outrageous things he had ever seen in a Congress. Majority Leader CANTOR offered a privilege resolution putting the Republicans on record as against any sort of deem and pass mechanism. A year later the story has changed.

No, most of all this is a diversion from the reckless cuts the majority has proposed, the slashes to Head Start, Pell Grants, Meals on Wheels, veterans, job training, medical research, all cuts that hurt middle class and working families.

We are still waiting for the Republicans to cut the special interest waste, like the oil company subsidies and the tax loopholes for the richest people in the Nation. And what about those tax

subsidies to those multinational corporations that take their jobs overseas?

You're not starting there to cut the deficit. No, it's working families and their children that you're going after.

You are taxing the patience of the American people. And you know what? You're taxing the memory of our Founding Fathers who educated us—and children in grade school today—on how a bill becomes a law.

The Republican majority is playing a dangerous game. If they do not get what they want, they will shut the government down.

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

Mr. CLYBURN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. You're playing fast and loose with the lives of the American people, their kids, their families and with American businesses. No matter what those damaging effects are, because of ideological reasons and political base, and electoral votes, you are willing to put the United States and its people, above all, working families, middle class families and their children and our economy, at risk.

Please read the Constitution. Understand how this democracy works, and take this bill and do away with it.

□ 1320

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, a freshman Member, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill as a cosponsor.

It has been over 40 days, and the Democratic leadership in the Senate has failed to act on a spending plan. If our government shuts down, our troops won't get paid. Now, they will still be serving this great Nation, but without pay. We need to ensure there are no political burdens that affect our troops while they are at war. As the Department of Defense has indicated, a funding lapse does impact their military's operational readiness.

The American people cannot wait; Congress cannot wait while the Democrats in the Senate continue to play politics. We have given them ample time to put forth a reasonable plan, yet the majority leader in the Senate is not serious about spending reform.

While the Democrats have been cheering for a government shutdown, Republicans have passed the largest spending cut in American history, and our actions are having results. Just this morning it was announced that the unemployment rate is at a 2-year low. Americans are going back to work because of our efforts.

Meanwhile, what has happened this week? The Senate Democrats have spent the week diverting attention, trying to figure out how to spin to reporters. And today, while the shutdown is imminent, they have gone home.

The cuts that the American people want are not extreme. They are necessary. When we are borrowing 42 cents out of every dollar, when our children and grandchildren's future is in jeopardy, these cuts are far from extreme. It is time for the Senate to act. Our goal is to cut spending, not to shut down the government.

Back in Mississippi we have a saying: Lead, follow, or get out of the way. Mr. REID, today you are in the way. So I challenge you today to lead by passing a plan of your own, to follow by adopting the plan that we have already passed. But if you can't do either of those, get out of the way and allow the Senate to act.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, this morning several dozen students from Key Elementary School came to visit the office, and they wanted to know what we were doing. They were all excited to be up on Capitol Hill. So I explained: Well, this afternoon we are debating a bill. It has been introduced by what we call the freshmen, the new Members of the House. The bill says that if the Senate doesn't agree with a big bill that the House has passed, if the Senate doesn't agree next week, then this bill would deem it passed, in fact, deem it enacted. Well, they were all kind of shocked because that is not what they learned in civics class.

They learned that a bill has to be passed by the House and then passed by the Senate, and then it goes into conference. And then, if the President agrees to sign it, then it can become law. But not this bill. So I was at a loss, of course, to explain how it was constitutional. They were kind of surprised that this is what the House was doing.

They wanted to know, Well, what is the bill that they want to be enacted? And I said, Well, it's a bill that I don't really agree with and a lot of the Members don't agree with. In fact, the Senate doesn't agree with it. Because while we have a lot of people unemployed, this would make apparently about 700,000 more people unemployed according to even Republican economists. So they were even further amazed by that. It also would eliminate a lot of regulations that have been passed by the House through a lot of deliberation, but it just says those regulations wouldn't take effect. So it is a very controversial bill.

Now, I was also able to tell them that I did suggest to the Rules Committee yesterday, although the majority rejected it, that there is something we could do today; and that is to say that if we put our staff out on the street without pay, hard-working employees who get a fraction of what we get paid, and we put another million Federal employees out on the street unpaid, then the Congress shouldn't get paid, either. The Senate did in fact pass that unanimously, including the Republican Leader Senator MCCONNELL obviously.

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

Mr. CLYBURN. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. So at least today we could put ourselves on record that we are not going to put people out on the street while we continue to get paid, because we get paid from a different authorization, as does the President. Now, this is legislation we could get passed. Since the Senate has agreed, it could go to the President right away. I know the President would sign it. That is what we should be doing today, not something that even a 10-year-old understands is unconstitutional.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to a gentleman from your home State, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, this is unbelievable. We are in a mess. We are in a fiscal mess, and we continually are still throwing barbs and saying, Well, it's not our fault. Yeah, we've been in charge of the House for 4 years and we've had the Presidency for 2 years, but it is not our fault; and we don't want to do anything to fix it.

So in fact here, last year when our friends on the other side of the aisle had all the majority, they failed to do the most basic thing that you ought to do when you run something: you pass a budget. No budget was passed because the November elections were coming up. You didn't want to make the tough choices that would hurt you in reelection, and you didn't want to have to go through that route, so you didn't pass a budget. You passed a continuing resolution.

Guess what, the American people in November spoke. They said the Federal Government is entirely too big, and the big bloated bureaucratic government is crowding out the free market.

And so what happened? We were sent here to Washington, D.C. to control the size of the Federal Government, and we are doing exactly that. We passed a significant budget cut to just a small part of the budget. We are not even talking about the 2012 budget year. That is coming up. But our friends on the other side of the aisle don't even want to show us where they are at. They can't cut spending. They can't do it. They don't want to say no to people. The American people and the children are asking us to say ''yes'' to the future.

I'm a military pilot. That's what I do as a Reservist. I have friends wondering if we are going to get paid. I say, Ask HARRY REID. I don't know. We have tried to make sure that you continue to get paid through this.

I have a friend, Tim Normand, who runs SDL Technology Partners back home. And as he is sending kids to college and as he is building his small business, he doesn't know if he can trust in the faith of what this government is going to be in the future because our friends on the other side of

the aisle don't want to do anything to begin to rein in this out-of-control government. We do. Pass this bill.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend from South Carolina.

Madam Speaker, there was some good news today, finally, that 214,000 Americans went to work last month. That is not nearly good enough. There is a lot more work to do. One of the ways to do that work is to come to a responsible agreement on the Federal budget. I am hopeful there will be such an agreement next week that sensibly reduces spending but protects education; that leaves to another day fights over whether to repeal health care. We believe we shouldn't; the other side believes we should. Whether or not to defund planned parenthood. We believe we shouldn't; most of the other side believes that we should.

Leave those discussions to another day and keep the government functioning, because the taxpayers will keep paying taxes even if there is a government shutdown. They pay even if they don't get the services.

So what are we doing this afternoon? What we are doing this afternoon is looking at a bill that on its face is unconstitutional. And the reason we are looking at this bill is so that Members of the majority side, who probably won't vote for the budget compromise next week, can say they did something. Well, doing something that is unconstitutional is wrong.

As Mr. CLYBURN read, article I, section 7 says: ''Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President.''

□ 1330

Article I, section 5 of the Constitution says, ''Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.''

''Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.''

What is wrong with this bill is that one House, our House, is determining the rules of the other House's, the Senate's, proceedings. You can't do that. It is a pretty simple concept.

I have heard all the convoluted arguments on the other side. I have heard all the twisted rationalizations. It comes down to this: If this afternoon the Senate passed a budget that our friends on the majority side don't like and said, if our friends on the majority side don't pass that budget in a week it becomes law, they wouldn't agree to that, because they would know that it is unconstitutional. This is the same thing.

It is ironic that with great fanfare on the first week of this session, after running a campaign saying they would produce jobs, what the majority produced was a reading of the Constitution on this floor. I thought it was appropriate. I thought it was actually moving and the right thing to do.

The wrong thing to do is to ignore what we read the first week. ''Each House may determine the rules of its proceeding.'' We can't determine the rules of proceeding for the Senate. They can't determine the rules of proceeding for us.

This is a bad bill. Vote ''no.''

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Do you all remember the story about an old man of great faith whose town was about to be flooded? The town was being evacuated and the water was already covering the road. The old man sat on his porch calmly, unafraid. A car pulled up to the house, the water almost too deep to drive in. The driver yelled, ''Get in. We'll take you to safety.'' The old man shook his head and said, ''Go on. I have faith in God. He will save me.'' So the car moved on.

A short time later, the water had risen so high that it covered the porch, so the old man simply went upstairs. A boat floated up to the house and the people yelled, ''Get in, we'll take you to safety.'' The old man said again, ''Go on. I have faith in God. He will save me.'' So the boat went on.

Hours later, the water had risen so that it almost covered the entire house. The old man was now on his roof, when a rescue helicopter came by. They called, ''Get in. We'll take you to safety.'' But the old man refused, saying, ''Go on. I have faith in God. He will save me.'' So the helicopter left.

So the water rose so high that the old man drowned. He went to heaven, of course, and when he arrived he asked God, ''I had faith in you to save me. Why didn't you?'' God answered, ''I sent you a car, a boat and a helicopter. What more do you want from me?''

I hope my Democrat colleagues in the other Chamber and this President understand that this bill is their helicopter. You had a chance to propose and pass a budget for 2011 last year when you all had unfettered power in Washington. You have had over a month now to address H.R. 1, a bill that cut a mere $100 billion from our budget. Today we are giving you a third chance to avoid a government shutdown.

Please grab onto this lifeline and work with us to prevent a government shutdown that could have international consequences. Vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1255.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Thank you, Mr. CLYBURN.

When I heard that this bill was coming forward, I had an opportunity to reflect on the fact that I have been having conversations with my constituents, and in each case I have posed to them how we are proceeding here in Congress and asked them if in fact they could accept a small across-the-board percentage decrease for FY 11. Invariably, each and every one said yes.

I have been on record for many months as suggesting that we can solve this problem, walk away from the ideology that is dividing us and simply reduce spending by 2 percent, which I think, if one does the math, gets us to the position that our friends on the other side of the aisle would like us to adopt.

It is clear to me after practicing law for more than 30 years, part of which was as a JAG officer in the United States Air Force, that clearly this is an unconstitutional piece of legislation and is nothing more than spinning in the wind.

I had the opportunity the other day when I saw the makeup of this bill to write to the Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, along with 27 other cosigners, and ask that S. 388 be separated from this legislation. This legislation is not moving forward, and if in fact we do see a government shutdown, we in Congress should share the pain. We have that responsibility, that obligation, and we must lead by example.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to one of my fellow freshmen, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank my good friend for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I commend my fellow Member for introducing the Government Shutdown Prevention Act, and I strongly support its passage.

I would like to say real quickly that what we have seen here in the last few minutes is a colossal waste of time. You had a bunch of folks saying, Madam Speaker, that this is unconstitutional. I just want to clarify so we can move past that and my colleagues can focus their arguments where it matters.

We intend for this bill, like all other bills, to pass the House, to pass the Senate, and be signed by the President. I too am a JAG officer from the Army, and I think that the JAG officer, Madam Speaker, from the Air Force would understand that this is a constitutional bill, like the other bills that we introduce here.

Now, why are we here today? Forty-one days ago this House passed a $100 billion spending cut from the President's 2011 budget. That bill kept the government operating. We did our job here. Now, there is another House down on the other side of the Capitol and we are here because they have refused to do their job. Forty-one days later, zero bills.

We have heard some suggestions here today that maybe we ought to do across-the-board cuts. I suggest that if they have got any friends on the Senate side, that they go down there and

see if they will propose a bill with some kind of cuts, because so far it is zero, zero bills from the Senate on this.

Senator HARRY REID thinks our plan goes ''too far.'' We have heard a lot of people using the word ''extreme,'' because that is a scary word. Let me tell you, the only thing extreme around here is the national debt. Do you want to see extreme? That is extreme.

Senator HARRY REID believes that shutting down the government is perfectly acceptable. In fact, we have seen with the pollsters and the pundits and Howard Dean and others that they want to shut down the government. Well, I don't want to shut down the government. I want to cut spending.

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

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I don't want the government shut down. I want spending cut. I have a question of what a shutdown would do to our Armed Forces, the airmen and the soldiers in Arkansas that are in my district.

Senator REID has failed to come up with a credible plan of his own. They can't cut just a few billion dollars, even though we have a GAO report that indicates $100 billion to $200 billion could be saved by getting rid of duplicative programs. If the Senate is unwilling to make the small cuts, how in the world are we ever going to be able to make the bold decisions?

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the Democratic Leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

□ 1340

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership in this debate this afternoon. I have been listening to it very intently. I heard the debate on the rule this morning and then the debate this afternoon.

Some questions have arisen. First, I want to state a fact. The fact is that every single one of us in this body as our first act raises our right hand to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. The bill that we have on the floor before us does violence to those provisions in the Constitution that describe how to pass a bill—not by one House deeming it, but, as our distinguished assistant leader, Mr. CLYBURN, described his daughter's schoolchildren in her class could tell you that you pass one House, you pass another House, it's signed by the President. But that seems to be missed by the makers of this resolution today.

Again, Mr. CLYBURN talked about the constitutional authority to bring this bill to the floor. It's truly a mystery how you can take an oath of office to defend the Constitution of the United States, bring a bill to the floor in violence of that, and justify it constitutionally.

I've heard the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, say that we have some visiting parliamentarians here who are watching this debate to see if Congress can get its job done. Please don't pay attention to this. What you see on the floor today is no example of democracy in action. It's silly. The Republican leadership is asking its members to make a silly vote. And it's time for us to stop that silliness and get serious about the creation of jobs, get serious about not shutting down government, abnegating our responsibilities and shutting down government.

I've heard Mr. HOYER earlier today talk about how we got here in terms of this budget deficit. We all know that we must reduce the deficit. That's why, during the Clinton years, as Mr. HOYER said, we reversed the first Bush's deficit. We came out in a trajectory of fiscal responsibility, going into surplus. The last five Clinton budgets were in surplus or in balance. But because of tax cuts for the rich, two unpaid-for wars, and a prescription drug bill that gave away the store to the pharmaceutical industry, we came back into deficit—the biggest swing in fiscal irresponsibility in our country's history. And now we've had to deal with that. And what's the answer that the Bush administration gave us? Tax cuts for the rich. That's how you create jobs. We didn't. That's how you reduce the deficit. We grew it.

I think it's important when we're talking about the deficit—which we all agree must be cut—and we talk about jobs to note that in the first year of the Obama administration more jobs were created in the private sector than in the 8 years of the Bush administration. Tax cuts for the rich did not produce jobs. Cuts in initiatives to educate our people and keep us healthy and safe, those cuts did not create jobs.

So here we are today, at the end of a week, wasting the public's time on a notion—not even an idea; on a notion—that does not rise to the level of a credible idea that one House can deem a bill the law of the land.

I also heard on the floor of the House a call for Senator REID, the leader in the Senate, to take up H.R. 1. He did. It failed. Not even the Republicans all voted for it in the United States Senate. Three Republican Senators voted against H.R. 1 in the Senate. Perhaps you don't know the date, but it did happen.

It's stunning to hear this debate that talks about visiting parliamentarians seeing an example of good government in action. No. Wrong.

So what could be the explanation for this? Mr. CLYBURN suggested it could be April Fool's and at end of this debate the gentleman will withdraw the amendment, apologize for wasting the public's time, and say that this is only an April Fool's joke. Because that's the only thing that it complies with. It does not comply or conform with honoring the Constitution. It does not create jobs. It does not reduce the deficit, and it does not have the support of the Democrats in the House of Representatives.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to remind the gentlelady that Article I, section 7 says all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. We failed to do that in the last Congress, and that's why the gentleman stands here today with this bill, proudly.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a very good freshman colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

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

Mr. LANDRY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Madam Speaker, when I was first elected, I declined my health care benefits because I don't believe we can fix a system we were not a part of. I declined my retirement benefits because our Social Security system is broken.

I support this bill because if the American people have to endure a government shutdown which is the result of a failure of the Senate Democrats, then none of us, including the President, should expect the American people to continue our pay until we fix this budget mess. The funding for the Federal Government is 182 days old. Democrats on the Senate have failed to pass a budget for 182 days—182 days. That's an entire school year. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: What would you think if your child's teacher did nothing for the entire school year?

Our Constitution authorizes Congress to be the power of the purse. It is our job to set a responsible and affordable budget for the Federal Government each year. If we can't do our job, we should not be paid.

Madam Speaker, it is time for the Democrats in the Senate to do their job.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my good friend from South Carolina.

David Frishberg wrote, in 1975, ''I'm Just a Bill.'' This has been utilized. I utilized it yesterday. My friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) utilized it again today. I shan't go into all of it, but I would encourage the American public to understand that my friends know how a bill becomes the law.

H.R. 1, the measure that we have been talking about, really did pass the House of Representatives and it went over to the United States Senate and it was rejected. The President also said that he would veto H.R. 1 if it reached his desk. So what we're doing here is symbolism. My friends on the other side are entitled easily to message anything they wish to address their base, but don't bring it to the American public under the aegis of this is something serious. It is not. It is absurd. It is a complete waste of time. And, even more importantly, as has been said by

many, and I believe everybody on the other side understands, it's unconstitutional.

It also has not gone unnoticed that my friends who advocated rightly that there should be transparency, in addition to being transparency, that measures should be allowed to be read before they're utilized. The leadership of the House of Representatives held a press conference before any Member of the House of Representatives saw Mr. WOMACK and Mr. WOODALL's bill. Knowing this, then, I guess what must be happening here is we are wasting our time on patently unconstitutional measures.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I won't go into all the details about the need to address jobs, but I do know this: STENY HOYER said earlier what all of us in America know, and when we were children we celebrated a lot—a lot of us—and it was April Fool's. We played jokes on people. But, listen, the American people are not fools and they're not foolish enough to believe this absolutely foolish unconstitutional measure.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very proud to yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. We're here because the Democratic majority last year did not do their job, did not give us a budget, did not due proper appropriations, and now the Senate has had the same problem. So I applaud anybody's efforts in trying to move the ball down the road so that we can appropriate. I just wish the Senate would do their job now and take care of it. But for a bill to say provisions that pass the House are hereby enacted into law violates my conscience and the Constitution. I cannot vote for it.

□ 1350

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to one of my freshman colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I thank the gentleman for the time.

It has been fascinating. I accept that I'm a freshman, and I know it's April Fool's Day, but it's been funny hearing the discussion about how this isn't constitutional.

Now, let me see. I'll walk through this.

It's a piece of legislation with a trigger mechanism in it. Okay. I know the other side does not like that trigger, but it still would require the Senate to pass it and the President to sign it. It was fun seeing something from my childhood, from the 1970s, of how a bill becomes a law. If I remember correctly, that's still how a bill becomes a law.

The most important thing going on here is not the gamesmanship about, ''Oh, it's April Fool's Day. Let's try to demagogue this piece of legislation.'' What's important here is that the American people know we're taking the job seriously and giving the Senate another chance to step up and do their job. We're sitting here—how many weeks after we passed H.R. 1?—and we're still doing this dance. At some point, the American people have to expect us to do our job. And if we don't do our job, not a single one of us here or in the administration or in the Senate deserves a paycheck.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I think that we need to reiterate that we just had a very principled statement from the gentleman from Texas, and I think we have a chance to rise above the normal partisanship.

The gentleman from Texas on the majority side just said he agrees with the proposition that the bill is unconstitutional, and I would urge Members, Madam Speaker, to listen to that example of principle. We don't agree on all things, but we should all rise to honor our oath of office and to oppose this bill based purely upon constitutional grounds.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a good friend and mentor, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, when a patient is bleeding to death on an operating table, we as doctors do everything that we can to save that patient's life. We don't just walk away, and we certainly don't call it quits. Well, that's what the Democrats want to do. They want to call it quits on our spending crisis, and the worst part is that they're doing it for their own political gains.

Democrats in Congress are intentionally plotting this government shutdown, and they hatched their plan months ago, I believe. If they'd wanted to, Democrats could have passed a long-term continuing resolution during the lame duck session without making any spending cuts at all. Instead, they passed a short-term spending bill so that they could play the shutdown card right now.

The Democrats' political game of wedging conservatives between unacceptable cuts and a government shutdown is an insult to the gravity of the problem. It's an insult to American families who are struggling to make ends meet. It's an insult to all of the American people who are out of work, and it's an insult to us—to the Members of Congress who are serious about trying to put this country on a road to economic recovery.

It's pitiful that the Democrats have wasted so much time stalling over these minimal cuts in their own self-interest while our country is financially bleeding to death. We should be focused on trying to revive our economy rather than bickering about $61 billion when we already borrow almost $60 billion per week.

Madam Speaker, since the Democrats refuse to stop their political games and get to work, those over in the Senate particularly, I urge my colleagues to pass the Government Shutdown Prevention Act so that we can do our jobs and start trying to heal our economy and create jobs in America.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, there is no stronger supporter of H.R. 1 than Mr. GOHMERT from Texas, and he made a very simple, very elegant, very eloquent statement of principle about adhering to the Constitution.

This legislation has to be interpreted by its own words, not by what people say is in it. What it explicitly says is that, if the House has not received a message from the Senate before April 6 stating that it has passed a measure providing for the appropriation for the departments and agencies of government for the remainder of the fiscal year—and this is the language of your legislation—the provisions of H.R. 1, as passed by law on February 19, 2011, are hereby enacted into law.

That's absurd. It's a pretend bill that says, if the House acts and the Senate doesn't, our action becomes law. It's absurd. It says, if the House acts and if the Senate doesn't and if the President doesn't sign this piece of legislation, it's law. That's the document that you've presented to this body to vote on.

Now, Mr. GOHMERT took the higher road here. Instead of taking out his frustration with the United States Senate at the expense of the Constitution, he stood up for the Constitution. That's what each and every one of us has the opportunity to do. All of us have had frustration with the other body because they sit on bills and kill them. In the eyes of the beholder, it's a good or bad bill, but it does not entitle us to essentially pretend that the Constitution doesn't apply to the legislation that we have to consider.

Also, if we have the political and practical problem of moving ahead on a piece of legislation in the House, is it right for us, in effect, to mislead the people who sent us here by suggesting that we're passing a law that has any impact when we know it has absolutely no impact? Is that a fair, appropriate

or honorable thing for a Democrat or a Republican to do?

I urge us to vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to answer my friend from Vermont's question, which is that it is not an appropriate thing to mislead the American people, so I'll just read one more time:

Having passed the House, having passed the Senate, and be signed by the President.

That's the regular order.

I'll say to my friend that I'm sorry we didn't have time to finish our discussion yesterday in the Rules Committee. I really am sorry that we were called away by votes.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend, a freshman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

Mr. BARLETTA. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, I came here to be a responsible Representative and to fight for my constituents. I didn't come here to shut down the government. My district has the highest unemployment in the State. People are hurting. They look at the reckless spending in Washington, and they get angry. It's just this simple: They don't spend money they don't have. So why does Washington?

This bill prevents Members of Congress and the President from getting paid if the government shuts down. I get it. The American people get it. Why doesn't Washington get it? It's something any business owner or logical individual anywhere in America can understand: If you don't work, you don't get paid.

Maybe this just makes too much sense for Washington.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. My friends, I think one of the truly edifying experiences we had in the opening days of Congress was that we read the Constitution, and I think one of us had the great good fortune to read article I, section 7: ''Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States.'' That's how a bill becomes a law.

Now, this is how ERIC CANTOR on 3/30/2011 said a bill becomes a law: ''The Senate's gotta''—this is just a transcription. I didn't do that. I just assume it's a Southern thing. ''The Senate's gotta act prior to the expiration of the CR. If it does not act,'' meaning if the Senate does not do something, ''H.R. 1 becomes the law of the land.''

□ 1400

That's not true. That's not constitutional. That's not fitting of this body.

Now, it is, however, consistent with how the majority party has been governing around here. They've passed rules that they have ignored. For example, on January 5, they had members of their caucus take the oath in front of a television set. On February 9, they failed to provide constitutional authority for a bill despite that it was one of their rules. On March 13, they failed to get a three-fifths majority for passage of a bill that raised tax rates, despite the fact that it was part of the rules. On March 17, they failed to make a bill available within 72 hours, despite the fact that it was part of the rules. And just March 30, they failed to include an offset for a new government program.

The rules are not a big thing for them to follow because this is why it's hard. It's a big book. So I brought you this, ''House Mouse, Senate Mouse,'' which is sold in the gift shop to teach children how to understand the Constitution, and permit me to read:

''It's the floor of each Chamber of the Senate and House where each Senator and each Congress mouse gets to vote on the bill, and if enough do, if enough do, this President signs it if he likes to.''

Well, the Senate mice haven't passed this yet. Perhaps if these were the rules that the Republicans had to follow—it's a much thinner book and it rhymes—maybe you'd get it right, but this is not the Constitution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLYBURN. Who has the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has the right to close.

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

Madam Speaker, I have often referred to this palatial Hall as our Nation's classroom. It is the reason I feel that we should not just stand here to enunciate precepts; but as elected leaders, we ought to lead by example. Therefore, Madam Speaker, I think it's important for us, when we bring legislation to this floor, that we demonstrate to those young children in classrooms all across America that we will not fly in the face of that Constitution that all of us have sworn to uphold.

I believe that it's a good thing to want to move a measure, but we ought not do so while violating the Constitution of the United States. And I think it's a good reason that the Senate rejected H.R. 1, because all of the economists who evaluated that piece of legislation made it very clear that, to them, it would destroy 700,000 jobs. That bill, H.R. 1, is a job-killer. Also, that bill, H.R. 1, will say to little preschool children in Head Start, we are terminating your educational experience by at least 200,000 so you would no longer have an educational experience.

Madam Speaker, I think it's laudatory for us to put our hands on the Constitution, swear to uphold it; but I think that what is most important is for each and every one of us to lead by example instead of enunciating precepts or empty gestures.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We have had a lot of talk on the floor today about children. We've been reading children's stories and been shown children's books. I've been harkened back to my own childhood in the 1970s and ''Schoolhouse Rock''; and for folks who have not seen the ''Schoolhouse Rock,'' there's an entire DVD now. It's advanced. I recommend that you pick a copy up for the young people in your life because it really is a fantastic beginning step about what it is that we're all about here, what it is that we're all about.

The Preamble is in that ''Schoolhouse Rock'' category. No more kings is in that ''Schoolhouse Rock'' category. And what they talk about is what does it mean for us to be Americans; and what it means is that folks elect their Representatives and they send them to Washington, D.C., and they say get your business done, get your business done. That's what we're trying to do with this resolution here today, get our business done.

I just want to read from the bill. It saddens me. I'm so thrilled that so many Americans watch what we do here on the House floor to hold us accountable, and I'm so saddened by all the misinformation that's circulated. I read here directly from the bill:

''If the House has not received a message from the Senate before April 6, 2011, stating that it has passed a measure providing for the appropriations for the Departments and agencies of the Government for the remainder of fiscal year 2011, the provisions of H.R. 1, as passed by the House, are hereby enacted into law.''

This bill that we send to the Senate, for the Senate to pass, and the President to sign, those provisions are hereby enacted into law. Now, I just want to study that a little bit closer. If the House has not received a message from the Senate stating that the Senate has passed a measure providing for the appropriations of the United States Government.

Folks may be wondering, Madam Speaker, why is it that we're doing that now? Wasn't that supposed to be done last September? Yes, it was. It

didn't get done. Should that have gotten done last December? Yes, it should have, but it didn't get done. So we're here today to get it done.

Forty-one days ago we passed a bill to fund the government. This entire body worked its will in a process that was as open as this House has ever seen: Democrats and Republicans working together, Republicans winning amendments, Democrats winning amendments, Democrats losing amendments, Republicans losing amendments. It made me proud to be a Representative and to serve in this body. It was the best work product this House could put together. We sent it over to the Senate 41 days ago. The Senate defeated it, fair enough. Folks don't have to agree with me. Fair enough. What they do have to do is they have to act. They defeated our bill, H.R. 1. They defeated a Democrat bill. Then they've done nothing.

I got a call earlier today. I held up a board just like this talking about what the Senate had done. Well, there's nothing on this sheet of paper, folks. Golly, you held up the wrong sign. The answer is, no, it's the right sign. Nothing, nothing have we received from the United States Senate. It's the same on both sides, blank. How in the world are we supposed to fund this government with nothing from the United States Senate?

This bill does two things and two things only, Madam Speaker. It says, Senate act. You don't have to act like us, act like Democrats, just act. Act. Do something, send us something, begin the process, make it available. Act.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. In that case, I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I just have a question. Do you really believe that what you're doing is constitutional?

Mr. WOODALL. Absolutely. I appreciate your asking. I appreciate your asking because having had my motives impugned throughout the day, and I know with the collegial relationship that you and I have in the Rules Committee, you know for a fact I wouldn't be here otherwise. I wouldn't be here otherwise.

Now, I'm no scholar of House activities. I know we have passed bills in this House that have incorporated things by reference before, and I'm sure we will do it again, not outside the process. To suggest—and you appreciate this, I say to my friend from Florida—to receive constitutional instruction from the team that brought us ObamaCare is troubling at the most basic levels.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield again for yet another question?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Do you have any precedent for the constitutionality of this particular measure? And I urge you based on what you just said, there have been measures that were deemed, but that was when they were agreed upon, but there is no authority anywhere for us to pass a law requiring of the United States Senate to undertake to do something, and I appreciate my colleague yielding.

□ 1410

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I will say that this is a unique procedure and these are unique times.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Unique and unconstitutional.

Mr. WOODALL. But I will just say to you that in 1999, a Republican Congress, a Democratic President, enacted the foreign relations authorization bill, by reference, in an appropriations bill. That's what we're doing today.

Folks, if you don't like it, call your Senate colleagues and get them to act. This is where we need to be. We need action from the Senate. Call your Senate colleagues. I've called them. I need you to call them, too. We need to move this ball forward.

If the government shuts down, our military men and women don't get paid, Madam Speaker. If the government shuts down, our USDA inspectors go home and beef and chicken leave our shelves in the grocery stores. This isn't play time, going back to our children references. This is serious business. Folks sent us here to do serious things.

And I could not be happier, Madam Speaker, then, for the second provision in this bill to say if you don't work, you don't get paid. It's a basic premise in this Republic, no pay for no work. I'm very proud of the work that we have done, and I implore my colleagues to contact their Senators and get them to do something. Something.

This is what we have from the Senate so far, Madam Speaker. We deserve better. The American people deserve better. And, dadgum it, the Senate can do better.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1255, the "Government Shutdown Prevention Act of 2011."

As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I reject H.R. 1255 on its face. H.R. 1255 seeks to commit a multitude of constitutional law violations and set aside the U.S. Constitution on a wholesale level. The Constitution is the veritable law of the land that we all took an oath to uphold. H.R. 1255 is an unfounded attempt to use the non-statutory "deeming resolution" or "deem and pass" procedure to unconstitutionally achieve the $61 billion in budget cuts that the Majority of this chamber failed to get passed in the Senate in the form of H.R. 1.

This legislation unconstitutionally states that if the House has not received any message from the Senate providing for the Appropriations of Government for fiscal year 2011 before April 6, 2011, then H.R. 1 would be deemed as passed by the Senate, signed by the President and enacted into law.

H.R. 1255 also prohibits the CAO of the House and the Secretary of the Senate from disbursing salary payments for Members of Congress, and also prohibits the President from receiving his salary. It states that the President and Members cannot be disbursed a salary for every day that there is a lapse in appropriations, or if the debt ceiling prevents Federal expenditures. However, because H.R. 1255 already would deem H.R. 1 passed, no funding gap could exist, while hitting the debt ceiling would by definition prevent Federal expenditures like Member salaries.

This legislation would have absolutely no practical effect. Since the Senate would have to pass it and President would have to sign it, this bill is nothing but a talking point for the Tea Party wing of the Republicans. This bill would not have any effect on current, serious negotiations to keep the government operating. The Member Salary portion of the bill would also have no effect since H.R. 1255 already would deem H.R. 1 passed.

This legislation is unconstitutional. The Majority would make history by deeming that the Senate passed a bill which was considered on the Senate floor and failed. The Majority would also make history by deeming that the President would have signed a bill which he promised to veto, should it reach his desk. After opening Congress with a reading of the Constitution, the Republicans are breaking their pledge again.

This legislation exposes extraordinary hypocrisy from the House Republican Leadership. In the 111th Congress, while Republicans promised never to use the "deem and pass" process, it only took a few weeks for them to break another pledge to the American people. During the 111th Congress, then-Minority Leader and now-Speaker JOHN BOEHNER called deem and pass a "scheme and plot" that set a precedent that was "one of the most outrageous things [he] had seen since [he] had been in Congress"—and, erroneously claimed it had "never happened in American history." Now-Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR has previously offered a privileged resolution on 'deem and pass' putting Republicans on record as considering this process a "malfeasant manner" and those who might support it as having "discharged the duties of their offices."

This legislation is a waste of the American people's time and a distraction from Democrats' serious efforts to keep the government from shutting down. Instead of passing this hypocritical, unconstitutional, meaningless bill, the GOP Leadership ought to spend more time at the negotiating table trying to reach a compromise agreement to keep the Government running.

I am an ardent supporter of working in a bipartisan manner to pass fiscally responsible legislation which properly funds the Federal Government through fiscal year 2011 and maintains important programs that are vital to our economic recovery. So, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill and supporting true bipartisan appropriations legislation to keep the Federal Government operational through fiscal year 2011, so that we may address and solve the important issues facing the American people.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, generations of our nation's children have learned

about civics and our American form of government in elementary school—and through iconic television programs like PBS' Schoolhouse Rock, where a singing Bill explains to his youthful audience the process by which, if he's lucky, he can become a law.

To this day, countless Americans still recall how the hopeful Bill gets stuck in committee before making it to the House floor, then has to start all over again in the Senate and even get signed by the President before finally becoming a law.

Today, the Republican majority wants to defund public television and pass legislation saying that an action taken by a single chamber of Congress can become law.

Our old friend Bill is distraught. After all these years, was he just getting a runaround? Were those pesky steps in the Senate and the White House really necessary? What is he going to tell the kids? How could he possibly have gotten it so wrong?

Madam Speaker, fortunately for us, and for the school children of America, Bill did not have it wrong. Article I, Section 7 of the Constitution clearly states: ''Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States.''

Madam Speaker, the clock is ticking. The nation is waiting. The time for gimmicks and distractions and game playing is over. We have serious work to do. Let's move past this foolishness and negotiate a responsible continuing resolution for the American people.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I would like to submit the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to formally notify you that the Committee on House Administration hereby waives further committee consideration of H.R. 1255, the Government Shutdown Prevention Act of 2011, in order that the legislation may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

Sincerely,

DANIEL E. LUNGREN,
Chairman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, either this is April Fool's Day or the Republicans are trying to fool the House of Representatives and the country by attempting to pass this legislation.

There is no truth in labeling whatsoever in H.R. 1255, the ''Government Shutdown Prevention Act of 2011.'' It will prevent no such thing. It will accomplish no such thing.

Section 2 of the bill says that if the House has not received a message from the Senate stating, by next Wednesday, April 6, that the Senate has passed a spending bill for the balance of this fiscal year, then ''the provisions of H.R. 1, as passed by the House on February 19, 2011, are hereby enacted into law.''

Who are the authors of this bill kidding?

The House passed H.R. 1. It lies defeated on the Senate floor, unloved and unwanted.

The Senate voted against H.R. 1, 44–56. It did not even get 50 votes, much less 60.

So what, exactly, is the point of this exercise today? It is obviously not to enact H.R. 1, because that is futile.

With the vote on this bill today, we will in effect be passing H.R. 1 a second time.

This is getting to be a pattern. Instead of finding bipartisan solutions to our pressing national problems, this Republican House seems stuck on a pointless partisan treadmill.

H.R. 1 contained five amendments to defund the Affordable Care Act.

Yesterday, the Energy and Commerce Committee passed five bills to remove funding for public health and doctor training programs under the Affordable Care Act.

The majority passed 9 amendments in H.R. 1 that stop EPA from implementing climate change and pollution rules. And next week, we will vote on another bill doing the same thing.

The majority passed an amendment to H.R. 1 that keeps the American people from the benefits of an open and free Internet. Next week, we will pass this again.

The majority defunded all of public broadcasting in H.R. 1, and then defunded NPR on the House floor a couple weeks later.

On this April Fool's Day, do you want to know the truth about all this frantic legislative activity?

After three months on the job, we have not created one job—because of one simple fact.

In three months, the Republican leadership has not passed one major bill of any consequence that has been enacted into law.

That is the simple truth. They have failed to enact anything of consequence.

And so with that shameful record, they come to the floor today with an illusion, a joke, a diversion, a cover-up for their failure.

The Republicans have the votes to pass a bill that says their spending cuts and ideological amendments are hereby enacted if we pass this bill.

But we are not enacting this bill, because under Article I, Section 7 of the Constitution of the United States, this bill has to go to the Senate and be passed in identical form and then signed by the President.

Madam Speaker, this is April Fool's Day, and this is a bill for fools.

But the American people will not be fooled.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, what holiday is this, again? Is it April Fool's—or is it Groundhog Day?

This bill, whether it's labeled H.R. 1 or H.R. 1255, is a distinct attack on the quality of life for women and their families in this country.

While the proposed cuts would be devastating to Americans as a whole, this bill would change the daily lives of women for the worse—and American women should understand.

Yet the Majority insists on ignoring the Constitution in order to ravage programs and policies that disproportionately impact women.

Today, I released a report documenting how this bill impacts women from birth to old age, every single step of the way.

The report shows that this bill cuts industries that disproportionately employ women and attacks programs that women depend on, such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

This bill zeros out Title X funding, so that obtaining primary care and preventive screenings becomes far more difficult for many women.

This bill cuts childcare programs and after-school programs so that women are forced to choose between working—and supporting their families—or providing child care at home.

We cannot stand by as this Majority attacks women from all sides.

We must fight against this assault on American women and their families.

I voted no on H.R. 1, and I urge a no vote ''on'' H.R. 1255.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 194, the bill is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Walz of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1255 to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON PAY DURING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Members of Congress and the President shall not receive basic pay for any period in which—

(1) there is more than a 24-hour lapse in appropriations for any Federal agency or department as a result of a failure to enact a regular appropriations bill or continuing resolution; or

(2) the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, has been reached.

(b) RETROACTIVE PAY PROHIBITED.—No pay forfeited in accordance with subsection (a) may be paid retroactively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

To stand here in this hallowed place as a Representative, as all of my colleagues, all 435 of us, the incredible privilege and honor to represent the hardworking Americans across this country. In southern Minnesota, the chance to see genuine folks out working hard, doing the things that they built this country and made us the greatest nation on Earth, and one of those things is a very basic premise, the American work ethic. The idea that you should work hard and do your best and be compensated at the end of the day and feel good and a sense of accomplishment in what you did.

We have an opportunity. The American people did send us here, as you heard on both sides of the aisle, to do a very simple thing—to get the work

done and move this country forward. The debate is that there are differences in how to do that. That's the strength of this land. It's democracy. But there is one very strong principle that we can reinforce, that work ethic, that if you do not get your job done, you certainly should not be paid. No middle of the night, no if it passes and goes this way. Very simply, the easiest of things to do: If this Congress after being here 4 months—and I don't care where you put the blame—can't get this done by next week and the government shuts down, there will be no chance of a single paycheck going and no retroactive pay. That's the least we owe those hardworking folks. That's the least that we can do here.

I want to be very clear. I understand the majority is having a problem. They've got a debate happening inside their caucus if compromise is a virtue or a vice. They will work that out and decide, because that's what this debate today was about: Where do we compromise for the good of the American public? I come down on the side of compromise.

But with that being said, if we don't get our work done—and I will do everything in my power to ensure we do not shut this government down—the repercussions are catastrophic for Americans, and not just macroeconomically. Our seniors aren't going to get their checks. We're going to see medical care slowed down to our veterans. We're going to hear from and we have heard from our military commanders that it stresses the readiness of this nation. Our Federal workers and even the hardworking staff here will not receive a paycheck.

How do you go home, to Georgia, to Alabama, to Minnesota, look somebody in the eye and say, We failed because we bickered again but, dang, I'm going to take home that check.

So I tell my colleagues, especially the new Members, if you're a freshman in here, you came with an optimism that should not be able to be beaten out of you. Regardless if you disagree with us with every fiber of your being, the very simple principle that if we can't get this done, let's put skin in the game. No if it goes to the Senate and gets passed; no if it's not constitutional.

I offer you the rarest of opportunities today, the first time you've had this chance. If you vote ''yes'' on this motion to recommit, it goes to the President today and becomes law of the land, and no one here will be paid. You can look your constituents in the eye and whoever you blame for it, you can say, I'm not getting a paycheck till we fix this.

So I want to be very clear. This is an opportunity, a rare opportunity. You can vote however you want and decide however you want to balance the budget, but do not allow to play games. It is the bright lights of day, the board is going to come up, and you're going to have the opportunity. Not what's in the underlying bill. That doesn't stop from retroactive pay. And that has to pass the Senate. MITCH MCCONNELL and every Republican already voted for my motion to recommit. So you have the chance to say, all right, I disagree with the Democrats on everything in this bill, but I'm not going to go back to Georgia and tell someone I'm picking up a paycheck and then trying to explain, but I voted for it really, but it was a motion to recommit that I didn't agree with and all of this. Nothing. Simple. Seventy-five words. Half page. Don't do your job, don't get paid. No work, no pay. It is very, very simple.

I yield to my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So the point is the law as it stands today is, we shut the government down, a million Federal employees don't get paid, our staff doesn't get paid, but we get paid. All the gentleman wants to say is treat ourselves like we would treat others. If our staff is going to be out on the street, we ought to be out there with them.

The other point the gentleman makes is, if we vote for this recommittal, the Senate has already approved it, and it goes right to the President. It gets signed into law. We've done something constructive. The alternative is to send something over to the Senate and the Senate's going to laugh at it. You know this H.R. 1255 isn't going to get passed. This would be passed. This becomes law. It's the right thing to do.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Here's your rare opportunity. If you don't do this and you say, ''But I'm going to vote for the underlying bill,'' the gentleman from Georgia said himself, Mr. WOODALL, that it would probably not pass the Senate. This is done. There's no more going anywhere. It's going to be done.

I know optimism abounds on April 1. I believe today the Twins are going to win the World Series. I believe that in my all heart. But I wouldn't take the bet or the chance on it. If you want to go back to each of your congressional districts and say, I stand with you to do what's right on the American work ethic. If we don't get done next week, we don't get paid.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WOODALL. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. I don't know where to begin. The misrepresentation, after misrepresentation, after misrepresentation. I don't impugn anyone's motives. I admire the passion. But if you really believe with no work, no pay—and I wish we still had that board up there—if you really believe it, all this time we've been spending talking about the Constitution, don't you think we ought to do that in a constitutional way?

I do. Because if we say it, we ought to mean it, and we ought to stand by our conviction.

Madam Speaker, to speak to these constitutional issues, I now yield to my chairman, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I heard the eloquent plea of our friends from the other side of the aisle. Let me just read to you a message I received from the White House about this bill, with the words that the gentleman has presented on the floor.

□ 1420

''Unfortunately, S.B. 388''—which are the words the gentleman puts in his motion to recommit—''is patently unconstitutional, both as applied to Congress in violation of the 27th Amendment and to the President in violation of the compensation clause of Article II.''

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. No, I will not yield.

So if one wants to, by this bill, have some pressure exerted on the House, the Senate, and the President, it would be in the language closer to that that's contained in the underlying bill——

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia controls the time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Upon which you can make an argument it is constitutional because it does not vary the pay given to either the President or the Congress, which——

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would like to let my chairman finish.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I believe regular order is to not interrupt one at the time that they are making the argument. Maybe it is because it is difficult to hear the words of the White House about the unconstitutionality of that which the gentleman brings to the floor.

If anyone wants us to act in vain, it is the gentleman on the other side who has presented this motion to recommit because it is, under any view, any view, unconstitutional. It violates the very terms of the Constitution with respect to the President and with respect to Members of Congress. So if you want to exert any influence on Members, if you believe this is the way to do it, you would accept the language that's in the underlying bill which does not attack directly the words of the Constitution.

I do not find it funny. I find it tragic that on this floor—we just heard the great arguments from the other side of

the aisle about observing the Constitution. And then they come to the floor and give us something which the White House says in its email to me is ''patently unconstitutional,'' not may be unconstitutional, not perhaps unconstitutional, not arguably unconstitutional, but ''patently unconstitutional.''

So the gentleman has presented us the kind of, I guess, shell game we talk about where it looks good when it's presented to you but, by sleight of hand, it makes sure that it has no impact whatsoever.

The gentleman says, well, it will go right to the President. That is not true. This is not the bill sent over to us. It's the same language, so it does not go right to the President, number one. Number two, unless the President is sending me misinformation via his messenger, the President's position is it's patently unconstitutional. The DOJ's position, his Department of Justice says that it is patently unconstitutional.

So I guess the gentleman is arguing to us, send it to the President so that he may commit a patently unconstitutional act.

Now, I may have disagreements with the President, but I have no evidence whatsoever that the President is waiting with bated breath over at the White House for us to send something to him so that he can do an unconstitutional act. Perhaps the gentleman believes that is the position he wants to put the President in. And even though I have great disagreement with this President, frankly, I don't think that is an appropriate thing to do.

So I would argue to my colleagues, reject this unanimously, because it is really something which doesn't pass the truth in labeling act; and more than that, it violates the Constitution on its very words. It's almost an attempt to directly violate the Constitution. You couldn't have written it better to violate the Constitution, but somehow the gentleman has achieved that high honor.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would say that I may be a freshman, but I know it cannot be said any better than that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 237, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

YEAS—188

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gohmert
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
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
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—237

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
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
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Barton (TX)
Campbell
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Miller, George
Smith (WA)
Visclosky

□ 1448

Messrs. BARROW, ROTHMAN of New Jersey, BLUMENAUER, NADLER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Messrs. PASCRELL, MEEKS, RUSH, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 202, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

AYES—221

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann

Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—202

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Farenthold

NOT VOTING—8

Barton (TX)
Campbell
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Green, Gene
Miller, George
Smith (WA)
Visclosky

□ 1455

Mr. WU changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDING THE KING STREET PATRIOTS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the King Street Patriots, a Houston political watchdog group, for being given the esteemed Ronald Reagan Award at the February meeting of the Conservative Political Action Conference.

The King Street Patriots started the True the Vote initiative in an attempt to uncover voter fraud in the greater Houston area. In their investigation they discovered unimagined levels of voter fraud, from vacant lots with registered voters to election judges helping voters with their ballots.

This is a movement made up of ordinary citizens who realize that voter fraud is one of the most egregious offenses under our Constitution. The King Street Patriots are now lobbying the Texas legislature to strengthen election laws and prevent future abuses.

Free and fair elections are essential to our democracy, and the King Street Patriots have shown an impressive commitment to civic duty, and I applaud their efforts.

□ 1500

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

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

Ms. BERKLEY. I rise today to reject Republican calls for an investigation into the decision to end Yucca Mountain. Let me save this Republican Congress a lot of time and a lot of money. President Obama put a stop to Yucca Mountain because it is too dangerous a site to store radioactive nuclear waste. This is a political stunt with one goal—turning my home State of Nevada into a nuclear garbage dump. Those pushing this review are lying about the dump safety. They know Yucca Mountain is smack in the middle of an earthquake zone. There's volcanic activity. There's groundwater issues.

Have we learned nothing about what is happening now in Japan? We ought to be demanding that the nuclear power plants act now to secure nuclear waste in dry-cask storage. Dry-cask storage will increase public safety now. Investigating Yucca Mountain will only increase the danger and waste money. Shame on the nuclear industry and its allies for being more interested in protecting their profits than in protecting public safety.

That is why, even in the face of one of the world's worst nuclear disasters unfolding now in Japan, the nuclear industry and its ''nuked-up'' buddies in the United States Congress are playing partisan games with nuclear waste.

DELAY, DELAY, DELAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, delay, delay, delay is the administration's energy plan. The Keystone XL Pipeline project would bring 700,000

barrels of oil a day from Alberta, Canada, to refineries in southeast Texas. This would provide more energy for America, but the President has had it for over 2 years and can't make up his mind on whether to approve the project or not.

The State Department, the EPA, and a bunch of out-of-towners have stonewalled the project on alleged environmental grounds. Pipelines are the most cost-effective and the most environmentally sound way to transport oil and natural gas. Oil must reach the refineries some way. We can either import oil through a safe and reliable pipeline from our friends and neighborhoods, the Canadians, or rely on risky tankers coming from unstable Middle Eastern countries and dictators.

Even the EPA should be able to figure this out, after 2 years of delay. Gasoline is nearly $4 a gallon. The administration needs to be realistic and approve this pipeline immediately. It's about time we start laying pipe.

And that's just the way it is.

TIME FOR A CEASE FIRE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. It's time to cease fire and sit down and negotiate. One would believe that I'm speaking about the conflict in the Mid East and about Libya. What I'm really speaking about is the Governor of the State of Texas and the challenge that we have of ensuring that $830 million comes back to the State of Texas for our school children.

Earlier today, I had the privilege of speaking to a group of students from Spelman College, an Historically Black College, and I told them their greatest contribution can be to go into the elementary schools and the secondary schools and talk to them about the value of education. We can't see America lose its excellence in education, see children in 60-person classes, teachers thrown out in the street. We need the $830 million in the State of Texas.

Let's resolve our differences. Let's give a commitment to the Secretary of Education that you will use these dollars for education only. Parents and teachers and students and those who are committed to educating our children, the best and the brightest, deserve that kind of commitment.

What is America great for? It's great because we've given the opportunity of education to all people. Texas, it's time to cease fire. Sit down, negotiate, and receive $830 million Federal dollars on behalf of the children of Texas.

TAXPAYERS AGAIN FOOTING THE BILL

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I just finished a hearing as chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Committee, and we had the administration up to talk about some of the programs that they're handing out money on; and one of them is giving out money to large corporations and to unions for early retirement of the employees of for-profit corporations.

So think about this. The United States Government is giving millions of dollars. In fact, they gave United Auto Workers $260 million towards their plan for early retirement for their workers.

Now, when you think about it, these are corporations and unions and entities around this country who've actually settled in with a contract with their employees. Yet the government is stepping in and giving them money to help them so they can get to 2014. And they're running out of money. Obviously, they will run out of money if they give free money to these corporations. They're going to accept it. And in the end, taxpayers are going to foot the bill.

In light of the fact we're losing $4 billion a day, why should taxpayers be giving out almost $5 billion to corporations that are very profitable to help their employees retire?

HONORING DR. BETH DUPREE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I rise today to honor Dr. Beth DuPree, an oncologist and breast cancer surgeon from Bucks County. Dr. DuPree's care and compassion for her patients extend far beyond the operating room. I'm honored to this evening attend a ceremony in honor of Dr. DuPree and her many accomplishments as doctor, civic leader, and humanitarian.

Beth founded and leads a group called The Healing Consciousness Foundation that provides valuable support services to anyone battling breast cancer and in need of support. Psychiatric services, exercise programs, diet coaching, or simply a shoulder to lean on are all provided through The Healing Consciousness Foundation. These are services which insurance and government programs do not provide, but which can be just as critical to a recovery.

Through her dedication and her hard work, as well as the sense of social responsibility that she instills in others to hear the calling to serve, Beth has made the mission of The Healing Consciousness Foundation, ''Turning survivors into thrivers,'' truly a reality.

WHITE RIBBON CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POMPEO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. BUERKLE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak about two of the most significant issues facing our society today—the twin scourges of domestic violence and sexual abuse. Our society has a moral obligation to stand up against those who exploit their power to commit violence against women, men, and children. I join other Members here today in taking the opportunity to discuss these issues and participate in the White Ribbon Campaign.

On Tuesday of this past week, March 22, in Syracuse, New York, the president of SUNY Upstate Medical University, Dr. David Smith, chaired a breakfast. It was the kickoff to the White Ribbon Campaign, a campaign that is to draw attention to and focus on, raise awareness of, domestic violence and sexual abuse. The White Ribbon Campaign is an international campaign, participating probably across 55 countries.

Later in the week, on Friday, again Dr. Smith led a group of men in a march raising awareness for domestic violence. They marched in women's shoes down the main street in Syracuse, New York. Again, ''walk a mile in their shoes,'' raising awareness, raising the consciousness of domestic violence and sexual abuse, these issues that face our society today. The international campaign has probably 55 countries and involves a general public education focused on preventing domestic violence.

Many of my fellow Members this past week have been wearing white ribbons for our commitment to putting the spotlight on domestic violence. Wearing the white ribbon speaks to our personal pledge to never commit, condone, or remain silent about violence against women and children. The white ribbons were sponsored by Vera House. Vera House was formed in 1977 in Syracuse, New York, by Sister Mary Vera because Sister Mary Vera recognized the need for emergency shelters for women.

□ 1510

She developed and expanded her services. Now, today, Vera House has merged with the Rape Crisis Center, and they serve the needs of so many women, men and children who have been abused. Again, the whole White Ribbon Campaign is to raise public awareness of domestic violence.

At this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Representative RENEE ELLMERS.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank my colleague and friend from New York and to point out the fact that, over the years, she has just been a tireless, dedicated supporter of women's issues, family issues, and of giving her voluntary support of legal services to facilities that provide domestic violence havens in New York. She is a strong advocate for the White Ribbon Campaign, and I am proud to stand with her today in support of ending violence against women.

We show our support today by wearing these white ribbons that represent

a pledge to never commit, condone, or to remain silent about violence against women and girls. So let's start this discussion by defining the different forms of violence against women.

Domestic violence occurs when one person in an intimate relationship uses a pattern of controlling assaultive behavior to abuse, threaten, harass, and intimidate the other partner. This violence comes in many forms. In its simplest terms, it is emotional abuse; name-calling; playing mind games; put-downs; threats—they can be physical or emotional—intimidation; using looks; smashing things; loud voices or actions to put you in fear of what might happen; isolation; controlling where you go, what you do, what you see; driving away friends and family; and of course sexual abuse and the use of children: making you feel guilty about the children, using custody or visitation to harass you.

None of these forms of abuse are acceptable, and part of the White Ribbon Campaign's objective is to bring these issues to light. The bottom line here is that there are men in this country who want to protect the women they love. Through the White Ribbon Campaign, they are speaking out against these atrocities that take place. They are educating and calling on their fellow man to stop the violence.

While we are taking a moment today to bring this important issue to light, I want to take a moment to commend the many facilities in my congressional district that are helping to provide a safe place for women but that are also working toward bringing families back together by working through the violence issues.

S.A.F.E. of Harnett County is a private, nonprofit organization whose mission is to provide safety and to serve as an advocate for sexual assault and domestic violence victims, survivors, and their families.

In Chatham County, North Carolina, the Family Violence and Rape Crisis Services has helped numerous people through effective programming. One victim said, ''The pieces of the puzzle are coming together. The Family Violence and Rape Crisis Service has given me the strength to be who I was supposed to be on my own.''

In Johnston County, Safe Harbor is another private, nonprofit agency that was created in 1984 with $500 and a donated phone line. This agency served around 3,000 victims in 2009.

There are numerous other facilities in my congressional district that are also doing good work toward stemming the tide of domestic violence. I want to commend them for their hard work and dedication to the downtrodden.

As I close today, I also want to commend the men who support the White Ribbon Campaign. I applaud them for rising up and for reaching out to educate. It takes a strong man to take this kind of action.

Ms. BUERKLE. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her kind comments and for putting attention on the Rape Crisis Centers and all of these centers which have dealt with this, because today, while we rise and we stand to call and bring to consciousness domestic violence, this is also a wonderful opportunity to thank the hundreds of thousands of people who volunteer in these shelters, who work for these agencies, who provide a safe haven for the women, the men and the children who are abused—for the victims of domestic violence.

My colleague talked about what these centers do. Vera House, the agency that I stand today to represent and to talk about, has expanded their services these days to outreach, advocacy, education, and children's counseling. Children, as you heard from my colleague, are often the victims of domestic violence between spouses. They are the ones who suffer. Vera House offers counseling to these children. Most importantly, Vera House provides violence education for the perpetrators. If we are going to change behaviors, we have got to educate and to retrain the way the perpetrators think.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of domestic violence and sexual assault.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Speaker, for over 14 years, I have worked at Vera House as a pro bono legal volunteer. The Women's Bar Association in Syracuse, New York, put together a program where all attorneys, male and female, go through training to begin to address the needs of the victims of domestic violence. Through those 14 years, I began to get an up-close, clear understanding of the issue of domestic violence. The fact is that domestic violence transcends socioeconomics; it transcends race. Domestic violence is an issue that everyone faces. It crosses racial lines; it crosses economic lines; it crosses social lines.

I recall one of my meetings with a woman whose husband was well-known in the media in our town. You would never suspect. You would never think that she would be a victim of domestic violence—educated, with financial means. Yet she was a victim. This is the pervasiveness of sexual assault and domestic violence.

At this time, I yield to my esteemed colleague, Judge POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady for yielding time, and I appreciate the work she has done on this issue and for bringing it to the House's attention today during this Special Order.

Domestic violence, as you said, affects the entire country—all races, all economic groups. No one is exempt from this dastardly deed. It's my honor to serve as chairman of the Victims' Rights Caucus. It's a bipartisan caucus. Congressman JIM COSTA is the co-chair. We hope to help promote the concept that victims are people, too, that they have rights, and that the same Constitution that protects defendants protects the rights of victims as well. I appreciate the gentlelady for being a member of that caucus.

In my other life, before I came to Congress, I'd spent most of my time at the courthouse in Houston for 30 years. I was a prosecutor and a criminal court judge, hearing criminal cases, and I saw a lot of people come down there. A lot of people were down there because they had committed crimes against their families. We need to understand that when you hurt someone in your family, it is not a family problem only—it is a criminal problem—and society must get to the point where we believe that it is socially unacceptable to commit crimes in the family.

Probably the most important person in my life when I was growing up was my grandmother. She never forgave me for being a Republican; she always considered herself a Democrat, God bless her. But one thing she said that was true was that you never hurt somebody you claim you love, and that's an absolute truth.

□ 1520

People who claim they love somebody and then physically or emotionally or verbally abuse them are wrong and should be treated accordingly and held accountable for that conduct. It is very important that we recognize that domestic violence is a true issue, and we also need to understand as a culture and as a community that when a person is the victim of domestic violence that it's not their fault. They are the victim.

The offender, in most cases the husband, they are not the victim. The spouse is the victim, the wife, and defendants and husbands who commit those crimes can't use excuses and try to portray themselves as the one being the victim. The offenders should be held accountable, and victims need to understand society and the law are on their side.

Many victims of spousal abuse and domestic violence, they don't report it. They don't want the neighbors to know. They don't want the community to know. They feel like they're beaten down physically and emotionally, and sometimes they think it is their fault. It's not their fault. It's always the offender's fault.

And so we as a culture, as a community, in this country, whether we're from New York or from Texas, we need to let people know that if they are a victim of crime, if there is a lady that is abused by her husband, that society comes to her rescue and helps in any way we can and to make sure we have a safe haven for them to go to if necessary and that we make sure that it's financed so that the wife does not feel

like ''I have no place to go because I can't afford anyplace,'' and so she stays in that abusive relationship, and sometimes it ends in worse tragedy.

Lastly, I'd like to talk about a very favorite person of mine who lives not far from here. Yvette Cade is just a regular person who lives in Maryland, and a few years ago she was trying to separate and divorce from her husband. A judge refused to grant her a restraining order, refused to grant a restraining order that she requested to keep her spouse away from her until all of the divorce had been worked out, and because the restraining order wasn't extended, her spouse went into a video store where she was working, carrying a jar of gasoline, and poured it over Yvette Cade's head and set that woman, that wonderful lady, on fire.

Now, because of a person in the store who helped put out that fire that this spouse had committed against Yvette Cade, she survived. And it's things like that that we as a culture need to hold these culprits accountable for these crimes against people in their family, and we need to take wonderful ladies like Yvette Cade and make sure we treat them with tender care and make sure we have compassion on them to prevent any further damage to them physically, emotionally, and also prevent the consequences that other people may choose to commit against spouses in their own family.

It is important that we continue to preach this word throughout the country that spousal abuse is something we're going to deal with as a Nation.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. BUERKLE. I thank my esteemed colleague from Texas for his kind comments, and I thank all of the gentlemen who have the courage to stand up and call awareness to the issue of domestic violence, who stand against the violence against women, men, and children.

Domestic violence is known by many names: domestic abuse, spousal abuse, family violence, intimate partner violence. It also takes many forms, from physical violence involving small things such as hitting or kicking, biting, shoving, or restraining. It can be emotional or it can be verbal, which manifests in many types of behavior: controlling, domineering, threatening, or humiliating. And we as a society have an obligation to raise the awareness of domestic violence so that women know, just as my esteemed colleague was talking about, it's not their fault. It is the fault of the perpetrator, whether that perpetrator is male or female, and that is the person who should be held accountable, not the victim.

It can also be economic abuse in which the abuser controls the victim's money, and this abuse we often see with the elderly. Another issue that we need to raise society's consciousness about, the issues of elder abuse.

Tragically, domestic violence is not a rare phenomenon, Mr. Speaker. The Centers for Disease Control estimate that domestic violence is a public health problem affecting over 32 million Americans, or 10 percent of the population. This is a tragedy of national proportion that society, again, we must raise up the consciousness of this horrific issue.

The effects of domestic violence are staggering. Physical abuse can be bruises, broken bones, head injuries, lacerations, but those are just the external physical wounds. Internal bleeding, chronic health conditions such as arthritis, irritable bowl syndrome, ulcers, migraines, miscarriages can also be linked to physical abuses that victims sustain.

But there are other effects as well. Many victims experience anxiety, stress, fear, guilt, depression, guilt that what is happening to them is their fault. Again, we have to raise the awareness and raise the consciousness of society that it is the perpetrator's fault, not the victim's.

Abused victims also frequently manifest a condition we think of relative to our veterans: posttraumatic stress disorder. Victims with conditions have flashbacks, nightmares, or exaggerated responses.

The effects of abuse can also be financial. Many victims courageously leave their abusers but often lack the education, the skills, and the resources to find gainful employment to care for themselves and any children they might have.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall sitting with women who are helpless. They sit across the table from you, and they are helpless because they don't know what to do. They don't know how to get out of the situation. They don't understand that there is help and that society is willing to step up and provide safe haven for them and for their children.

I spoke to a prosecutor who had a program that would go after deadbeat dads and go after the support so that women would be able to leave, be safe, and get support in order to support their children. I think that our society is coming around. We have wonderful organizations like Vera House, but we in this House must work hard. We must continue to raise awareness about these issues.

The other societal scourge I referenced in my opening remark is sexual assault. Sexual assault is, simply put, any unwanted contact of a sexual nature. It does not matter if the victim is on a date or drinking when it occurs. It's never okay to force sexual contact on you against your will.

Again, it's raising the awareness. It's letting society know, the vulnerable know, that it's not your fault and that you don't have to withstand these abuses.

Like domestic abuse, sexual assault knows no privileged class immune to its ravages. Men, women, children, all ages, all races, all religions, and ethnicities are victims. The effects are often similar to the victims of domestic abuse, and the effects can be especially troubling for children and men.

I serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I am passionate about veterans' issues. It is a committee that is bipartisan. It's a committee that works together because we all understand, we all understand the service and the sacrifice of our men and women in the military. I am the daughter and sister of veterans and believe that we owe a debt of gratitude to our men and women in uniform, but part of that debt extends to making sure that we don't turn a blind eye to sexual assault of women and men in our armed services.

We have much to do, but I applaud the U.S. Air Force's recognition that sexual assault against both male and female airmen is a serious problem that needs a systemic solution. And while the Air Force has emphasized sexual assault prevention in responses for several years, they acknowledge that sexual assault is still a problem in the Air Force, as it is for our military services. In the Air Force's own words, Sexual assault continues to burden our airmen and degrade our mission effectiveness. Sexual assault is a crime and there is no place for this or this behavior in our Air Force. We must demand better of ourselves and of society.

□ 1530

Consequently, they contracted with Gallup to conduct an anonymous poll about sexual assault in the Air Force. The findings were, to put it mildly, disturbing. The results of the survey in the 12 months prior were that 2,143 women and 1,355 men reported that they had been sexually assaulted, with the majority of female victims reporting that their assailant was a fellow airmen. Even one victim is one too many.

Sadly, it is unrealistic to think that our Armed Forces would be immune to the kinds of problems endemic in our society. We must engage as men, women, moms, dads, community leaders, airmen, soldiers, marines, sailors, and guardsmen; churches, synagogues, mosques, youth centers, sports teams, schools, colleges. The list goes on. It will take all aspects of society to change a culture that increasingly devalues human life.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are created in the image of God and that for each of us, He has a purpose in our lives. No woman should ever, ever have to fear for the safety of her unborn child because of an abusive husband. No child should ever dread going to bed because of a parent who is molesting her. And no man should be raped because justice turned a blind eye to prison rape.

I have six children and 11 grandchildren, Mr. Speaker, and as a parent and a grandparent, I think about the lessons I have tried to teach to each of them. Some of those lessons were very successful, some less so, but I taught my kids to help others. Helping others

includes living up to the pledge I mentioned earlier, that I am making by wearing that white ribbon: I will not commit, condone, or remain silent about violence against women, men, or children. And I commend the other Members of this body for the white ribbons that they courageously wore to, again, raise the awareness of domestic violence and sexual assaults.

We have a serious problem in front of us, Mr. Speaker, in every community in America, but I have hope. America is an amazing country, and I am so privileged to be an American, to be free. I believe that the greatness of this country is a reflection of both the greatness of our founding and the greatness of our people. We are up to and equal to the task of fighting domestic violence and sexual assault if we put our American minds and our American spirits to it.

So, today, as I stand before you, Mr. Speaker, again, to call attention to the scourge of domestic violence and sexual abuse, it's, at the same time, celebrating the wonderful agencies and shelters and volunteers and people who have stepped forth who are willing to take this issue on, who are willing to address it, who are willing to help the victims of sexual assault and domestic violence. We are blessed by their service, by their commitment to society, by their appreciation of the value of human life and their desire to help those who need that help.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the ability to be able to call attention to these issues.

At this time, I want to say to Vera House in Syracuse, as well as all of the shelters and all of the agencies throughout this country, thank you for your service. Thank you for what you do for the victims of domestic violence and sexual assaults.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to recognize a minority Member at this time.

KEEPING THE GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and to once again bring a case before you that I believe will be overheard in an effective way by the American people and responded to you by, of course, your good judicial and prudential judgment.

I came here to the floor to talk about a number of things. I should always bring up the number one thing that is on my mind first. And I know that it's impossible for me to exhaust the subject, but I have given it a significant endeavor over the last year and a half. And now, as things move towards a head, with the continuing resolution negotiations and debate that is taking place and the major decisions that will be formed over the weekend by the leadership in the House and in the Senate in consultation, presumably, with the White House, we expect to see some kind of a proposal come before one or both Chambers next week before the clock ticks down on the continuing resolution that is temporarily funding this government in a piece of shell appropriations that should have never have happened. But that's a subject matter perhaps outside of what I should bring up today, and we should focus on the issues at hand, and they are this:

There was a strong pledge that was made that if Republicans win the majority, Mr. Speaker, that we would cut $100 billion out of this fiscal year's budget. I will submit that, recognizing that we were 5 months into this fiscal year before we had an opportunity to begin that process, that calculates out to be about $61.5 billion if you annualized $100 billion. Even though the initially proposed continuing resolution did not include those kinds of cuts, there was an intense debate here in this Congress driven by the 87 freshmen Republicans to get that number up to a number that was either $100 billion or $100 billion if you calculated it on an annualized basis.

We did come together on that number, and this House did pass H.R. 1, which included in it $61.5 billion worth of cuts out of fiscal year 2011, even though, let me say, the function of the House was not functional during the last 2 or 3 years at least of Speaker PELOSI's time, and there was no appropriations process that one could bring forward, and there was no budget that was brought forward and, therefore, government was being run on stopgap measures of continuing resolutions.

During the lame duck session—the lame duck session being the period of time when Congress comes together to meet after an election. I have said that lame duck sessions should only be to take care of the urgent issues that need to be handled before the new Members of Congress can be sworn in. The old Congress, at least in theory, is delegitimized by the elections that take place. Last year, it was on November 2. They no longer represent the will of the American people. That has been reflected in the election results all across the land. And this House was designed to be a quick reaction strike force to be responsive to the American people.

So our Founding Fathers put it within the Constitution, never amended out, that House Members are up for election every 2 years. And every 10 years there will be a census, and that census is designed then to be used to redistrict the districts. And we have now agreed that 435 is the maximum number of House Members. And as the population moves and as the population grows, every 10 years, we reset the congressional districts to as accurately as possible reflect the new population distribution in America. That goes on, along with every 2 years, there is an election.

So the elections have two purposes. Every 10 years, it is to reflect the population change; and every 2 years, including that 10-year census year election, which comes up in 2012, it's the quick reaction response to the will of the American people. Because our Founding Fathers understood that, if you put people in this office and let them have tenure for life like we are hearing about in States like Wisconsin or Ohio what tenure does to a person's due diligence, then there would be people that would sit here forever and never be responsible to the American people.

□ 1540

They recognize if they would set the Senate up in 6-year election cycles that the Senate wouldn't be accountable within a short period of time, not within 2 years or 4 years, but in 6 years. That was intentionally so the Senators would be more inclined to make long-term visionary decisions, and House Members could come in as the shock troops, so to speak, to bring the quick reaction if the Congress got out of sync with the people.

Well, it's pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress got out of sync with the people last year. Actually, they began to get out of sync with the people well before that, more than 4 years ago.

But when President Obama came in he had huge majorities to work with in the House under NANCY PELOSI as Speaker and in the Senate with HARRY REID as leader, even to the extent that they had a massive majority in the House of Representatives, and they had a filibuster-proof majority in the United States Senate. And so they felt their oats, so to speak.

And their ideology, drove them, I think, to—maybe they didn't know it. I think some of them knew it, and I believe the Blue Dogs that were in this House of Representatives that lost their elections last November knew it. They knew they were walking the plank. They knew they were going down into political Davy Jones' locker if they voted for ObamaCare. But they did, because of leverage, because of legislative shenanigans, because—and I'll say it, Mr. Speaker, that to understand this, that ObamaCare, for a long time here in the House of Representatives, was H.R. 3200, a bill that came through the Energy and Commerce Committee in a fashion that was, at least envisioned, to be a functional fashion through our Constitution and by our Founding Fathers. But it came through, and there were long, long debates in committee, but H.R. 3200, which was the product of the House, didn't make it to the floor for a vote.

What came to the floor for a vote under ObamaCare was a bill that was written in Speaker PELOSI's office of 2,600 or so pages, plus or minus 100. It depends on the font type. But 2,600 or so pages of a bill that no, not one person had an opportunity to read it all before it came to the floor for a vote. And as much as it was studied by many, there are quite a few Americans now that have read it all.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'll submit this, that it has so many convoluted contraptions within it, that there isn't a single person on the planet, no matter how intellectual they might be, no matter how much experience they might have, there's not one person that has the capability of reading the ObamaCare bill and understanding all of the activities of that bill where it references other sections of the code and you have to read it and switch back and forth, zigzag in and out of existing code and look at the ObamaCare piece of legislation and, at the same time, understand the implications to Americans. It's one thing to understand what a bill does technically, and it's another to understand how people have to live underneath that legislation. So H.R. 3200 kicked off to the side. The product of the actual committee didn't come to the floor. The product of the Speaker's office, her staff, many of them young, junior people writing up a bill that they thought was right for America, dumped down on us here to be on a short period of debate and a vote be passed by the House, and could not and would not have passed the House the day it was brought to the floor for a vote except for a couple of little promises. One of those promises was that the Senate would pass a reconciliation package, which put other pieces into it in order to avoid the filibuster rule in the Senate. So in order to get that done, they had to bring some things that couldn't get passed under the filibuster rule in the Senate, write them up in a separate bill. Well, somehow that bill couldn't have been amended to the one here on the floor because that wouldn't have passed. And furthermore, the ObamaCare bill that was written in NANCY PELOSI's office couldn't have passed here on the floor because Bart Stupak had a dozen Democrats that locked up with the Republicans and said, we aren't going to vote for a bill that funds abortion. NANCY PELOSI wrote a bill that funds abortion. HARRY REID wrote a reconciliation package that they promised to send over to the House that did the things that his Senators needed to have happen and that House Members needed to have happen, and the piece of ObamaCare that was written by NANCY PELOSI that funds abortion was going to satisfy the Stupak dozen if the President signed an Executive order that amended the legislation that was before the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't expect every American to be completely understanding this convoluted process. In fact, I'd expect most of them to be very confused about this. This was designed to be a confusing process. And the idea, the very idea that the President of the United States would take an oath of office to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, that everybody in this Chamber would do the same thing, and everybody in the Senate would do the same thing, and then believe somehow, all you have to do is read article I of the Constitution, and one can easily conclude that the President cannot amend a piece of legislation by signing an Executive order. He does not have the authority to do so. That is a constitutional violation.

And I have, in the very similar, if not exactly identical language that is in the Iowa Constitution, gone to court to prove exactly that when former Governor Vilsack thought that he could rewrite the code of Iowa by executive order. And the case of King v. Vilsack is in the books, Mr. Speaker, and the Court vacated the executive order of the Governor of the State of Iowa because he thought he could legislate by executive order. I said he couldn't. We went to court. The judge said he couldn't, and it's resolved in that issue, and the point is conceded by former Governor, now Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack.

That same tactic was used by the President of the United States, Barack Obama, when he signed an Executive order that was designed to amend the bill that was about to pass, actually he signed it after the bill passed. And the bill that passed on the condition that the President would sign an Executive order to take care of the funding for abortion and that the Senate would pass a reconciliation package that fit the other needs.

Why couldn't we do this under what we call here regular order? Why couldn't we have a committee process that would work a bill through?

Well, they did, but NANCY PELOSI dropped that one in the trash, wrote her own. Why couldn't they allow the reconciliation package, if it had any merit, to be amended on to the ObamaCare legislation, even if it's the legislation that was written in Speaker PELOSI's office, and rejected that out of committee? Why couldn't that have been an amendment that could have been voted on up or down here in the House of Representatives attached to the same piece of legislation?

Why couldn't they have put the language of Barack Obama's Executive order that supposedly says the Federal Government's not going to fund abortion. Why couldn't they have put that into the bill too and had an honest debate on an honest piece of legislation? Why not?

Well, because it wasn't. Because they could not pass it under an honest process. It had to be a legislative shenanigans process. That's what we got.

And as that bill went to final passage that night, I got a little bit of sleep that night, not much. I drafted legislation to repeal ObamaCare. Probably at the same time, me not knowing it, Congresswoman MICHELE BACHMANN of Minnesota drafted legislation to repeal ObamaCare. We each got our legislation drafts down and they came to us shortly after 9 o'clock that morning, exactly the same 40 words, within 3 minutes of each other, that said we're going to—now, I'm going to do this a little bit in summary, but only 40 words—that this Congress would repeal the act of ObamaCare. And it references the two sections that are the components by number, by bill number, and the last words of that repeal bill is as if it had never been enacted.

So we introduced that legislation, actually separately. I joined on hers and she on mine, and we went to work to get signatures to move the repeal bill. That turned into a discharge petition with 173 signatures on it, and that would be throughout the summer and into the fall of last year that we were getting signatures on the discharge petition.

And Mr. Speaker, you will know that if there's 218 signatures, a majority of the House of Representatives on a discharge petition that represents a bill, that bill bypasses committee, and the Speaker can't block it, and it comes to the floor to be voted up or down without amendment. That's what a discharge petition does.

Well, it took us a long ways down the line of a commitment to repeal ObamaCare, and it was a tool that was used by several, and I'll say many candidates for Congress who now, some of them elected to this Congress, part of the 87 freshmen Republicans, all of whom ran on the repeal of ObamaCare. And I believe, and don't know this, and I've heard no exceptions, but I believe it's also likely that all of them ran on defunding ObamaCare, cutting the funding off, because we knew that a Republican majority here in the House could pass the repeal of ObamaCare, which we did in the second week here, under H.R. 2.

□ 1550

The second highest priority for Speaker BOEHNER was the repeal of ObamaCare. H.R. 1 was funding the government; H.R. 2 was repealing ObamaCare.

That legislation passed the House with a resounding solid bipartisan vote and went over to the Senate, where every Republican in the Senate voted to repeal ObamaCare.

We committed to cutting off the funding to ObamaCare, and that's the next step. And I said, since last July at least, to cut off all the funding to ObamaCare in every appropriations bill that comes out of the House of Representatives.

Well, H.R. 1 was the single piece of legislation where we had the maximum amount of leverage. That is the funding for the duration of the year for all of the functions of government.

We learned sometime last year that there were automatic appropriations

deceptively, I believe, written into ObamaCare that are designed to create this perpetual money machine that funds the implementation of ObamaCare. Some call it mandatory spending. I do not. I call it automatic spending. There is automatic spending in ObamaCare written into it. And the number is still on my hand in Sarah Palin fashion, $105.5 billion automatically appropriated, spent in an authorization bill completely outside of regular order of this Congress, with a handful of exceptions, in short term and few dollars. But in scope and in magnitude, no one has ever tried, no one has ever had the audacity to try to impose an automatic appropriation on this Congress that would be $105 billion.

Some of that money goes beyond that. That is just 10 years. Some of it is appropriated, Mr. Speaker, in perpetuity; $1 billion a year here and $1 billion there that goes on every year that can't be stopped unless Congress goes in and shuts it off. And that is what we need to do, Mr. Speaker. We need to do this in every bill.

This continuing resolution that is before us now must include within it the language that cuts off the funding to ObamaCare, the current and the previous, the language that cuts off the automatic spending in ObamaCare.

There is $18.6 billion for fiscal year 2010, most of it not spent yet, that implements ObamaCare, $18.6 billion of the $105.5 billion, and there is another $4.95 billion in 2011 that automatically appropriates to ObamaCare. That is $23.6 billion, Mr. Speaker, that goes in to kick ObamaCare in. It has been found unconstitutional by two Federal courts, and it has been rejected by the American people who sent 87 freshmen Republicans here to repeal ObamaCare, and we are sitting here looking at $23.6 billion in automatic spending. We are struggling to cut the budget by $61.5 billion. Well, let's do that. But over here is $23.6 billion in automatic spending that goes on.

And if, as I believe, HARRY REID is committed to shutting our government down—and by the way, the majority leader in the United States Senate speaks, I think, as a proxy for the President. What does the President want here? Well, he wants to delay, or he would be telling HARRY REID to pass something. And I believe HARRY REID wants to delay and then shut down.

They have convinced me that their intention all along was to shut down this government. That is why they agreed to a short-term continuing resolution until March 4, so they could posture themselves to be in a position to force a shutdown of the government. They think that they can blame it on Republicans, and then the public will punish Republicans at the polls.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will submit that is not the way it is and not the way it will be now, because JOHN BOEHNER and ERIC CANTOR's leadership have demonstrated clearly that this majority in this Congress, the Speaker's office, the majority leader's office down the line have three times—H.R. 1, 2-week CR, 3-week CR—demonstrated there are the dollars for the legitimate functions of government. There are the dollars for it. We have provided it three times here, and three times the Senate hasn't moved on anything of their own initiative.

So they have convinced me that their goal all along was to shut down the government. And if I didn't believe that, all I had to do was listen to Senator SCHUMER or Howard Dean or some of the language coming out of Majority Leader REID. I am convinced that they are committed to shutting this government down.

If they do that, we need to say to them: Here are all the resources, again, and no money to implement ObamaCare.

If there is no money to implement ObamaCare but all the money that is necessary for other fiscally responsible, legitimate functions of government and they go in and shut this government down and point their fingers at us, the American people will know differently. They will understand that it always was the strategy to shut the government down by the Democrats in the Senate, and the White House, and that we are committed to keeping it open. But we cannot be allowing the funding to go forward to an unconstitutional taking of American liberty, which is ObamaCare on its face.

It is unconstitutional in four different ways: It is irresponsible; it is unsustainable; it can't be funded; and we can't find the funds to fund it all. It is $2.6 trillion in outlays in the first 10 years.

We must, Mr. Speaker, cut off the automatic funding to ObamaCare, and any funding going forward to ObamaCare let the courts decide. And we decide here in the House of Representatives to draw a line, draw a bright line and stand firm. That all needs to happen in that way.

And history tells us this, Mr. Speaker: That when there was a government shutdown, the argument last time was over spending, most of it within either Medicare or Medicaid. If my memory serves me correctly, it was over $300 billion in cuts. Whether it would be a plus-up or a plus-down from that, you can't take a stand on a money figure. You can't say, I'm going to stand and fight on $300 billion. But if they lower my cuts down to $299 billion, I'm going to be a ''no.'' Or, if they take it up to $301 billion, I will be happier yet. You cannot stand on a principle that is a dollar figure, because whatever you pick it is always going to be on a sliding scale. It is not a principle.

We are standing on $61.25 billion right now. Well, if they lower those cuts down to $61 billion, do we say ''no''? I think that the Democrats on the other side understand that. That is why they have floated this number of $33 billion in cuts. They haven't said whether they were willing to accept it yet.

They got to $33 billion in cuts this way: They took $61.5 billion, divided it by two, and rounded it up to $33 billion. That is how they arrived at the number. There isn't any question in my mind about that. And they want to be able to say, well, we met you halfway and a little more, so you should be happy that we are willing to compromise. To them, compromise is: Take the number, cut it in half, and then, if you can't get agreement, cut it in half again. And they call it compromise.

Well, I have said money itself is not a principle. You can't stand on something strongly unless you are standing on a principle. Well, a principle is an unconstitutional 2,600-page taking of American liberty, the nationalization of our skin and everything inside it called ObamaCare. That is a principle.

It is completely unsuitable for an American people that live with the liberty and freedom that God gave us, that our Founding Fathers so well articulated in the Declaration and in the Constitution, that is part of our tradition, part of our history, and part of the inspiration for the entire globe to be knocking on the door wanting to come to the United States of America. Because of what? Liberty, Mr. Speaker, listed out in the Bill of Rights: Freedom of speech, religion, and the press. Freedom to peaceably assemble, and petition the government for redress of grievances. The Second Amendment, to keep and bear arms. The right to own property. Protection from double jeopardy. To be tried by a jury of your peers. The philosophy of Federalism that devolves the powers down to the States or the people respectively. All of this and going on. Equal protection under the law and the 14th Amendment. On and on and on.

These are the inspirations for a vigorous people, a people that have a belief and a common cause and a common culture, a cultural continuity of belief in our liberty.

And they would impose us, what? Socialized medicine? A Federal taking of our right to manage our own health care? And part of that management would be to buy a health insurance policy that is driven by the marketplace that people demand and want? That would have any of the bells and whistles that the market demands and have every bell and whistle that the market demands, and should not have mandates imposed on it by the Federal Government that are imposed within the States.

People should be able to buy their own health insurance policy across State lines. The protection for the monopolies of State health insurance companies is anti-market, it is anti-free market, it is anti-freedom. And John Shadegg's bill that he pushed so hard while he was here needs to be something that goes to the President's desk, that allows people to buy insurance across State lines; so that a

young man 23 years old paying $6,000 a year for a typical policy in New Jersey, laden with mandates, could instead go buy that typical policy in Kentucky for not $6,000 but $1,000. Doesn't that help our costs? Doesn't that get more people insured? Doesn't that do the right thing and protect people?

That is just one. I could take you down through a list of seven or eight or nine good solid Republican ideas, most, if not all, of which can come to this floor as standalone pieces of legislation and be sent over to the Senate, where HARRY REID would push them off his desk into the trash can. They wouldn't have the respect of going in his desk drawer.

□ 1600

Why? Because they are liberty oriented; they are free market oriented; they are constitutional; they are principled, and it gives people back their liberty.

But this country, the United States of America, this vigorous people that we are, we have a vitality that is unique. We have all of the vitality that comes from the rights that I have talked about. We have the vitality of the free enterprise system, which is the foundation of our economic system.

I would point out that there are flashcards that newly arriving immigrants, or those, I should say, that are studying for their citizenship test, mostly that is 5 years in, studying for their citizenship test, flashcards. On one side it will say, Who is the father of our country? You snap it over, it says, George Washington. Next card, Who emancipated the slaves? Snap that card over, Abraham Lincoln. Next card, What is the economic system of the United States of America? Free enterprise capitalism. That is an axiom of faith of the American people, that we are free to spend our money as we choose.

ObamaCare commandeers our paycheck, Mr. Speaker. It takes it over. And they say you must buy this health insurance policy that is approved or produced by the Federal Government, and if you don't do that, we are going to send the IRS in to punish you, to fine you. It is a punishment if you don't buy it.

If they can pass a law that requires you to buy a product that is produced or approved by the Federal Government, if they can commandeer 5 percent or 10 percent, or in many cases 25 or 40 or even 50 percent of your payroll to pay for a health insurance premium, if they can commandeer any part of your earnings and force you to buy something, the next step is they can commandeer your money to buy a General Motors car because their investment may not be doing so well, or a Chrysler. Or maybe you could buy some shares of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. They took that over, too, didn't they? Maybe they can force you to invest in the student loan program. They took that over, too, didn't they? They could force you to buy a certain kind of washing machine, a certain kind of shoes. And they can also force you, at that point, you have to buy so much diet pop instead of non-diet pop, so many ratios of carrots versus candy bars.

If they can commandeer 1 percent of your paycheck and force you to buy a product, they can commandeer 100 percent of your paycheck and force you to buy all products, to the point where you are enslaved by the Federal Government. How can that be constitutional for a free people?

Mr. Speaker, I will submit it is not and it cannot be, and that is why this House voted resoundingly to repeal ObamaCare. That is why every Republican here and in the Senate voted to repeal ObamaCare. That is why we must cut off all funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare in every appropriations bill, and that is why they deceptively plugged into ObamaCare the automatic appropriations of $105.5 billion, and that is why they front-loaded it with $18.6 billion in the FY 2010 budget to intensively implement ObamaCare, and that is why there is another $4.59 billion in this fiscal year. There is $23.6 billion sitting there in the pot.

And think of this, Mr. Speaker. If they are successful in forcing a shutdown of this government, and while they are busily trying to point their fingers at those of us who provide the resources to keep it open, we would still see $23.6 billion hard at work implementing ObamaCare. The lights could go off in Federal offices all over America because of a shutdown, but you could drive down and look at where the lights are on. Guess what? That is the $23.6 billion still there, still implementing ObamaCare, like Santa's little elves, making sure we have socialized medicine before the lights come back on.

That is what we are faced with, Mr. Speaker. That is where we must draw a line. We must stand and do this fight. The fight is inevitable. So choose the ground when the army is the strongest and on the ground that we can stand and fight on, and that is this: Provide the resources for the legitimate functions of this government, not for the illegitimate functions of this government. And if the President of the United States working through his mouthpiece, HARRY REID, or directly brings about a shutdown, it will be about a bright line between all of the legitimate functions of government versus perhaps a legislative tantrum, an act of audacity and narcissism that his signature piece of legislation called ObamaCare means more to the President of the United States than all of the functions of government put together, Mr. Speaker.

For all those reasons, I say, this is the week to draw the line. This is the week to do the fight. This is the week to do the battle. We have to have it. We can't avoid it. Let's get it over with so we can get on with the legitimate functions of the United States Government.

TRIBUTE TO GERALDINE FERRARO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a good friend and a former colleague who passed away this past week, a true trailblazer, former Congresswoman Geraldine Ferraro. She is one of the few people in history who can lay claim to being a first. She was the first woman to be nominated for Vice President on a major ticket and also the first Italian American to achieve that honor. She was a leader, an advocate, a devoted public servant and beloved family member. I am also honored, most of all, to have been able to call her a friend.

The history that has unfolded after she stood on the stage in San Francisco in 1984 to accept her party's nomination for Vice President has happened thanks to her taking those first steps. I remember being there at the convention in San Francisco in 1984 and how proud we were that one of our own, a New Yorker, Gerry Ferraro, was being nominated as Vice President. At the same time, our Governor at the time, another New Yorker, Mario Cuomo, gave the keynote address at that convention.

Since that time, of course, another woman has appeared on the ballot of a major party for Vice President and another came within a handful of delegates of becoming the first Presidential nominee. Strong women in politics and business are not the exception any longer; they are mainstream. As Gerry declared in San Francisco, ''I stand before you to proclaim tonight: America is the land where dreams can come true for all of us.''

Gerry grew up, as I did, in New York City and went into teaching before going to law school, as I did, and grew up in the South Bronx as a young person, as I did as well. She headed the new Special Victims Bureau of the Queens County District Attorney's Office and was a Queens criminal prosecutor before being elected to the House of Representatives in 1978.

While serving in the House, she created a flex-time program for public employees which has become the basis of such programs in the private sector. She also successfully sponsored the Women's Economic Equality Act, which ended pension discrimination against women, provided job options for displaced homemakers, and enabled homemakers to open IRAs.

When I think of Gerry Ferraro, I think of her as a typical representative of the middle class in New York's outer boroughs. She had a certain kind of combination of street smarts and book smarts and a certain kind of sense and moxie, knowing how to get ahead and what to say.

We are all better off, no question, America is a better place, because of the accomplishments of Gerry Ferraro. Women from coast to coast are better off because of her. But all Americans, women or not, are better off because of what she did. She took those first steps in 1984 when she was nominated. Sixty-four years after women won the right to vote, a woman had removed the ''men only'' sign from the White House door.

I thought it would be good at this point to read some of the things that The New York Times had mentioned about the highlights of Gerry Ferraro.

She was considered very ideal for television: a down-to-earth, streaked blond, peanut butter sandwich making mother whose personal story resonated powerfully. Brought up by a single mother who had crocheted beads on wedding dresses to send her daughter to good schools, Ms. Ferraro had waited until her own children were school-aged before going to work in the Queens District Attorney's Office.

In the 1984 race, many Americans found her breezy style refreshing. ''What are you—crazy?'' was one of her familiar expressions. She might break into a little dance behind the speaker's platform when she liked the introductory music.

Gerry Ferraro, Geraldine Anne Ferraro, was born on August 26, 1935, in the Hudson River city of Newburgh, New York, where she was the fourth child and only daughter of Dominick Ferraro, an Italian immigrant who owned a restaurant and a five-and-dime store, and the former Antonetta L. Corrieri. One brother died shortly after birth, and another, Gerard, died in an automobile accident when he was 3, 2 years before Geraldine was born.

□ 1610

Geraldine was born at home. Her mother, who had been holding Gerard at the time of the crash, and who had washed and pressed his clothes for months after his death, would not go to the hospital for the delivery and leave the third brother, Carl, at home. Geraldine was named for Gerard, but in her book, ''Framing a Life: A Family Memoir,'' written with Catherine Whitney, Ms. Ferraro said her mother had emphasized that she was not taking his place. ''Gerry is special,'' she quoted her mother as saying, ''because she is a girl.''

Her mother soon sold the store and the families' house and moved to the South Bronx. With the proceeds from the sale of the property in Italy that her husband had left her, she sent Geraldine to the Marymount School, a Catholic boarding school in Tarrytown, New York. She sent Carl to military school. Tarrytown, New York, is part of my district.

Ms. Ferraro's outstanding grades earned her a scholarship to Marymount College in Tarrytown, from which she transferred to the school's Manhattan branch. She commuted there from Queens, where her mother had moved by then. An English major, Ms. Ferraro was editor of the school newspaper and an athlete and won numerous honors before graduating in 1956. ''Delights in the unexpected,'' the yearbook said about her.

After graduating, Ms. Ferraro got a job teaching in a public grade school in Queens. She later applied to Fordham Law School, where an admissions officer warned her that she might be taking a man's place. Admitted to its night school, she was one of only two women in a class of 179, and received her law degree in 1960.

Ms. Ferraro and John Zacarro, whose family was in the real estate business, were married on July 16, 1960, 2 days after she passed the bar exam. She was admitted to the New York State Bar in 1961, and decided to keep her maiden name professionally to honor her mother. She was admitted to the United States Supreme Court Bar in 1978.

For the first 13 years of her marriage, Ms. Ferraro devoted herself mainly to her growing family. Donna was born in 1962, John in 1964, and Laura in 1966. Ms. Ferraro did some legal work for her husband's business, worked pro bono for women in family court, and dabbed in local politics. In 1970, she was elected president of the Queens County Women's Bar Association. In 1973, after her cousin Nicholas Ferraro was elected Queens District Attorney, she applied for and got a job as an assistant district attorney in charge of a special victims bureau investigating rape, crimes against the elderly, and child and wife abuse. The cases were so harrowing, she later wrote, that they caused her to develop an ulcer, and the crime-breeding societal conditions she said, planted the seeds of her liberalism.

When she was elected to the House, she became very good friends with Tip O'Neill, who was the Speaker. Ms. Ferraro found her opportunity in 1978 to run for Congress when James Delaney, a Democratic Congressman from a predominantly working class district in Queens, announced his retirement. In the House, Ms. Ferraro was on the Public Works and Transportation Committee, and in doing that she successfully pushed for improved mass transit around LaGuardia Airport. Tip O'Neill, the Speaker, took an immediate liking to her, and in her three terms she voted mostly with the party's leadership.

She was elected secretary of the Democratic Caucus, thanks in part to Tip O'Neill, giving her influence on committee assignments, and in 1983 she was awarded a seat on the House Budget Committee. It was Ms. Ferraro's appointment as chairwoman of the 1984 Democratic Platform Committee that gave her the most prominence. In her book, ''Ferraro: My Story,'' she said that in becoming the first woman to hold that post she owed much to a group of Democratic women, congressional staffers, rights activists, labor leaders, and other who called themselves Team A and who lobbied for her appointment.

When she was running there were a lot of slights, being the first woman. People were either adjusting or not adjusting to a woman on a national ticket. Mississippi Agriculture Secretary called Ms. Ferraro, ''young lady,'' and asked if she could bake blueberry muffins, to which she said, Yes, I can. Can you?

Gerry Ferraro always had a smile and always had a kind word and never said no to someone needing her help. Even though I came to the House 4 years after she left, I got to know her very well and truly feel a loss in having her pass away.

Near the end of 1998, she learned that she had multiple myeloma—bone marrow cancer—that suppresses the immune system. Before then, she was Ambassador to the United States Human Rights Commission during the Clinton administration. And we remember her as cohost of the CNN program ''Crossfire'' from 1996 to 1998. She wrote books and articles and did business consulting. She addressed her place in history in a long letter to the Times in 1988, noting that women wrote to her about how she had inspired them to take on challenges, always adding a version of ''I decided if you could do it, I can too.'' Schoolgirls, she said, told her they hoped to be President some day, and needed advice.

Gerry Ferraro said, ''I'm the first to admit that were I not a woman, I would not have been the vice presidential nominee. But she insisted that her presence on the ticket had translated into votes that the ticket might otherwise not have received. In any event, she said the political realities of 1984 had made it all but impossible for the Democrats to win that year, no matter what the candidates or their gender. ''Throwing Ronald Reagan out of office at the height of his popularity, with inflation and interest rates down, the economic moving, and the country at peace, would have required God on the ticket,'' Ms. Ferraro wrote. ''And she was not available.''

Geraldine Ferraro is survived by her husband, three children, and eight grandchildren. I must say that I was disappointed that in the House we didn't have a plane to take all the Members to the funeral yesterday. I'm sorry about that because, frankly, I think it was a bit disrespectful. But we all remember Gerry Ferraro. We remember her as a true New Yorker. We remember her as a true American. We remember her as someone who each of us she inspired to push on with whatever goal we want to achieve, no matter how daunting or impossible it looked. That's how I'll remember Gerry Ferraro. I'll remember her at the 1984 convention standing on the stage with Walter Mondale, both putting their arms around each other, and even then there was a question about how they

would interact, as it was the first time a woman was on a national ticket.

I will miss my friend Gerry. We will all miss her. But we are all better people because of her. Rest in peace, Gerry. We will always remember you. And so will the history books.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a while ago, one of my colleagues was down here talking about ObamaCare and what a problem it was going to cause for this country from a financial standpoint as well as causing rationing of health care and a whole host of other things. But what I want to do right now is bring to the attention of my colleagues and anybody else that's paying attention a decision that was just made by U.S. District Judge Rosemary Collyer that affects everybody on Social Security who wants to have a health care plan besides Medicare.

I'm going to read you an op-ed that just was in the Washington Examiner and also in The Wall Street Journal that I think every single American ought to be aware of because this has wide-ranging impact on everybody in this country. Here's what it says. ''A recent court ruling has helped President Obama push ahead with a mandate that all citizens be required to have government health care. This court ruling would mandate that every citizen in this country has government health care.'' Socialized medicine.

''In a March 16 decision, U.S. District Judge Rosemary Collyer, who previously served as General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, ruled that seniors who elect to opt out of Medicare coverage must forfeit their Social Security benefits as well and repay all past Social Security benefits prior to opting out.''

I hope everybody is getting that in their offices. If you don't take Medicare coverage and you're a senior and you opt out of Medicare coverage because you want another form of health care, maybe a better form of health care, then you have got to lose your Social Security payments and pay back all the Social Security payments that you received in the past.

□ 1620

Now, anybody who is paying attention is going to say, ''You know, that didn't really happen,'' but I'm telling you that decision was made on March 16 by Judge Rosemary Collyer, a U.S. district judge here in this area.

The ruling relates to a lawsuit that was filed in 2008 in—and this is the name of the case—Hall v. Sebelius. Several senior citizens challenged a 1993 Clinton administration program rule, and they sued the Federal Government for their right to opt out of Medicare without losing their Social Security benefits. The plaintiffs all paid their Medicare taxes throughout their employment histories and did not request reimbursement of the money.

So they'd paid into Medicare for the entire time that they'd been working. These individuals simply wished to engage other health insurance plans. They wanted to get some other health insurance plans besides Medicare. They'd paid into Medicare and they'd paid into Social Security, but they wanted to get other health insurance besides Medicare.

It goes on to say that they believed it would provide better coverage than that of the government's Medicare program.

In addition, these seniors contributed to Social Security while they were working, and accepted these benefits upon retirement. Now, here is what the seniors' lawsuit argued:

Both the Social Security and Medicare acts state that the application for Social Security benefits and Medicare are voluntary and that applications for each program are not dependent upon each other. Forced participation in Medicare violates an individual's constitutional right to privacy. The Clinton-era rules were promulgated without undergoing the required notice and comment rulemaking requirements, which is a violation of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act.

The judge stated that, in its arguments, the Obama administration ''extols the benefits of Medicare and suggests that plaintiffs would agree that they are not truly injured if they were to learn more about Medicare, perhaps through discovery.'' Note the familiar condescending Obama administration tone: Take the Medicare, and then find out what's in it. You'll like it when you do.

We had that problem before on legislation. You'll remember the previous Speaker of the House. When asked about ObamaCare, she said, Well, we've got to pass the bill. Then we'll find out what's in it.

That really made a lot of sense—but once again, this is pretty much the attitude of the administration.

Here is what the judge went on to say:

''The parties use a lot of ink disputing whether plaintiffs' desire to avoid Medicare part A is sensible.''

Translation: If Americans don't want government-run health care, well, they just don't have much sense. After all, the government knows what's best for them, and they don't.

What is most astounding about this case is that, as of late 2009, this same judge, Judge Collyer, supported the plaintiffs' claim and even refused the Obama administration's request to dismiss the suit. Her ruling then was that neither the statute nor the regulation specifies that plaintiffs must withdraw from Social Security and repay retirement benefits in order to withdraw from Medicare, which means simply that, if they decide not to take Medicare, they can continue to get their Social Security that they paid into, as they should, and they wouldn't have to pay back the Social Security benefits they'd received in the past. That makes sense.

She changed her mind. This judge made this ruling in 2009. Now she changes her mind, and she argues in her stunning reversal, ''Requiring a mechanism for plaintiffs and others in their situation to 'dis-enroll' would be contrary to congressional intent, which was to provide 'mandatory' benefits under Medicare part A and for those receiving Social Security retirement benefits. Plaintiffs are trapped in a government program intended for their benefit. They disagree and wish to escape,'' Collyer wrote. ''The court can find no loophole or requirement that the Secretary provide such a pathway.''

According to Collyer, an ''entitlement'' is mandatory. You have to take it. Now, here is the government saying you have to take Medicare, and her opinion will undoubtedly be relied upon by the Obama administration as support for claims of mandatory entitlements, such as that which is the crux of ObamaCare, which could be Medicare for everyone. Everyone would have to be covered, not by their own individual health care plans that they have or by their employers' health care plans or a group plan they're on, but everyone would have to be covered by Medicare, which is a government-run, socialized medicine approach, which ultimately would ration health care and cost a great deal more. ObamaCare, when you run it out for 10 years, you'll find is going to cost literally trillions of dollars at a time when we have a $14 trillion national debt. This year alone, we're exceeding our revenues by $1.4 trillion.

The Wall Street Journal reported that Kent Masterson Brown, the lead attorney for the seniors, commented that, if Americans wonder how bureaucrats will write ObamaCare's rules, they need look only to this ruling. ''When they do,'' he said, ''they will realize nothing will be optional.''

This is an alarming decision that came about in a disturbing manner. Collyer's ruling is a danger to freedom-loving Americans. Let's look to the plaintiffs' appeal—they're appealing—to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals for more favorable results.

That's where we are today. If she is not reversed, that means anybody who gets Social Security, who may have another health care plan and who may not want to be on Medicare, will either have to take Medicare or will have to pay all their Social Security benefits back; plus, they don't get Social Security in the future.

Now think about that. You don't want to take Medicare for whatever reason, and you've been paying into Social Security all of your life. You're

getting Social Security benefits, and because you won't take Medicare, they say, Uh-oh. You've got to pay all your Social Security benefits back to when you received them, and you can't get any more in the future.

That is just absolutely crazy.

I want to read to you some information that I have from the actual wording of the statute, and this is very, very important because it can only be interpreted one way. Yet this judge and the Obama administration are changing it so that it will fit their desired objective. Let me read this to you. Be patient with me while I read this and get all the information before me.

Here is what the Medicare statute says. My colleagues in your offices, see if you get from this that the people have to take Medicare if they're getting Social Security or if they have to pay the payments back and not get any more of their Social Security benefits. Here is what the Medicare statute says:

The Medicare statute provides that only individuals who are entitled—entitled—to Social Security are entitled to Medicare. If you're ''entitled'' to Social Security. You have to be entitled to Social Security in order to be entitled to Medicare, but it does not say if you're entitled to Social Security that you have to take Medicare. It only says, if you're entitled to Social Security, you're entitled, if you want to, to take Medicare.

This judge is changing the words that are in the statute to mean, if you take Social Security, you have to take Medicare; but the law does not say that. She is making law on the Federal bench, but that's not what our Founders contemplated when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Listen to this again: The Medicare statute says that only individuals who are entitled to Social Security are entitled to Medicare.

Therefore, the judge is arguing the only way to avoid entitlement to Medicare part A at age 65 is to forgo the source of that entitlement, i.e., Social Security retirement benefits. So she is standing the law of the country, the Medicare law and the Social Security law, on their heads. This will mean to every single citizen of this country that, if the government says, ''Here is something we want you to do. If you don't do it, we're going to take away another benefit you have or another government program,'' you will have to do it, because that's what this judge's ruling simply means.

□ 1630

If the government is giving you a benefit like Social Security and they decide that there's another benefit that you're entitled to, then say you have to take it, but you don't take it, they will be able to withdraw your Social Security and say you have to pay back all of the benefits of the past. This is absolutely insane. It is government run amuck, government run out of control.

And this judge, if I had the ability, would be fired. I can't remember the exact date, but in 2008 she ruled in favor of the plaintiffs saying if you have got Social Security and you don't want Medicare because you have got another health care plan, you don't have to take it; and now she's reversed herself and said if you get Social Security, you have to take Medicare.

And once again, before I give up the floor, Mr. Speaker—and I see my good friend's here, I'm going to yield to you the balance of my time—this is what the law says: the law says that only individuals who are entitled to Social Security are entitled to Medicare. But that does not say if you're entitled to Social Security you have to take Medicare, and she's saying—and I hope everybody's getting this—she's saying that if you're getting Social Security, you have to take Medicare. You've got another health plan, if your employer has another health plan, doesn't matter; you've got to get rid of those, and you have to join Medicare or you lose your benefits.

Now, this case is on appeal, and I hope it goes all the way to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court will reverse it because, if it does not repeal this decision by Judge Collier, then what's going to happen is that everything that government says will have to be done, and you will have almost complete government control over every aspect of our life. If they can say you get Social Security, you've got to take Medicare and if you have got a separate health care plan, to heck with it; and if they can go far enough to say that, they can say anything they want to to make you jump through a hoop. And that is just dead wrong, and it flies in the face of everything that we believe as far as the free people and a free government is concerned.

I just can't believe some of the things that are happening around here; and the thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is the American people who are involved in so many things that they can't pay attention to all the things that are going on. They rely upon their elected Representatives because we have a democratic Republic to study these bills and make decisions that are best for the entire country. And that's the reason they do this, because we've got 300 million people here, and they can't read every bill or watch every court decision.

But the fact of the matter is, these courts, a separate part of our government, our Forefathers said we've got a judicial branch, a legislative branch, and an executive branch, and they're supposed to be coequal. But here you have a Federal judge making a law that will transcend laws that we have on the books and change the way of life for every single American.

Remember what this does. The law says if you're getting Social Security, you may take Medicare, and what the judge is saying, if you get Social Security, you have to take Medicare, no matter what other health care plan you have; and if you don't do what the government tells you, you have to do it, then you're going to lose your Social Security benefits; and not only that, you have to pay back, probably with interest, every Social Security check you received.

That is horrible. This administration and this judge ought to be taken to task for it; and with that, I'd like to yield to my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my good friend for yielding.

You know, we hear so often from this administration they're concerned about the little guy, but we know that Wall Street executives gave contributions four times more for the present President than they did for his Republican opponent; and so it kind of tells you where you see where the contributions come from for a particular candidate, who they really care about.

We're told that they really care about the working poor; and yet the very thing we're talking about under the ObamaCare bill is almost inconceivable except that it was pushed through by this President and two Democratic majorities, that there's a provision that if you are just above the poverty line and you can't afford the health insurance that this administration dictates—as I understand, we will be including pregnancy, say you're a young single person, no plans of getting pregnant, no ability to get pregnant, other things that will not affect you at all but have been mandated by the administration—instead of being able to buy a cheaper insurance policy you can afford, this administration will have made it so expensive that people just above the poverty line won't be able to afford it.

And how the bill deals with those working poor just above the poverty line, it requires a 2 percent additional income tax if you cannot afford the insurance that they mandate.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Can I just say one thing. My colleague, a good friend of mine, Representative GOHMERT points out the fallacy and the problems with the ObamaCare bill, and that is bad, very bad and it should not be in law, and that's why we moved H.R. 1 to repeal it.

But this decision that I was talking about, LOUIE, even goes further than that. It says if you're getting Social Security, you have to take Medicare, and what they're doing is they're saying everybody in this country is ultimately going to have to be under a government-run program, Medicare or ObamaCare, which means socialized medicine and an entirely different approach to medicine which will be controlled by government bureaucrats.

Mr. GOHMERT. I understood where my friend was going, and I had not heard about that opinion, and I'm so glad the smart gentleman had brought that to our attention because that is

just incredible except that it is exactly what the Democratic proponents of ObamaCare and the President himself had said before they wanted to get to.

The goal was to use this to get to a complete government-run health care, a single-payer system, where everybody is required to be under it, and so this decision speeds that process up dramatically; but it is ultimately where they said they wanted to get anyway.

Now, having seen socialized medicine firsthand in the Soviet Union as an exchange student back in 1973, and having seen another form of socialized medicine for 4 years in the United States Army, I don't want to go there. I don't want the government in charge of my health care. I saw that in the Army. We have some incredible medics. We have some folks that shouldn't be practicing medicine that were working there; and, in fact, I'm hopeful that I was helpful in getting rid of some of those.

But that's not where we need to be going. People deserve better. But the fact is that in the bill itself there is retribution for the working poor who can't even afford to do what the administration has dictated.

So between a judge saying if you've got Social Security, you're going to be crammed into this policy, and this administration and former Speaker PELOSI and HARRY REID saying that we're going to penalize you because you're working poor and can't afford the luxuries of the policy we're mandating, the working guy just doesn't have much of a chance unless we are able to turn some of those things around.

And the working poor is what I often saw at Ft. Benning when people were not getting paid what they should have under President Carter; but now the military is paid better, and yet I wanted to bring up the situation that exists. There is an attempt to use the military as pawns even while they're out there fighting to protect us in foreign areas, combat theaters. The last thing those people should have to worry about is whether or not their money arrives in their account so their family can be taken care of. Yet we're hearing from military people, they understand if there's a shutdown, sure, they will get their pay eventually when the shutdown is over and maybe they will be lucky and HARRY REID and the Democrats in the Senate won't force a shutdown for very long.

□ 1640

We know they want to force it because they keep saying they do. And of course we heard from Senator SCHUMER himself that this is a political game to them. They are going to force a shutdown and basically blame the tea party. The military are the ones who are going to get hurt there. This from the Democratic Party that says all they care about is those working to protect us; and yet when you see what they are really doing behind the scenes, it is no such thing.

We have a report from CRS here that says: ''Even though uniformed personnel have been excepted from furloughs during a lapse in funding, no special provision allows the Defense Department to provide pay when appropriated funds are not available to do so. In this regard, uniformed personnel are treated no differently than excepted civilian Federal employees who are similarly expected to continue working during a shutdown but whose pay will be delayed until appropriations are enacted.''

Well, I know my friend from Indiana feels, as I do—and we've got, I don't know, around 50 other people just in a matter of an hour or so that have signed on to this bill, H.R. 1297, that says—and I will get over right to the meat of this thing—it says, During a funding gap impacting the Armed Forces, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in the case of the Coast Guard, out of any amounts in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in the case of the Coast Guard, determines to be necessary to continue to provide pay and allowances without interruption to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including Reserve components thereof who perform active service during the funding gap.''

So we hope that the majority leader in the Senate, HARRY REID, and Senator SCHUMER and those who have been saying privately, which got exposed—like the Bible says, What's done in the dark will be exposed, and it has been. They are out to shut down the government, try to blame the tea party.

And they have expected that one of the things they will, I'm sure, be able to do is have the ''lamestream media'' that run out and try to do anything they can to support that party go try to find spouses of military in harm's way who are scared to death because now the government has been shut down and there is no check coming for the next pay period. This will address that, and we can take our military off the table as pawns and let them be about concentrating on protecting us and saving their own lives.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I'm sorry to interrupt you, LOUIE, but one thing I think that my colleagues and anybody that is paying attention ought to know is, first of all, I have heard that the Republicans don't have an alternative health care plan. We've had one for 2 years, and the media keeps saying that we haven't provided an alternative. We do, one that will work and won't cost the taxpayers and the future generations almost everything that they will ever expect to earn. That's number one.

The other thing that concerns me is that the administration and now their complicit persons in the court and the media are trying to do everything they can to move this country in a direction that nobody has ever anticipated and that is complete government control over our lives. And I know that you and all of our colleagues from this side of the aisle are very committed to making sure that doesn't happen.

The last thing I would like to say is, we need to cut government spending. You know this. And we're sending legislation over there to try to cut $100 billion or $61 billion out of this year's spending, $61 billion. The projected deficit this year is $1.4 trillion, so $61 billion is a drop in the ocean. It's nothing. Yet they don't want to cut anything or any programs. And if we don't cut spending, this country will not only be bankrupt, but we'll be giving a legacy to our kids and grandkids that they will never forgive us for.

So I just hope my colleagues are really aware of that. We don't want to shut the government down. We are committed to cutting spending. They are the ones that, when we send a spending cut over there, won't let the bill pass; and we're cutting in a responsible way. So they're the ones that are causing the problem. We do not want the government shut down.

Mr. GOHMERT. One of the things that is being said is, But what about the children? I welcome that question, because those of us who are standing so firmly in trying to cut this runaway spending are the ones who are standing for the children and the children's grandchildren because what has been done—and in truth, I remember getting beat up in '05, '06 for $160 billion in deficit spending. It was wrong. We shouldn't have been there. But now for the last 3 years, 2½, to be over a trillion dollars each year is just reprehensible. It is wrapping such a heavy weight and chains around the necks of the children—some not even born yet—that it is unthinkable that somebody would invoke for the children to keep the self-aggrandizing spending going when it is going to come out of the children and their grandchildren's pockets.

We've got some that say, It's all going to work out. Don't worry about it. Look, just let the spending go. Don't rock the boat.

I saw this prayer from Peter Marshall back when he was Chaplain of the Senate. And just for historical purposes, in one of his prayers in the Senate, he said, ''Our Father, give us the faith to believe that it is possible for us to live victoriously even in the midst of dangerous opportunity that we call crisis. Help us to see that there is something better than patient endurance or keeping a stiff upper lip, and that whistling in the dark is not really bravery.''

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my colleague for coming down to the floor.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GERLACH (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for Thursday March 31 after 5 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 4, 2011, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information

Gary L. Ackerman, Sandy Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Jason Altmire, Justin Amash, Robert E. Andrews, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Tammy Baldwin, Lou Barletta, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Karen Bass, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Rick Berg, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Mo Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Ann Marie Buerkle, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Francisco ''Quico'' Canseco, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, John C. Carney, Jr., Andre Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Hansen Clarke, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. ''Gerry'' Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Chip Cravaack, Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Mark S. Critz, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Jeff Flake, Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, John Garamendi, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Gabrielle Giffords, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Jane Harman*, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Nan A. S. Hayworth, Joseph J. Heck, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie K. Hirono, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Tim Huelskamp, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Dale E. Kildee, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Larry Kissell, John Kline, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, Jeffrey M. Landry, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher J. Lee*, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Luján, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Connie Mack, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Carolyn McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Mick Mulvaney, Christopher S. Murphy, Tim Murphy, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, John W. Olver, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Benjamin Quayle, Mike Quigley, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Silvestre Reyes, Reid J. Ribble, Laura Richardson, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, David Rivera, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter J. Roskam, Dennis Ross, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Robert T. Schilling, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, Tim Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland, Jackie Speier, Cliff Stearns, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott Tipton, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Joe Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Daniel Webster, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Allen B. West, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Frederica Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

964. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the of the Navy, Case Number 10-03, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

965. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received February 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

966. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8196] received February 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

967. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received February 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

968. A letter from the Director, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Amendment to the Bank Secrecy Act Regulations — Reports of Foreign Financial Accounts (RIN: 1506-AB08) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

969. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Minimum Capital (RIN: 2590-AA01) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

970. A letter from the Deputy Director for Operations, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits

received February 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

971. A letter from the Deputy Director for Operations, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

972. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Publicly Available Consumer Product Safety Information Database, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

973. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report to Congress on implementation of the National Correct Coding Initiative in the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

974. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; General and Plastic Surgery Devices; Classification of Contact Cooling System for Aesthetic Use [Docket No.: FDA-2010-D-0645] received March 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

975. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Application of ASTM Standard Practice C1671-07 when performing technical reviews of spent fuel storage and transportation packaging licensing actions received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

976. A letter from the Co-Chairs, Commission on Wartime Contraction in Iraq and Afghanistan, transmitting Special Report 4 ''Iraq — A Forgotten Mission? The United States needs to sustain a diplomatic presence to preserve gains and avoid waste as the U.S. military leaves Iraq''; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

977. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) HIV/AIDS Partnership Framework With the Government of the Republic of South Africa (RSA); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

978. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) HIV/AIDS Partnership Framework With the Government of Botswana; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

979. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting HIV/AIDS Partnership Framework with the Government of the Republic of Namibia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

980. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Determination and Certification under Section 490(b)(1)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act Relating to the Largest Exporting and Importing Countries of Certain Precursor Chemicals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

981. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 102(g) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 1994 and 1995 (Pub. L. 103-236 as amended by 103-415), certification for FY 2010 that no United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

982. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Shreveport, LA; Texarkana, TX; Milwaukee, WI; and Southwestern Wisconsin Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AM28) received March 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

983. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-45 and CF6-50 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0068; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-16580; AD 2011-02-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

984. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1043; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-200-AD; Amendment 39-16593; AD 2011-03-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

985. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0761; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-069-AD; Amendment 39-16598; AD 2011-03-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

986. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-215-1A10 (CL-215), CL-215-6B11 (CL-215T Variant), and CL-215-6B11 (CL-415 Variant) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1108; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-151-AD; Amendment 39-16592; AD 2011-03-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

987. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation (Type Certificate Previously Held by Raytheon Aircraft Company; Beech Aircraft Corporation) Model 400A and 400T Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0954; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-078-AD ; Amendment 39-16596; AD 2011-03-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

988. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701, & 702) Airplanes, Model CL-600-2D15 (Regional Jet Series 705) Airplanes, and Model CL-600-2D24 (Regional Jet Series 900) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1109; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-155-AD; Amendment 39-16597; AD 2011-03-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

989. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4-600 and A300 B4-600R Series Airplanes, Model A300 F4-605R Airplanes, and Model A300 C4-605R Variant F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0801; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-054-AD; Amendment 39-16595; AD 2011-03-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

990. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200 and -300 and A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0852; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-005-AD; Amendment 39-16594; AD 2011-03-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

991. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 767 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0377; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-246-AD; Amendment 39-16599; AD 2011-03-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

992. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Model F.28 Mark 0070 and 0100 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1038; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-250-AD; Amendment 39-16601; AD 2011-04-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

993. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Cessna Aircraft Company Model 750 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1107; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-263-AD; Amendment 39-16600; AD 2011-03-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

994. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1113; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-16603; AD 2011-04-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

995. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A340-200, -300, -500, and -600 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0040; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-185-AD; Amendment 39-16606; AD 2011-04-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

996. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A340-200, -300, -500, and -600 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0039; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-184-AD; Amendment 39-16605; AD 2011-04-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

997. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness

Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Model F.28 Mark 0070 and 0100 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1112; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-051-AD; Amendment 39-16607; AD 2011-04-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

998. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Marine Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Non-Vessel-Operating Common Carrier Negotiated Rate Arrangements [Docket No.: 10-03] (RIN: 3072-AC38) received March 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

999. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Department of Energy FY 2009 Methane Hydrate Program Report to Congress'', pursuant to Section 968 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1000. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hospital and outpatient care for veterans released from incarceration to transitional housing (RIN: 2900-AN41) received February 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1001. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEFAR) HIV/AIDS Partnership Framework with the Government of the Republic of Zambia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 910. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. 112–50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. House Joint Resolution 37. Resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices (Rept. 112–51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1307. A bill to provide that Executive Order 13166 shall have no force or effect, and to prohibit the use of funds for certain purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 1308. A bill to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act to extend the termination date for the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DOLD, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. CAPITO):

H.R. 1309. A bill to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. JONES, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 1310. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain emergency medical devices from the excise tax on medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. POLIS, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1311. A bill to provide for the coverage of medically necessary food under Federal health programs and private health insurance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an increased work opportunity credit with respect to recent veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H.R. 1313. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage investment in certain industries by providing an exclusion from tax on certain gains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 1314. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a global rare earth element assessment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1315. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BONO MACK (for herself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 1316. A bill to direct the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to modify the approval of any drug containing controlled-release oxycodone hydrochloride to limit such approval to use for the relief of severe-only instead of moderate-to-severe pain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 1317. A bill to discontinue Radio Marti and Television Marti broadcasts to Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 1318. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to expand the Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility in Far South Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CHU, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLT, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. STARK, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1319. A bill to promote the sexual and reproductive health of individuals and couples in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1320. A bill to strengthen United States nonproliferation activities and to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to strengthen nuclear energy cooperation and nonproliferation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. FOXX, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 1321. A bill to continue restrictions against and prohibit diplomatic recognition of the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. JONES, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1322. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide protection for company-provided retiree health benefits; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 1323. A bill to require the President to recommend specific reductions in nonsecurity discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2011 to offset the costs of military operations in Libya; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 1324. A bill to eliminate sweetheart deals under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 1325. A bill to require that certain Federal job training and career education programs give a priority to programs that provide an industry recognized and nationally portable credential; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 1326. A bill to underscore the importance of international nuclear safety cooperation for operating power reactors, encouraging the efforts of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, supporting progress in improving nuclear safety, enhancing the public availability of nuclear safety information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. BERG):

H.R. 1327. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PAUL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1328. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of qualified acupuncturist services under part B of the Medicare Program, and to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for coverage of such services under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 1329. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the credit for research activities permanent and to provide an increase in such credit for taxpayers whose gross receipts are predominantly from domestic production activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1330. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1331. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish a system of background checks for employers and employees of the electronic life safety and security system installation and monitoring industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. REYES, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WU, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. PAUL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HELLER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia):

H.R. 1332. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.R. 1333. A bill to establish a Gulf Coast Economic Restoration Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1334. A bill to provide for nuclear weapons abolition and economic conversion in accordance with District of Columbia Initiative Measure Number 37 of 1992, while ensuring environmental restoration and clean-energy conversion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 1335. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 1336. A bill to allow the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to create or save jobs by providing interest relief on certain outstanding disaster loans relating to damage caused by the 2005 Gulf Coast hurricanes or the 2008 Gulf Coast hurricanes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 1337. A bill to support efforts by the Department of State to strengthen the bilateral relationship with Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIRES (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 1338. A bill to improve the efficiency, operation, and security of the national transportation system to move freight by leveraging investments and promoting partnerships that advance interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1339. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, the body of laws of the United States dealing with the National Guard, to recognize the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1340. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act with respect to consumer confidence reports by community water systems; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 197. A resolution electing Members to the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WATT, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DINGELL, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H. Res. 198. A resolution recognizing the coordinated struggle of workers during the 1968 Memphis sanitation workers strike to voice their grievances and reach a collective agreement for rights in the workplace; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Res. 199. A resolution honoring the 29 coal miners who perished in the explosion at the Upper Big Branch Mine in Montcoal, West Virginia, on April 5, 2010, and remembering all those who have lost their lives while mining for the resources on which the United States relies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

7. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 10 memorializing the Congress to adopt legislation prohibiting the EPA from unilaterally regulating greenhouse gas emissions; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

8. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska, relative to House Resolution No. 5 urging the Congress to reauthorize full funding for the program in S. 223; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KING of New York:
H.R. 1307.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4
The Congress shall have Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:
H.R. 1308.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of U.S. Constitution, to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:
H.R. 1309.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. TURNER:
H.R. 1310.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. BALDWIN:
H.R. 1311.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:
H.R. 1312.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. POLIS:
H.R. 1313.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:
H.R. 1314.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. DUFFY:
H.R. 1315.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mrs. BONO MACK:
H.R. 1316.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The authority for enactment of this Bill flows from Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution. The Congress has the right to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. McCOLLUM:
H.R. 1317.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers.''

By Mr. CUELLAR:
H.R. 1318.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Inherent in Congress's powers to raise, support, and maintain armed forces under Clauses 12 and 13 of Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America is the responsibility to provide adequate health care for those who served to protect and defend our country.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:
H.R. 1319.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill, the Global Sexual and Reproductive Health Act, is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BERMAN:
H.R. 1320.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is introduced pursuant to the authority delineated in Article I section 1, which includes an implied power for the Congress to regulate the conduct of the United States with respect to foreign affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:
H.R. 1321.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TIERNEY:
H.R. 1322.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BARTLETT:
H.R. 1323.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1. all legislative Powers are vested in the Congress; and also ArticleI, Section 7: All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House; and also Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect funds to pay the Debts and pay for the common defense of the US; and to raise and support Armies; and provide and maintain a Navy; and Section 9 No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of Appropriations made by Law AND
Article II, Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a POTUS; Article II,Section 2. POTUS is Commander-in-Chief; Section 3; POTUS shall recommend to Congress measures judged necessary and expedient

By Mr. BUCHANAN:
H.R. 1324.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United StatesConstitution.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana:
H.R. 1325.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:
H.R. 1326.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GERLACH:
H.R. 1327.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HINCHEY:
H.R. 1328.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANCE:
H.R. 1329.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:
H.R. 1330.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 1331.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
''The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.''

By Mr. McKEON:
H.R. 1332.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority for the Social Security Fairness Act of 2011 is Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, giving Congress the authority to control the expenditures of the federal government.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:
H.R. 1333.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 1334.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clauses 1 and 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 1335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, and Article I, Section 8, clause 18.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 1336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. I Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. I Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 1337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 1338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 1339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 1, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 1340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 58: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 98: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 104: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 114: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 152: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 177: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 178: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 198: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 237: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 238: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 280: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 282: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 361: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 375: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 401: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 417: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 420: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 421: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 436: Mr. HANNA, Mr. HURT, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 439: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 440: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 451: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 452: Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 459: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 509: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 527: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. REED, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 539: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 546: Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 605: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 615: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 651: Mr. BACA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 656: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 673: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 674: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HECK, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 694: Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 704: Mr. POSEY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 709: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 724: Mr. HOLT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 733: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 735: Mr. HELLER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 745: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 750: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 757: Mr. WEST.

H.R. 765: Mr. HELLER, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 780: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 819: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 841: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 860: Mr. COSTA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 873: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 909: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 910: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BERG, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 930: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 933: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 938: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUSH, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 942: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 948: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 964: Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 998: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 1040: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1057: Mr. POLIS and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1058: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 1066: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1074: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.

H.R. 1081: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1084: Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1091: Mr. WEST and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1093: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1111: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1116: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1119: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1134: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1149: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1155: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1161: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1164: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1175: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1179: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1186: Mr. JONES and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 1187: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1188: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1204: Mr. MORAN, Mr. TONKO, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1206: Mr. PAUL, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 1211: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1212: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1236: Mr. JONES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1250: Mr. OLVER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 1255: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1256: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1259: Mr. JONES and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 1265: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1278: Mr. FATTAH and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1281: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1286: Mr. WEST, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COLE, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. AKIN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HURT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1288: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1297: Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HALL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. WEST, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 13: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. WELCH.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HECK, and Mr. HERGER.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H. Res. 11: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. LYNCH.

H. Res. 25: Mrs. CAPPS and Mrs. MYRICK.

H. Res. 111: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 134: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 137: Mr. COSTELLO and Ms. SUTTON.

H. Res. 152: Mr. CRENSHAW and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 166: Mr. GERLACH.

H. Res. 172: Mr. PETRI.

H. Res. 173: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H. Res. 177: Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 183: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 185: Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. STARK, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. WU, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WOLF, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.