United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 2011 No. 54

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 13, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB WOODALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

RECOGNIZING ALCOHOL AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, this week, during Alcohol Awareness Month, I will introduce what I believe is the next logical step in Federal efforts to prevent underage drinking. My bill, the Reauthorization of the Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking Act, builds on the successful public health efforts of the original bill, better known as the STOP Act.

Since the STOP Act became law in 2006, there have been increased community efforts to address underage drinking as a public health crisis, and we have seen localized improvement in teen drinking statistics.

While these positive results are encouraging, the fact remains alcohol still is the primary drug of choice of our youth. In 2009, about 10.4 million teens aged 12 to 20 reported drinking alcohol in the past month. Of these, approximately 6.9 million were binge drinkers, and 2.1 million were heavy drinkers. Alarmingly, according to the latest publication of the Monitoring the Future survey, 53.7 percent of 12th graders believe drinking five or more alcoholic beverages once or twice each weekend is not a significant risk. These facts leave little doubt about the need to continue Federal underage drinking prevention efforts to educate our society about the dangers of alcohol abuse among our youth.

The STOP Act reauthorization bill will continue the successful programs of the original STOP Act, including the anti-underage drinking national media campaign directed at parents, the coordination of Federal efforts through the interagency council, and the grant program to help communities address underage drinking.

As a result of the recent research, the bill also directs the Institute of Medicine to report on the impact of drinking alcohol on the development of the adolescent brain, and it establishes grants to train pediatric health care providers on how best to screen and treat children and teens who have had alcohol exposures.

Mr. Speaker, continuing the investment of the STOP Act is a cost-effective strategy to reduce the $53 billion annual cost of underage drinking to our Nation. Most importantly, it will reduce the suffering, violence, and death that far too often are caused by underage drinking.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the STOP Act reauthorization bill and keep our country moving forward in addressing this public health crisis facing our youth.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BAY OF PIGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Bay of Pigs operation.

On April 17, 1961, the anticommunist patriots of Brigade 2506 were determined to help their homeland and their loved ones who were living under a repressive regime. Even though the operation was not successful, the dedication and the commitment that these brave individuals illustrated during the conflict was exceptional. During the operation, one hero was asked if he wished to be evacuated, and he said, ''I will never leave this country.'' These individuals showed a strong sense of heroism as they were up against the repressive regime's armed forces.

President Ronald Reagan was a longstanding supporter of individuals taking action to free themselves from oppressive socialist and communist regimes. When referring to the Bay of Pigs, President Reagan stated, ''By supporting courageous freedom fighters around the world, we're shining a light on the path out from communism.''

These heroes reached the beaches of Playa Giron to fight against communism in Cuba that was being supported by the Soviet Union during the Cold War. The evil empire made a strong push into Cuba that became a national security threat to the United States.

A strong Soviet Union presence in Cuba led to the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Printed on recycled paper.

The intrusion cemented the dangers of the Soviet Union having very close ties to the Cuban regime. Democracy and liberty of the people in the Western Hemisphere were in severe jeopardy as the communist forces were looking to expand their control. But the will of freedom-loving people who seek a better future will not be deterred by the evils and the power of communism. The protection of human rights and freedom of expression are fundamental necessities under a free society.

As the spread of communism crumbled during the Cold War, democracies throughout the Western Hemisphere flourished in open societies. However, the United States must remain vigilant that history does not repeat itself.

At this moment, Russia is currently infiltrating the Western Hemisphere by joining forces with antidemocratic tyrants such as Chavez, Ortega, and Morales. Recently, reports have indicated that Russia has sold $15 billion worth of weapons and military equipment to Chavez. In addition, senior Russian military officials have mentioned the possibility of establishing refueling bases for Russian bombers in Cuba. Russian activities in the Western Hemisphere raise serious concerns as they are arming rogue regimes that are counter to the interests and the security of our beloved Nation.

The veterans of the Bay of Pigs symbolized this struggle between communism and freedom. The brave Brigade 2506 patriots decided to risk their very lives in order to liberate an oppressed society. These men fought courageously on that historic day. They came from many backgrounds, but all of them cared about freedom and liberty for the people of Cuba.

Even though the Bay of Pigs operation was not successful, their call to serve rose again to protect our Nation from enemies abroad. Many of these veterans continued to serve the United States by joining our Armed Forces and fighting with honor during the Vietnam War.

I would like to acknowledge all individuals who consistently are working toward fulfilling the dreams of a free Cuba, which is the dream of the veterans of Brigade 2506 who aspired and fought for a free and democratic Cuba.

I would also like to recognize the veterans of the Bay of Pigs who are with us today in the gallery. Gentlemen, thank you very much for your sacrifice and your commitment for a free Cuba and a strong United States.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members not to bring attention to occupants of the gallery.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF LANCE CORPORAL HARRY LEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Harry Lew.

Harry Lew was a marine serving the mission of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. Freedom, however, does not come without a price. Harry Lew died in Afghanistan on Sunday, April 3, 2011. He was 21 years old. He was the son of Sandy and Allen Lew, the brother of Carmen Lew, and he was my nephew.

Lance Corporal Harry Lew died while serving on watch duty in Helmand province. He had joined the Marines in August 2009 and reported to his unit in February 2010.

□ 1010

He was based in Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, with the 2nd Battalion, 3rd Marine Regiment, 3rd Marine Division, III Marine Expeditionary Force. His unit was deployed to the Middle East in November, where they joined a Marine combat team for counterinsurgency work with the Afghan National Security Forces. Their goal was to provide security to locals and to promote development in the regime.

He was set to return home in July 2011, 3 months before his death.

Harry was a popular and outgoing student, both at Santa Clara High School, where he graduated in June 2008, and at Mission College, where he took classes for a year. He was known for joking, smiling, and for wanting to keep the mood light. One of his teachers said he brought ''life and laughter to his classroom.''

He loved physical sports, especially ''tricking,'' a form of breakdancing involving kicks, flips and twists. It combines wushu, Chinese martial arts and gymnastics. He was so accomplished in this sport that as a member of the club called the Sidestep Breakdance Club, he performed several times in front of the high school. His friends said his best trick was the butterfly twist, where one spins 360 degrees in a horizontal flip. Upon his death, his friends honored him with a tricking session at his high school.

Harry's best friend, Travis Trotter said, ''Everyone here has been influenced by him in some way or another, whether it be through his dancing, his artistic talents, his tricking or just being the person he was, friendly with everyone.''

Of his service, his superior in the Marines said: ''Only a small portion of our society volunteers to serve their country. Lance Corporal Lew was one of those volunteers. Within the 2nd Battalion, 3rd Marines, he was well liked by his fellow marines and was known for getting along with everyone because of his easy-going nature.

''He took his job seriously and performed his duties with enthusiasm. In Afghanistan, he volunteered for the difficult missions and demonstrated uncommon endurance on 4- to 8-hour foot patrols. Lance Corporal Lew also demonstrated his commitment and courage on two separate occasions when his unit came under enemy fire. One of those events is captured in the following:

''At approximately 7:30 p.m. on March 21, 2011, 3rd Squad of 3rd Platoon, Golf Company, 2nd Battalion, 3rd Marines, was engaged by enemy small arms fire while defending a position in Gawraggi village, Nawa-e-Barazkai district, Helmand province, Afghanistan. The enemy engaged with several bursts of automatic weapons fire. At that time of contact, the majority of the squad was in a small hole in the ground, taking cover to eat evening chow. Lance Corporal Lew immediately identified the enemy position approximately 200 meters to the southeast and engaged the enemy position initially with an M203 grenade launcher located at his post. He then picked up his M240 squad automatic weapon and engaged the enemy with an estimated 200 rounds until they had had enough and broke contact. His squad then continued with their mission.

''This is an example of Lance Corporal Lew's service. It serves as a reminder of all those who today serve in harm's way. Like Lance Corporal Lew, they serve to protect our country, our freedom, and our way of life. I am grateful for the courage and sacrifice of Lance Corporal Lew.''

Harry Lew was a good son and brother, a friend to many, a great performer and a dedicated soldier. His ready smile and warm attitude will be remembered by all who knew him. His sacrifice for his country will never be forgotten.

For his service, Harry Lew will be honored with the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the Afghanistan Campaign Medal.

TRIBUTE TO LANCE CORPORAL ANDREW PAUL CARPENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lance Corporal Andrew Paul Carpenter who tragically lost his life while bravely serving our country.

Andrew enlisted in the United States Marine Corps on September 7, 2007, where he was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. In August of 2010, Andrew was deployed to Afghanistan for the second time, where he bravely served on the front lines during combat operations.

While patrolling the Helmand province in Afghanistan, Lance Corporal

Carpenter sustained fatal combat-related injuries and died on February 19, 2011.

Andrew graduated in 2002 from Columbia Central High School in Columbia, Tennessee. He was active in the school's marching band where he played trombone and helped the band win a State championship during his senior year. Andrew went on to further his education at Middle Tennessee State University.

He enjoyed numerous activities such as playing golf, soccer and paintball, and made friends easily through his dependable and loyal nature. He is remembered by those who knew him as someone who was constantly looking for ways to help those in need. It is no wonder that serving the United States Marine Corps was a natural choice for him.

Before joining the Marines, Andrew worked at the YMCA Fun Company, where he pursued one of the things that he enjoyed most in life—working with children. Andrew would often dress up in Batman costumes to entertain kids at the YMCA after-school program. He was known for his tender heart and his ability to positively impact the children he encountered.

On January 1, 2010, Andrew married the love of his life, Crissie. She was truly his best friend and soul mate, and he would often say that their wedding day was by far the best day of his life. Shortly before Andrew was deployed to Afghanistan, he and Crissie learned that they would be blessed with a baby boy. Landon Paul Carpenter was born March 18, 2011.

Landon, no words can sufficiently express the gratitude or repay the debt that we owe your father for his selfless service in protecting our great Nation. He laid down his life so that we may all be blessed with our Nation's most fundamental tenets—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Your father, simply put, is a true American hero. As you grow up in this great Nation, know that you are given that privilege because of men like your father who make great sacrifices to protect our freedoms.

Crissie, during this difficult time, I hope that you can find some solace in the fact that your husband nobly gave his life so that you and your son can continue to live in the land of the free.

And, finally, thank you to Andrew's family for raising such an extraordinary young man.

Today we honor and remember Andrew Paul Carpenter. We will never forget the sacrifices he made in order to ensure that we continue to be blessed with the precious gift of freedom.

God bless America.

DISASTROUS PRIORITIES OF 2012 BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from two Members on each side of the aisle who, without respect of course to any partisan differences, raised their voices in sadness about the loss of two of our brave Americans in the defense of freedom. I join their sentiments.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. Those two Americans whose lives we have now lost showed extraordinary courage, extraordinary honesty in their willingness to serve. We in this body will now be called upon to show such courage and honesty as we address the extraordinary fiscal crisis that confronts us.

Today, President Obama is speaking on a plan to confront our Nation's unsustainable deficits. I believe it will stand in stark contrast to the budget that is going to be offered by Mr. RYAN, a budget of disastrous priorities, in my opinion, that concentrates its plan on middle and working class Americans in terms of its cuts, while creating yet another windfall for the wealthiest in our country, at a time when income inequality is at a height we haven't seen since the 1920s.

□ 1020

The Republican budget ends Medicare as we know it, transforming a system of guaranteed health care into a system that provides seniors with less coverage and greater expenses year after year after year. It dismantles Medicaid, putting seniors' nursing home care at very substantial risk, and, in fact, with an inability to pay, and cutting off care for disabled and poor Americans.

These entitlements must be addressed, but we must address them in a way that both keeps them sustainable and makes them available for generations to come. Somehow, however—after undermining the social compact of Medicare, after cutting care for the most vulnerable, after sending more than 30 million Americans back to the ranks of the uninsured—the Republican budget finds trillions of dollars to give as tax cuts to the wealthiest among us.

Republicans say we are too broke to afford the promise of Medicare, but we are flush enough to spend trillions in tax cuts for those of us who are the best off. In fact, the Republican budget spends so much on corporate subsidies and tax breaks for the wealthy and loses so many savings by repealing the cost controls in the Affordable Care Act that it fails to balance the budget for 10 years or even 20 years.

We have been down this so-called ''Path to Prosperity'' before. It leads to skyrocketing deficits because the supply-side dogma that lower taxes mean higher revenues has proven false over the last three decades. Read the facts. If Republican tax dogma made sense, then our debt would not have increased 200 percent under Ronald Reagan or 115 percent under the second President Bush, but it did. In fact, we've seen Republican promises of prosperity proven wrong time and time again over the 30 years that I have served here in Congress.

In 2007, now-Majority Leader CANTOR said that the Bush tax cuts ''have spurred spectacular economic growth.'' That was in 2007. Let me remind all the Members of this body, it was in December of 2007 that we fell into the Great Recession, the deepest recession we've had since Herbert Hoover. The growth was spectacular only for the top 1 percent, but for the rest of America, the Bush economy produced what The Wall Street Journal called ''the worst track record for job creation since the government began keeping records.'' That's what The Wall Street Journal said of the Bush economic program, which CANTOR said would be a job creator.

Throughout the Bush years, middle class incomes stayed stagnant and deficits soared. What did Republicans say about a budget that actually helped create unprecedented prosperity, the 1993 Clinton budget? Here's what now-Speaker BOEHNER said: ''How does this create any real new jobs? Who does this spending stimulate except maybe the liberal faculty at Harvard or Berkeley?'' Of course, contrary to the Speaker's assertion, the Clinton years saw the biggest production of jobs since I have been serving in Congress of 22.7 million new jobs—in the private sector, almost 21 million jobs as opposed to the private sector loss of jobs under President Bush, about 7,000 loss of jobs per month, versus 216,000 new jobs every month on average under Bill Clinton.

Those words represent the same flawed priorities we see in this new Republican budget: tax breaks for the wealthy, a failure to invest in the future, and a heavier burden on working families.

Our country deserves better, Mr. Speaker. Let's reform our entitlement programs with a scalpel, not an axe. Let's look for savings in every part of the budget, defense included. Let's close tax loopholes, but let's also use the Tax Code to reduce the deficit and ensure that all of us, even the most privileged, pay their fair share.

Republicans have taken us down this primrose path before, Mr. Speaker. It has demonstrably led to higher debt, stagnation for working Americans, and, most recently, an economic implosion. We must not choose that dead end again.

UMD NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. CRAVAACK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to the players, coaches, and supporters of the Minnesota-Duluth Bulldogs men's ice hockey team for their historic victory this past Saturday on April 9, 2011.

In dramatic fashion, Kyle Schmidt, who grew up just minutes from Duluth in Hermantown, Minnesota, scored the game-winning goal 3 minutes and 22

seconds into overtime to help the Bulldogs win their first championship in school history by a score of 3–2 over the University of Michigan. The thrilling win culminated in a fantastic season for UMD's men's ice hockey team, with the Bulldogs amassing an impressive record of 26–10–6.

The NCAA hockey title win comes in the same academic year as the NCAA Division II football title for the Bulldogs, making the University of Minnesota-Duluth just the second college ever to win both a hockey title and a football title in the same academic year. Mr. Speaker, that's quite a feat.

I know I speak for the Eighth District and for all Minnesotans to say how proud we are of our Bulldogs. And it is great to have the NCAA championship trophy back in the State of Hockey, Minnesota.

KOREA FTA AND ITS EFFECTS ON WORKING PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this morning to address the House and the American people regarding the Korea Free Trade Agreement and its effect on working families.

Let me start by saying that I am committed to trade. Trade can benefit our Nation, our businesses, and our working families. In fact, I am a member of President Obama's Export Council. Our goal is to double American exports in 5 years, not to export American jobs.

But the problem with our current trade policy, the one that started with NAFTA and has gone downhill from there, is that its benefits are skewed. The benefits are concentrated in a few powerful multinational corporations, and it is hardworking middle class families who pay the price.

The Korea FTA doesn't fall far from the NAFTA tree. A few stock prices and CEO bonuses may go up, but the Korea FTA will kill jobs, push down American wages, and drive small American companies who face unfair competition out of business.

Perhaps the biggest problem with the Korea FTA is that it opens the door for more illegal trade from China. Members on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the FTA debate have concerns about trading with China. We all know that China manipulates its currency, doesn't protect intellectual property, and engages in illegal transshipment to escape U.S. tariffs. You can go on the Internet right now and find Web sites bragging that they can hide the source of Chinese goods and thereby avoid paying duties owed to the U.S.

The illegal transshipment, mislabeling, and duty evasion rob the American people of money that we are owed. They also drive U.S. businesses out of business. U.S. businesses often go to great length and expense to prove that Chinese goods are being dumped and are receiving illegal subsidies. When the duties the U.S. imposes aren't paid, hardworking Americans lose their jobs when their workplaces shut their doors forever. From New York to South Carolina to Lynwood, California, in my own district, American businesses have turned off the lights and sent workers home due to unfair Chinese competition.

And China doesn't even have to break the rules to reap the benefits of the Korea FTA. This agreement, which was negotiated by President Bush, only requires that 35 percent of a Korean car be made in Korea to be eligible for tariff benefits. That means that 65 percent of the car can be made in China by child labor, prison labor, and workers who lack the right to form free and independent unions.

America has lost about 7.5 million jobs since the recession began. We cannot afford another job-killing trade agreement that ignores America's middle class families.

□ 1030

We have learned some very hard lessons after more than 15 years of NAFTA-style free trade agreements. We've heard many promises, just like the promises we're hearing about the Korea FTA. But the fact is that there are failures.

NAFTA was supposed to solve illegal immigration by developing a robust economy in Mexico that would allow hardworking people to provide for their families by staying home. That didn't work. CAFTA was supposed to include bold new safety and wage protections for workers, but these protections are disappointingly weak, allowing countries to downgrade their own labor laws. And in the Oman FTA, the administration actually negotiated a deal with a country that, as our own State Department reported, was experiencing a forced labor problem. Forced labor. How are our American families supposed to care for their families and send their kids to college when they are competing with forced labor?

Free trade was supposed to increase economic opportunity for everybody, for big businesses as well as small, and for hardworking families at home and abroad. This has not happened. Too many communities have been left to rot because corporations shut down U.S. plants to chase increasingly cheap labor and weak environmental standards abroad.

After 15 years of living with NAFTA and its clones, real wages for American families are down. Our trade deficit is in the tens of billions of dollars. Our manufacturing base is falling apart. The American worker is now more productive than before, but that increased productivity has not led to higher wages. The truth is the NAFTA free trade models favor the wealthiest few and the corporate fat cats at the expense of small businesses, workers, families, and our communities.

In the coming weeks and months we'll be asked to consider at least two of the Bush administration's trade deals with Korea and Colombia. Despite the long record of failed FTAs, we are going to hear that there is a consensus of support for these FTAs. We'll hear that anyone who knows anything about trade supports these agreements. Don't believe it, because it's not true. Advocates for America's families, both inside and outside of Congress, have grave concerns. We want a new path that creates real opportunities for workers and the businesses that employ them. We want trade agreements that don't sell our environment short, close doors for our children, or substitute the judgment of international trade lawyers for our courts.

Some of my colleagues say that the Korea FTA isn't that bad. That we can live with it.

That argument misses the point. Why are we settling for "not that bad"? We should be fighting for the best trade agreements possible.

NAFTA-style FTAs simply aren't good enough. We should focus on creating a trade policy that creates and saves well-paying jobs here in America.

Our trade policy should help small businesses hire more employees, not shut their doors.

It should help our trading partners to grow and flourish, not race to the bottom in labor and environmental standards.

Our trade policy should not reward bad actors like China, but reward playing by the rules.

If we stand united for working Americans, we can deliver a trade policy that accomplishes these goals.

Minor adjustments to NAFTA-style deals aren't good enough.

I urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to stop settling for "not that bad" and embark on a trade path that promotes development and prosperity for all.

TIME FOR AN AFGHANISTAN-PAKISTAN STUDY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House legislation I am introducing to create an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group, modeled after the Iraq Study Group, to bring fresh eyes to the war effort in Afghanistan, which is now in its 10th year.

Last August, I began pressing the administration to convene an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group. While reticent at first, to their credit President Bush, Secretary of State Rice, and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld came to support the Iraq Study Group, ably led by bipartisan chairs, former Secretary of State James Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton.

It has been my hope that the Obama administration would come to view this bipartisan fresh eyes approach as something which is ultimately good for our men and women in uniform and

good for the country as a whole. Aside from the specific policy recommendations, the Iraq Study Group helped force a moment of truth in our national conversation about the war effort. It was apparent last summer and is still truer today that with roughly 100,000 U.S. troops presently in Afghanistan, no clear end is in sight to our Nation's longest running war, at 10 years and counting. Public support for the war is at an all-time low. A national conversation about Afghanistan is what is urgently needed.

Before proposing this idea to the Obama administration, I spoke with a number of knowledgeable individuals, including former senior diplomats, public policy experts, and retired and active duty military. Many believed, all believed our Afghanistan policy was adrift. And there was a near unanimous position that an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group was needed. Among the distinguished individuals who embraced the idea was former ambassador to Iraq Ryan Crocker.

Sadly, the war has remained distant for many Americans. It is rarely spoken of from the Presidential bully pulpit. In fact, a recent Fox News piece reported, ''The last time Obama specifically devoted a full public speech to Afghanistan was December 9, 2009, 16 months ago, when he announced at West Point that he was sending an additional 30,000 U.S. troops to that war-torn country.'' And this Congress ought to be looking at this also.

Further, the war is seldom covered in great depth in the news. And yet, for the husbands and wives, and mothers and fathers, sons and daughters who have sent off a loved one in uniform, the war in Afghanistan is anything but distant. It is uncertainty and sacrifice, it is separation and worry, and many times it is life and death.

Despite my several letters to the President and other senior administration officials calling for a, quote, ''vigorous, thoughtful, and principled debate and discussion among some of our Nation's greatest minds,'' the idea for the study group has languished.

So today, after the Obama administration has neglected this, I am introducing legislation to create an Afghan-Pakistan Study Group comprised of nationally known and respected individuals who love their country more than they love their political party, and who would, I believe, serve to provide much needed clarity to a policy that appears adrift at best, and highly politicized at worst.

In reading ''Obama's Wars,'' I was deeply troubled by Bob Woodward's reporting, which indicated that discussions of the war strategy were infused with political calculations. Woodward also wrote of an administration that wrestled with the most basic questions about the war: What is the mission? What are we trying do? What will work? These are questions that demand answers. I believe that Americans of all political viewpoints can embrace this fresh eyes approach, for it is always to our national interest to openly assess the challenges before us and to chart a clear course to success.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation. This Congress, both political parties, cannot do what this administration is doing. We cannot ignore this issue.

HOW GOP BUDGET IMPACTS SENIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. For decades, Medicare has been a lifeline for older Americans, providing quality and affordable health care for all seniors. But this week House Republicans are proposing to strip seniors of this guaranteed benefit. The Republican budget proposal dismantles Medicare as we know it, telling seniors they are going to be on their own to find insurance no matter what the cost or how sick they are. And it slashes Medicaid coverage for seniors who need long-term care, threatening our sickest, most frail elderly in nursing homes with no care at all. This is absolutely the wrong approach to solving our Nation's budget problems.

Every day, 48 million elderly and disabled Americans across this country count on Medicare for their life-saving medications, doctor visits, and hospital care. Sixty-nine percent of people over the age of 65, and they are both Democrats and Republicans, oppose Medicare becoming a voucher program. Seniors know that changing Medicare to a voucher program means that they will no longer have access to a guaranteed set of health benefits, that the value of a limited voucher won't keep up with rising health care costs, that the voucher would become insufficient over time, and the care they need could become unaffordable, that too many taxpayer dollars will be spent on advertising campaigns and administrative costs instead of actual medical expenses.

And seniors know that privatizing Medicare means limits on benefits, obstacles to care, uncertain reimbursements, copayments for primary care or specialty care, exclusions for certain services, discrimination based on income, illness, or age, and more uncertainty if a serious illness or need for long-term care occurs. Seniors know that privatizing or voucherizing Medicare will mean that they pay more in premiums or do without. And it doesn't end there.

In addition to Medicare cuts, Republicans also want to take away Medicaid for the nearly 6 million seniors who depend on it for nursing home or long-term care. They say proudly that they will cut funding to States by $1 trillion. This means that disabled and frail elderly Americans will be placed on waiting lists for services or have no access to care at all.

□ 1040

In Pennsylvania, my home State, nearly 40 percent of funds spent on long-term care would be at risk. This includes 62 percent of nursing home residents and 25,000 Pennsylvanian seniors who receive home health services.

And yet when Republicans had the opportunity to reduce costs while maintaining and strengthening care for our seniors, they demonized the plan, voting time and again to stop important improvements in Medicare. And they still want to repeal the law that eliminates copayments for preventive care services, that makes prescription drug benefits more affordable and improves coordination of care and health outcomes, reduces errors and reduces costs for seniors.

They want to repeal the law that curbs the growth in Medicare spending, saves taxpayers almost $500 billion by ending overpayments to insurance companies, and extends the life of the Medicare Trust Fund for 12 years. Instead, the Republicans here in Washington want to end Medicare as we know it and put health care for American seniors at great risk.

As a senior member of the Budget Committee, I know how important it is to find solutions to reducing the deficit. To do this right, the solution must include spending cuts, tax policy reform, and economic growth.

We should not fix our budget problems by failing to meet our obligations to our seniors. Every day we hear how determined Republicans are to slash billions of dollars from the central programs because we simply can't afford it. They say we can't afford to make investments in the future. We can't afford to educate our children or fix our roads or fuel innovation or cover health care costs for seniors.

Yet in the same proposal to slash Medicare and Medicaid for millions of seniors, Republicans make permanent tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans. In the very same budget proposal where Republicans take away guaranteed benefits for seniors, they protect billions of tax subsidies to the oil and gas industry.

In the very same budget proposal where Republicans give seniors a limited voucher to pay for higher insurance premiums, they protect the Pentagon from spending cuts on unnecessary weapon systems.

One trillion dollars in tax expenditures, $700 billion in tax cuts for the wealthy few, $40 billion in tax breaks for oil companies, and billions of dollars to continue inefficiencies at the Pentagon—all of this spending is protected by the Republican budget. And instead, they choose to slash benefits to our seniors and our disabled Americans.

Budgets are about priorities and they're about our values. Yes, we should get serious about our Nation's deficit, but let's be sure that our priorities are right and we do not threaten our obligations to our seniors, to our children, or to America's future.

SUPPORT NATIONAL AUCTIONEERING DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LONG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the cornerstones of American capitalism and my profession for over 30 years, that being auctioneering. Auctioneers sell approximately $250 billion in assets each year in the United States, and this figure does not include the millions of transactions that occur online with online auctions.

It's estimated that there are 20,000 auctioneers in the Nation, the vast majority of which are small business owners. Auto auctions make up the largest volume of auctions, with over $80 billion in vehicles being sold by auctioneers annually in the United States. If you drive a used car, chances are very good it's been across the auction block.

Auctions and auctioneers have existed for over 2,000 years. Auctioneering was fundamental in the creation of commerce here in the United States. Auctioneers first arrived in the United States when the Pilgrims arrived.

You go to an auction in Kalamazoo, Michigan; Branson, Missouri; Tucson, Arizona; Portland, Oregon; Miami, Florida—anywhere you go to an auction in this country, we all go by one handle, and that handle is ''colonel.'' You can walk up to an auctioneer in any auction in the United States, you don't know that auctioneer's name, you say, ''Hey, Colonel,'' they'll turn around and answer you.

Why ''colonel''? That dates back to the Civil War in this country. After the Civil War, they needed a way to get rid of the mules and tack and things they had left over, supplies; so they did that by a matter of public auction. They nominated the Army colonels to serve as the auctioneers. Now, they didn't have any professional training as auctioneers; however, they would just say, ''I'm at a dollar for this saddle, a dollar-fifty. Anyone give two dollars? Sold at a dollar-fifty.'' So when you hear the term ''colonel,'' that's where it originated, back in the Civil War.

Auctioneers were instrumental in the formation of early commerce by selling crops, imports, livestock, tools, tobacco, fur, and farms. Even President George Washington was a big auction fan and an avid buyer at public auction.

For over 30 years, I had the honor of selling real estate at public auction. Did I sell depressed, distressed real estate? Once in a very great while. But I sold real estate as people's first option, not their last resort. So keep in mind, auctions could be a way to achieve the highest value in the shortest amount of time. If you've got a hot property, instead of having it listed and sold in 1 day or 2 days, put it up at public auction and see what happens.

Every day auctioneers work with banks, attorneys, accountants, businesses, individuals, and government agencies to liquidate property seized and surplus property. Auctioneers create a competitive marketplace and connect buyers with sellers every day.

The National Auctioneers Association and its members strive to advance the auction methods of marketing and upholding the highest standards of professionalism to the national public. For over 20 years, National Auctioneers Day has been observed by State and local governments.

For those reasons and more, JEFF DUNCAN, another freshman auctioneer Member of Congress here, and I want to make this, the third Saturday in April, National Auctioneers Day. We will be dropping a bill to that effect. This would heighten the awareness of people in the United States of the contributions made by auctions and auctioneers to the history of the Nation and its economy.

Auctions are the last stronghold of the competitive free market enterprise system and continue to be the most effective means of establishing a fair market value.

Also, one other thing. Being an auctioneer in Congress, the way our debt is running out of control, they find it very handy to have JEFF DUNCAN and me here in Washington. We are two of the few people that can actually keep up with the national debt:

I'm at a trillion now 2, 2 trillion dollars now 3 woodygive 3 trillion, 3 trillion bid and now 4, 4 trillion, now 5, 5 trillion dollars now six are ye able to buy 'em at 6, 6 trillion now 7, woodygive 7 trillion, 7 trillion dollars bid now 8, 8 trillion dollars now 9, 9 trillion now 10 woodygive 10 trillion dollars, 10 trillion dollars now 11, 11 trillion now 12, do I hear 12 trillion dollars, 11 trillion bid now 12, 11 trillion bid now 12 now 12 woodygive 12 trillion dollars, 12 now 13, 12 trillion bid now 13, 13 trillion now 14 woodygive 14, 14 trillion dollars now 15 woodygive 15 trillion. Sold, 14 trillion dollars.

Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, we also can say those numbers backwards; so when we get the spending under control here, I'll be back.

ELIMINATING HIV/AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank you for the opportunity to greet a group of ministers that have come to the Nation's capital in order to support the resources to eliminate HIV and AIDS virus infections.

It is strange how God has made us forget the blessings that we have with good health until, of course, that health is endangered, and then we recognize that what we have depended on may be threatened or may be gone or may not even exist for the 40,000 people that don't enjoy health insurance.

But because this disease has such a stigma and because a million Americans suffer from it, and 500,000 Americans have died from it, it has been a very costly situation in terms of providing the medication to stop the disease and to prevent death. And death is certain without treatment.

These ministers have formed, some 20 years ago, in a group that was headed by Deborah House—and today it is directed by C. Virginia Fields, and Pastor Calvin Butts from the Abyssinian Baptist Church, a landmark in Harlem, New York City, and the country—have brought together ministers from all over the country as well as the National Medical Association and other outstanding people to make people aware of the fact that this disease is not only caused by the infection of the virus, but it's caused by reckless sex, unprotected sex, actions of men that are in prison, actions that when they come home they transmit through sexual activities to their wives.

□ 1050

So to a large extent, it is the ignorance of people that has caused this disease to explode and to spread beyond the communities where it was initiated.

It has cost a lot of money in order to make certain that we control the spread of this disease, but it doesn't really take that much money to be active in making certain that people are educated about the threat of those diseases.

And that is why they come to Washington today, when there is a belief that Medicaid that provides health care for the very, very poor—that it is not in jeopardy by people who want to transfer a Federal, a national, responsibility to the States, as we find proposals coming up this week.

That is why Medicare, which is a national program, is being threatened by the idea that people can get a voucher and go out and get insurance from an insurance company. Imagine going to an insurance company, being infected with AIDS, a terminal disease, and seeing what costs the private insurance company would ask you for without Federal assistance.

So it seems to me that all people—black, white, Catholic, and Protestant—could come together in terms of answering the question, How do you treat the lesser among us? How do you treat the poor in our community? And isn't it a fact that if we reach out a hand and provide the medicine and the support for those people who are infected with HIV and with AIDS, in the longer sense what we are doing is allowing Americans to be more productive, healthy, having healthy families and healthy children so that they will be able to get an education, a decent job, and provide America with the type of talent that is so important if we are going to meet the obligations of this new age where technology is going to be so important if we're going to be competitive.

So now is the time, where these ministers have come to our Nation's Capital, perhaps to reach out to people of

all faiths—whether they come from the mosques, whether they come from the synagogues, whether they come from our churches—to go back to the Biblical writings as we look at what we are faced with today. And that is, how does a great nation, as the United States of America—how do we treat our powerless? How do we treat our poor? What opportunities do we have for people who are poor to leave poverty and move to the middle class?

The answer to those questions, Mr. Speaker, is in our hands, and I do hope that we vote and do the right thing.

RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, once again, to highlight the epidemic of rape and sexual assault in the military.

As I said last week, the Department of Defense, by its own calculations, estimates that over 19,000 servicemembers, mostly women but some men, are raped or sexually assaulted every single year; and, furthermore, only 13 percent report these rapes or sexual assaults. Why is that? Because the system of justice designed to adjudicate cases of rape in the military is in complete shambles. Victims are blamed. Assailants are promoted. Unit commanders, whose promotions are dependent on the conduct and performance of the soldiers they supervise, have an incentive to see that allegations are few and convictions are fewer.

Meanwhile, what are we doing here in Congress? Over the last 16 years, there have been reports and there have been hearings, 18 of them, and we make lots of noise; but then nothing is done about it. As a result of this code of silence, the overwhelming majority of cases get swept under the proverbial rug.

Last week I told the story of Technical Sergeant Mary Gallagher. The feedback I've gotten is considerable. A woman named Katie wrote on my Facebook page: ''I am one of those victim soldiers. Jackie, thank you for fighting for a basic right. I have no idea why this is still not being handled properly. I dream that soon women and men will be able to serve our country without the threat of rape that will go unpunished.''

But stopping military rape should be more than just a dream; it must be a reality. We owe our servicemembers the same protection that they provide to all Americans.

Today I want to share the story of Seaman Panayiota Bertzikis. Seaman Bertzikis served in the Coast Guard from November 2005 to May of 2007. Her allegation is as follows:

On May 30, 2006, Seaman Bertzikis was raped by a shipmate when she stationed in Burlington, Vermont. During a hike, her rapist threw her onto the ground, punched her in the face, and raped her.

She reported the rape to command, who told her to cease speaking about it or she would be charged with the military equivalent of slander. She later obtained photographs and admissions made by her rapist through the Freedom of Information Act, but command failed to bring him to justice in any way. Instead, they forced Seaman Bertzikis to live on the same floor with her rapist, where he would remain a constant threat. Command also told the seaman to work with her rapist and use the time together to ''work out their differences.''

Command was well aware, but did not stop, further assaults and harassment of Seaman Bertzikis. Instead, she was transferred to Boston where Coast Guard personnel called her a ''liar'' and a ''whore.''

When she was on base performing her duties, a group of Coast Guard personnel cornered Seaman Bertzikis and tried to rip off her uniform. They called her a ''crazy lying whore'' and said she would ''pay for snitching'' on their friend. They threatened to rape her again.

When she reported this harassment, the Coast Guard's ''victim advocate'' told her not to pursue disciplinary action because she would be seen as ''difficult.'' In addition, her appointed attorney said if her rapist did not have a history of sexual assault, ''why would he assault anyone now?'' Seaman Bertzikis was denied rank because of the pending investigation, despite the fact that she had met all the necessary requirements.

She described her horrific ordeal this way: ''If I told them that my house was broken into, not one person would question me, blame me, or say that I was lying. But when I say that my body was broken into, people automatically feel that they have the right to judge me, to doubt me, and to blame me.''

What a profound statement by Seaman Bertzikis. She has now started the Military Rape Crisis Center to help her fellow colleagues and victims. Turning pain into purpose, she is truly an American shero.

Seaman Bertzikis's story shows the urgent need to protect servicemembers from abuse.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Jack Graham, Prestonwood Baptist Church, Plano, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we are blessed by Your presence, amazed by Your grace, and dependent upon Your strength for every day. We praise You for Your abundant provision, and we are forever grateful for Your sustaining love. We do not take these blessings for granted. We make it our holy ambition to glorify You as we offer our lives in devoted service to Your Kingdom first, and to our beloved country.

We pray for one another with the confidence that You hear repentant hearts and respond to those who humbly seek to obey You and live by Your wisdom.

We pray for personal renewal, for robust faith, and a vibrant vision for the future. Remembering that righteousness exalts a nation, we turn to You and trust You to not only make us great, but to make us good.

We pray in the name of God, who is able to raise His dear Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, to life and give us eternal hope in Him.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. JACK GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is with great privilege that I welcome my dear friend Dr. Jack Graham, pastor of Prestonwood Baptist Church in Plano, Texas, one of the Nation's largest, most dynamic congregations, as our guest chaplain for today's opening prayer.

The mission at Prestonwood Baptist is to glorify God by introducing Jesus Christ as Lord to as many people as possible and to develop them in Christian living using the most effective means to impact the world, making a positive difference in this generation.

Pastor Graham is an anointed and amazing speaker, accomplished author, community servant and bold leader who truly walks by faith. It is an honor to have him here in the people's House blessing our Nation's business and government leaders in Jesus' precious name.

Thank you, Pastor Graham, for all you do as a true servant of the Lord. God bless you and I salute you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ILLEGALS REJOICE OVER COURT RULING

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, Arizona border ranchers tell me that when illegals enter Arizona with their maps and their lists of churches that give sanctuary, they also know about U.S. courts. When some illegals are actually captured, they oftentimes ask the Border Patrol if their case will be in the ninth court or the 10th court. Illegals want their cases in the ninth circuit court because they believe, based on history, the ninth court is liberal, tolerant and more lenient regarding illegal immigration and border security than the nearby 10th court.

The ninth circuit court proved the illegals correct when the liberal court wrongly threw out the Arizona law that allows State law enforcement officers to enforce laws against illegal entry. Arizona had to enact this law because the Federal Government doesn't adequately secure the border. And how can a court possibly say it's unconstitutional for a State to protect its citizens?

But there is hope. The ninth court has been reversed more than any other court by the Supreme Court, and hopefully the Supreme Court will rule that Arizona and the Federal Government have constitutional authority to protect the border from illegal entry.

And that's just the way it is.

BUDGET REALITIES

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the realities of the Republican budget are starting to come into focus, especially health care. Vouchers to insurance companies will cost seniors and society more.

Today, Members of Congress are being inundated by visits from hospitals and health care providers who are in a panic about the Medicaid block grant that will allow the Federal Government to shift its burden for the poor and the disabled to States who often cannot or will not make up the difference in the fund loss.

Most disappointing, Republicans have abandoned the work on Medicare reform. The reform provisions in the Affordable Care Act used to be bipartisan. Instead of increasing the total cost of health care and shifting the burdens to the elderly, poor and disabled, we should be taking our medical spending—already the highest in the world—and showing how we can get more out of it.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, this week the House and Senate will consider a bill to fund the government for the rest of the fiscal year that reduces spending by $38.5 billion.

Considering that the position of HARRY REID at the beginning of the year was that we shouldn't cut a single dime, we have moved the conversation in the right direction.

Senator SCHUMER called Republican cuts ''extreme,'' but even the full $61 billion that the House pushed for would have only made a small dent in our huge deficit.

The real extreme position is to do nothing. If we do nothing, interest payments and entitlement spending will consume the entire budget. If we do nothing, we will lose the capability to defend our Nation. If we do nothing, our roads and rails will crumble.

This week Republicans will present an alternative to the do-nothing strategy. For that, we will certainly be labeled ''extreme.'' We have a great Nation; but as long as we are beholden to our creditors, foreign and domestic, we risk losing prosperity and freedom.

We shouldn't wait any longer to get our budget in order. We can begin this week, but we shouldn't stop until we have passed long-term solutions.

PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, later today we are taking up a bill to repeal funding for prevention and public health. Members will have a simple choice; the choice is to pay now or pay later.

Staying healthy and treating disease will always have a price. In my State of Maine, treating preventable chronic diseases held a price tag of $1.4 billion last year alone. But there is a better way. We can invest in preventing these life-threatening expensive illnesses, we can invest in slowing the spread of HIV/AIDS, and we can promote better nutrition to reduce obesity. That is exactly what the Prevention and Public Health fund does in my State and throughout the country. It invests in prevention and good health, and it reduces chronic disease. Spending just $10 per person in preventative programs will save this country $16 billion a year in health care costs.

Madam Speaker, our choice is not just pay now or pay later; it's pay less now or pay a lot more later. And that's a choice we can't afford to make.

□ 1210

CELEBRATING NATIONAL AUCTION WEEK

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. On this day in 1743, our Founding Father, Thomas Jefferson, was born.

But I rise today to talk about the National Auctioneers Association celebrating National Auction Week. I'm proud, as an auctioneer for over 16 years, to serve with fellow auctioneer in our Auction Caucus here in Congress, Representative BILLY LONG from Missouri.

Auction and auctioneers help families and businesses all over this great land sell trillions of dollars worth of assets every year.

And so I will leave you with this thought: Hey, now, wouldya give 25 now, 35—sold.

And we sell it every day.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the Disabled American Veterans, an organization representing our Nation's wartime disabled vets.

Disabled American Veterans works to ensure our government fulfills its promise to those who so bravely served our Nation. And I am pleased to honor their service at their 67th annual convention this week in Rhode Island.

The greatest tribute that we can pay to our disabled veterans is providing them access to quality health care and education and mental health services, housing, and employment assistance. For their courage and commitment, and for the burdens borne by their families, our disabled veterans and their

loved ones must receive the support and the services they rightly deserve.

These men and women of valor have made tremendous sacrifices in the name of freedom and in advancement of our Nation's security. We live in a free society today because of the service these men and women and their families have given our Nation.

I applaud the work of the Disabled American Veterans for their dedicated service to our Nation's heroes and their families.

RECOGNIZING HOLLOWAY TERRACE FIRE COMPANY OF DELAWARE

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

Mr. CARNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the many volunteer fire companies that play such an important role in protecting public safety in my home State of Delaware.

Like many Delawareans who have seen or been helped directly by one of our volunteer firefighters, I continue to be amazed and humbled by their professionalism and willingness to sacrifice to put the safety of others ahead of their own.

Today, I'd like to recognize the Holloway Terrace Fire Company, which is celebrating 90 years of service to our community. For generations, members of the Holloway Terrace Fire Company have given their all to protect those who live and work in New Castle, Delaware.

In that time, no one has given more to the fire company than Mr. William ''Bill'' Maxwell, Sr. This year Bill is celebrating 50 years of service in the Holloway Terrace Fire Company. He joined as a junior member and has risen through the ranks to become deputy chief, fire chief, and now a member of the board of directors.

I would like to thank every volunteer firefighter who works to protect Delaware communities and encourage them to continue their service for many years to come.

HIV/AIDS

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I ask this Congress to address a grave public health crisis facing not only my district but my country.

Too many of our young people are dying. Many high school students in metro Detroit, the area that I represent, many of whom are African American, are being hit by an epidemic of HIV/AIDS.

I urge this Congress to support a piece of legislation sponsored by the National Black Clergy for the Elimination of HIV/AIDS to address this issue, save the lives of our young people, and provide them with hope for a promising future.

HONORING BILL SAMUELS, JR., PRESIDENT OF MAKER'S MARK DISTILLERY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor a giant of Kentucky's legendary bourbon industry, Bill Samuels, Jr., president of Maker's Mark Distillery, on the occasion of his retirement.

His father's recipe first got bourbon invited to the top shelf. His mother had the radical idea of dipping bottles in red wax. His godfather was Jim Beam.

Bill's career path seemed obvious, but ''obvious'' was never Bill's path.

Everyone agrees distilling bourbon isn't rocket science, but only Bill makes the claim with authority—he's excelled at both. He designed fuel injectors for Polaris missiles and graduated from Vanderbilt Law School. Finally, four decades ago, he decided to give the family business 1 year—but he never left. When his time came, he didn't merely take over. He took Maker's Mark to unimaginable heights.

Then a little-known brand, Makers is now among the world's most sought-after spirits, its red wax a renowned icon. And every barrel maintains the same recipe and craftsmanship as Bill, Sr.'s first batch in 1954.

As cochair of the Congressional Bourbon Caucus, I urge my colleagues to join me in toasting Bill as he passes the wax-tipped baton into the capable hands of his son, Rob.

Bill's service to Maker's Mark and Kentucky—like his bourbon—continues a family's tradition, makes our Commonwealth proud, and is simply the stuff of legend.

BUDGET CUTS MUST FOCUS ON WHAT MATTERS

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, this week, the Republicans are rolling out their budget. And some people say it's a new, bold budget. I'd say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, it's the same old budget: misplaced priorities, focus on making sure we continue to have the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America, tax cuts for oil and gas companies when we're at $110 a barrel—and not focus the cuts on NPR or Planned Parenthood or energy efficiency. Those aren't what created the debt that this country faces.

We obviously have a problem, but those things came from big tax cuts, prosecuting two wars, and not policing Wall Street. That's where this budget should be focused. Let's get to the real issues that this country faces.

So I would say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, go back, start over with your budget, and let's really hit the things that are important. We need to be making things in America, not giving tax breaks to send things offshore.

So let's focus our real efforts, come together as a country, and deal with this budget.

RECOGNIZING ACE MENTORS

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the mentors and high school students participating in the ACE Mentor Program, headquartered in Stamford, Connecticut.

ACE brings together nearly 6,000 volunteers in the integrated construction industry to mentor more than 10,000 students in 32 States each year. Most of the high school students in this program come from disadvantaged backgrounds. ACE matches teams of these young men and women with volunteers in the construction industry, creating career and education pathways for disadvantaged youth.

Each year, leading companies in the construction industry contribute an estimated $22 million in volunteer time to this program. Connecticut-based companies providing volunteers to ACE include the EMCOR Group, United Technologies, and Lane Construction.

I applaud the volunteers, students, and companies involved in the ACE Mentor Program, and I'm encouraged by their commitment to create jobs and improve young lives.

''ROAD TO RUIN'' REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, tomorrow marks the 100-day celebration for congressional Republicans taking control of the House. How will we celebrate? Well, not by focusing on jobs or the economy or growing the middle class, but, rather, with the road to ruin budget that will end Medicare while extending tax breaks for Big Oil.

The road to ruin Republican budget proposal will end Medicare. It will end a program that 46 million seniors and disabled individuals depend on for their health care. Rather than the Path to Prosperity, as its been designated, this budget is more like the road to riches, a road paved in gold with lavish handouts for special interests paid for and built with dollars from senior citizens who will see their hard-earned benefits rationed.

We must stop this road to ruin budget lest it lead to a cliff of catastrophe for our Nation's seniors.

IN MEMORY OF SIDNEY HARMAN

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I was very saddened this morning to hear the news of the passing of the husband of our former colleague Jane Harman.

Sidney Harman lived to, as the report came out, the ripe young age of almost 93. He was an amazing individual. I knew of him because of his great work in an organization called BENS, Business Executives for National Security. He also very famously took on the responsibility of what he described as an American icon, Newsweek magazine, when he made the decision to ensure that it would continue to thrive. And he has done a phenomenal job.

And I'd like to say that our thoughts and prayers are with our former colleague Jane and the entire Harman family. The world is a greater place for Sidney Harman having lived and a lesser place for his passing.

□ 1220

SAVE MEDICARE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Before Medicare, 25 percent of the seniors in America lived in poverty, many driven there by the lack of affordable, decent health insurance. Medicare passed with virtually no Republican support. It solved that problem. Seniors today are guaranteed quality, affordable health care. They pay about 27 percent of the cost.

While under the guise of fiscal responsibility, the Republican budget wants to turn back the clock to the good old days. Throw the seniors into the private health care market again. And the estimates are seniors would have to pay 68 percent of their health care costs under the Republican plan. That would drive many into poverty.

It's opening day of the 2012 fiscal budget year, and President Obama has a chance to hit the first pitch out of the park by declaring Medicare will not end during his Presidency, on his watch. He won't stick it to seniors. He's going to stand up for seniors.

THE RYAN BUDGET

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. You know, budgets aren't just about a series of numbers. Budgets fundamentally are moral documents. And I fear that Republicans have made clear that their moral compass puts the wealthy and big business ahead of the American middle class, our seniors, disabled, and poor.

In order to pay for an enormous tax cut for millionaires and billionaires, they are ready to abolish the guarantee of Medicare. In order to protect tax cuts for the oil industry, they would cut Medicaid, resulting in seniors and the disabled being forced out of nursing homes and causing poor children to lose health care coverage or pay more. In order to pay for tax cuts for businesses that ship American jobs overseas, they would cut investments in education and job training programs.

The Republican budget does not represent Americans' core values and should be rejected.

LEMOORE PILOTS

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to two heroic officers from the Naval Air Station in Lemoore, California, that I represent, who tragically lost their lives on April 6, 2011, Lieutenant Matthew Ira Lowe and Lieutenant Nathan Hollingsworth Williams. These pilots were among our best, doing extraordinary things.

Lieutenant Lowe, of Plantation, Florida, received his commission in 2002, and later was assigned to Strike Fighter Squadron 94 based at Lemoore Naval Air Station. Throughout his service, Lieutenant Lowe earned the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, and was training to become a pilot for the Blue Angels exhibition team.

Lieutenant Williams, of Oswego, New York, received his commission in 2004, and following his training served in Afghanistan aboard the USS *Theodore Roosevelt*. Returning home, Lieutenant Williams became a flight instructor at Lemoore Naval Air Station, training other officers on the aircraft the Super Hornet.

Madam Speaker, the deaths of these two individuals, Lieutenant Williams and Lieutenant Lowe, are a tragic reminder that the men and women who serve our Nation every day in harm's way throughout the world put their lives at risk.

Please join me for a moment of silence as we honor the service of these two individuals for our country.

SAVE MEDICARE

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, Medicare is a guarantee that senior citizens, regardless of their economic circumstances, will have the medical care that they need in their twilight years. Medicare plays a critical role in removing doubt from people's minds that if they have an ailment and are otherwise uninsurable in the marketplace, as many are, that their needs will be met. Not to say that the program doesn't have its problems. We periodically need to do a ''doc fix,'' and we have to find a way to pay that in the long term. There are real issues with regards to the reimbursement rates and making sure they are adequate so seniors can get their care.

But the answer, Madam Speaker, is not phasing out Medicare. There is a need to mend it, not end it. I think by improving the quality of care for seniors and ensuring that seniors have access to preventative care, we can help decrease overall health care costs without abolishing and phasing out Medicare, as is contained in the Republican budget proposal.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1473, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 35, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 36, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–60 part 2) on the resolution (H. Res. 218) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 218 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 218

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes. 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 Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. (a) If H.R. 1473 is passed by the House, it shall be in order to consider separately in the House the concurrent resolutions specified in subsection (b). All points of order against consideration of each concurrent resolution are waived. Each concurrent resolution shall be considered read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except 20

minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

(b) The concurrent resolutions specified in subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and

(2) the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473.

SEC. 3. If the House receives a message from the Senate transmitting its passage of H.R. 1473 without amendment, then the Clerk shall not certify an enrollment of the bill until notified by the Speaker or by message from the Senate that the Senate has taken the question on adoption of each concurrent resolution specified in section 2 that was adopted by the House.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I rise to a point of order against consideration of H. Res. 218.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I object to consideration of this rule because the rule in its final language says that the Clerk shall hold the enrollment of this bill until the Senate considers bills to defund health care reform and considers a bill to defund Planned Parenthood.

As such, it violates the rules of the House which require that anything passed by this House be filed forthwith. And with your permission, I will read that section:

''The Clerk shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the House and, in cooperation with the Senate, examine all bills and joint resolutions that have passed both Houses to see that they are correctly enrolled and forthwith present those bills and joint resolutions that originated in the House to the President in person after their signature by the Speaker and the President of the Senate, and report to the House the fact and date of their presentment.''

In fact, what this rule does is it says that after this is passed, it shall not be sent to the Senate, shall not be sent to the President until the other body, the Senate, takes an action, considers these two things which already have been considered here.

□ 1230

This is clearly a violation of the rules and a very dangerous violation of the Constitution as well, because we believe in this House that our actions, once taken, trigger an action in the other body or by the President.

If we are to say that bills, when passed by this body, are held in spaces at the desk by an officer of this institution, a non-elected officer of this institution, we are, in fact, violating this rule.

It is very important, Madam Speaker, that you rule that this rule needs to be sent back and cleansed of that language, or else we are, in effect, saying the passage of an act here shall be contingent upon the consideration of something in the Senate. That is a dangerous precedent, violates the laws, and violates the Constitution of the United States.

I ask for your ruling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to address the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

Enrollment is the process by which a proposed act of Congress is printed on parchment for presentment to the President. A House-originated measure is enrolled by the Clerk of the House. A Senate-originated measure is enrolled by the Secretary of the Senate.

After the two Houses have agreed to a unitary text for a measure, they still may agree to alter that text before presentment. The usual vehicle for this is a concurrent resolution. Such a concurrent resolution typically directs the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate to make specified changes in the text previously cleared for enrollment. Such a concurrent resolution might even be proposed in anticipation of the actions of the two Houses to clear the presumptive text for enrollment.

It is not unusual for the Clerk to take notice of the pendency of such a concurrent resolution and to seek guidance from the Speaker on the prospect that the concurrent resolution might be adopted by the two Houses. The Speaker, likewise, might assess the likelihood of adoption of such a concurrent resolution before seeing that the enrollment is signed by the presiding officer of each House or presented to the President. The two Houses might even adopt a concurrent resolution asking the President to return an enrollment so that they might change it.

Just as section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974—as a matter of rulemaking—contemplates the possibility of holding an enrollment for a time, so also might a proposed special order of business enable such an interim hold of an enrollment.

The point of order is overruled.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman shall state it.

Mr. WEINER. Am I to understand this rule correctly that under the rule we are about to consider, if the House of Representatives approves the continuing resolution, that bill, despite the fact that the government is going to cease operating unless it passes, could theoretically sit at the desk, never to be sent to the President, never to be sent to the Senate ad infinitum if the Senate fails to take a specific action?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has inquired about a matter that may be debated by the Members during consideration of the pending resolution, rather than being addressed from the Chair.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Boulder, Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this measure, all time yielded will be for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the matter before us.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of three measures: H.R. 1473, H. Con. Res. 35 and H. Con. Res. 36. H.R. 1473 funds the government for the remainder of fiscal year 2011. H. Con. Res. 35 and 36 are enrollment correction measures that end Federal funding for the President's health care plan and Planned Parenthood. As these measures represent a final agreement on this fiscal year's funding, on par with a conference report, this rule provides simple up-or-down votes on all three of these items.

Furthermore, this rule directs the Clerk of the House to refrain from finalizing the enrollment of H.R. 1473 until the Senate has acted on all three measures to ensure that the enrollment corrections resolutions get full consideration. H.R. 1473 will be debatable for 1 hour. H. Con. Res. 35 and 36 will be debatable for 20 minutes each.

Madam Speaker, it has been a long, difficult, ugly, messy process; but we have finally achieved an important victory for the American people.

Today's underlying continuing resolution is a step toward, a step toward the fulfillment of a fundamental promise that was made to the taxpayers. We will halt the practice of reckless and unchecked growth in Federal spending; and critically important, Madam Speaker, we will reverse the course that we have been on. This final continuing resolution for fiscal year 2011 imposes the single largest cut in nondefense spending in our Nation's history. It also implements a number of reforms that will ensure greater accountability in how tax dollars are spent.

Madam Speaker, this is not the end of our work to restore discipline and accountability of the Federal budget, far from it. After fighting so hard to get to this point, it's important to point out that the truly difficult work still lies ahead for us.

This resolution is also not the perfect measure we were all working for. Many of us fought hard to have even greater cuts and more significant reforms.

But today's action is so critical because it is the turning point; it is the

turning point, Madam Speaker. It is that profoundly important first step. The American people have said enough is enough, and this Congress is finally responding.

We are ending an era that has seen growth in non-defense discretionary spending over the past few years of 82 percent. Under Speaker PELOSI, Madam Speaker, we have had an increase in non-defense discretionary spending of 82 percent. We are making serious, meaningful cuts in the size and the scope of government.

But as I said, these are only just the beginning. When we conclude this debate, we will turn directly to the fiscal 2012 budget. Our very thoughtful Budget Committee chairman, Mr. RYAN, has put forth a bold budget plan that seeks to tackle the fundamental reforms that are absolutely essential to the future viability of our economy.

If the process we have just come through has been difficult, the task that lies ahead is Herculean. A $1.6 trillion deficit poses an almost unfathomable challenge. It demands a tremendous level of seriousness and resolve that each and every one of us must rise to.

The consequences of failing to do so would be both disastrous and predictable. We have already gotten a strong dose of the economic challenges that would ensue. For months and months on end, we have dealt with a moribund economy and a very painful lack of job opportunities. The stifling nature of the national debt, the tax and regulatory uncertainty, the policies that favor government intervention over entrepreneurial empowerment, all of these have contributed to our economic challenges.

It is increasingly apparent that the recent positive movement on job creation has been fueled by our effort to rein in wasteful government spending and restore the certainty that businesses need to make new investments.

As we continue our efforts to impose fiscal discipline, I hope and believe we will continue to see positive news on the jobs front. But these economic challenges are far from over for most hardworking Americans.

We know what difficult times we and the American people are facing. We know very well how painful these challenges have been, but they pale in comparison to the crisis that will come if we do not have the courage to fundamentally transform the way this government spends money.

We need look no further than the euro zone to see what's in store without a dramatic change in course. We have seen Western European economies come to the brink of collapse, crippled under the weight of their sovereign debt and nearly dragged some of the world's largest, most stable economies along with them.

The coming budget debate will be a seminal moment in which we must reject this failed, economic model. Today, with this historic spending cut, we are paving the way to do just that. Madam Speaker, this is not the end of our work; but it is, as I said, just the beginning.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolutions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1240

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, for all the talk of Republicans' commitment to cutting spending, there are several odd things about this bill before us that would lead one to believe that it's more of a partisan political exercise than a serious attempt to get the Nation's fiscal house in order, which we need and deserve as Americans.

Under this bill, critical services that many Americans rely on to educate our children, to keep our streets safe, to improve public health, to keep our water and air clean would face tens of billions of dollars worth of real and difficult cuts. Times are tough. We know we have to cut spending. Okay. So why does this bill then provide the Pentagon with an additional $5 billion above the previous request at a time when the civilian and uniformed military, including thoughtful policymakers from both parties, believe that we need to reduce spending across the board?

Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen stated that our national debt is our biggest national security threat. He also noted that the past decade's doubling of the budget of the Department of Defense has led to undisciplined spending and waste within the department. Secretary Gates concurs, stating that we can't hold ourselves exempt from the belt-tightening. Yet, despite members of the military and civilians involved with defense saying that they, too, can't be spared, not only have they been spared by the Republican majority, but their budget has been increased by $5 billion.

The recent bipartisan Commission on Fiscal Responsibility, often called the ''Simpson-Bowles commission,'' called for substantial defense reductions over the next 10 years. They recommended cuts that would have led to $60 billion in savings and security spending in the first year and would have kept our Nation safe. In fact, if we were to implement the commission's recommendations around security spending, we would save $100 billion in 2015 alone.

But Republicans didn't go after their favorite areas of Big Government spending. Instead, they went after our efforts to strengthen our schools, to keep our air and water clean and to keep our streets safe; and the rest of their so-called ''spending cuts'' don't seem to be saving much at all. In fact, yesterday, we had an interesting discussion in the Rules Committee about whether this bill really even saves close to the $38 billion claimed. Apparently, most of the savings are from allocations of money that wouldn't be spent anyway.

An Associated Press story yesterday called this bill ''budget tricks,'' saying that $23 billion of the $38 billion aren't even real savings, that they're counting savings from unspent census money. This is from the AP: leftover Federal construction funding; $2.5 billion from the most recent renewal of highway programs that can't even be spent because of restrictions that have already been set by other legislation. Today's Wall Street Journal calls the Republican spending bill ''spending cut hokum.'' Now, the ''spending cut hokum'' bill identifies that there was $18 billion in real cuts and $20 billion in fake accounting tricks that are not real cuts.

Yesterday in Rules, I actually had the opportunity to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he could explain that discrepancy between the claimed cuts and the real cuts which those who have dived in have identified, and he demurred on that account. So, in the end, what have the Republicans accomplished?

I'd like to talk about this graphically and sort of show the American people what we're talking about here:

Now, with these charts, I use the Wall Street Journal's figures, which credit the Republicans for more cuts than does the Associated Press, but out of caution, I want to trust the Journal in this case as a well-researched source and use their figures even though they have less than the AP. The Wall Street Journal still says that the majority of the Republican cuts are, in fact, hokum cuts. So here is what we're talking about, Madam Speaker:

This is the deficit. This is the CBO's, the Congressional Budget Office, estimate of the deficit. It is $1.399 trillion. This is what we're talking about here. This is the continuing resolution savings. That's it; not one penny more. Let me sort of take an example of an American family. We'll have to take a few zeros off of this for most Americans to even understand these figures.

Let's say the deficit is $139,000 and not $1.399 trillion. I was a small business man before I came to Congress; so I understand how to balance a budget. I know most American families are trying to balance their family paychecks, to stay in their homes, to make their mortgage payments. It's $139,000 you lose in a year. That's tough. You have to take out a second mortgage and max out your credit cards, and you try to cover that $139,000, okay? Then you know you've got to make some serious changes. What are you going to do? You hem and you haw for a couple of months; you argue with your creditors; you threaten to shut down your business. On the eve of shutting down your business, because you can't afford another loss of $139,000, what do you do? You figure out how to lose $137,000 the next year. Do you know what? That $137,000

is going to put that American family out of business just as surely as that $139,000, but that is the Republican approach to this bill.

Now let me talk about some of the alternatives we have before us.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I would be happy to discuss this on the gentleman's own time. I want to go through this excellent chart. If the gentleman wants to come over, he can look at what we have here and what the Democrats have presented.

If we were serious about deficit reduction, Republicans could have supported several amendments offered by Democrats and voted on in the House when we debated H.R. 1. The Democratic amendments alone would have cut spending by nearly $129 billion, more than three times the amount that's even claimed in this bill.

Here are some examples: Congressman STARK and Congresswoman LEE offered one amendment that would have reduced defense spending to its level 3 years ago—we were already in two wars at that time as well—saving $36 billion in the first year alone, and that would have left intact the defense budget of $688 billion, more than enough to meet the security needs of our Nation. Congressman NADLER offered an amendment that would have finally ended our support for the war in Afghanistan, saving $90 billion. Congresswoman WOOLSEY offered an amendment that would have saved $415 million by ending the V–22 Osprey program.

In fact, just yesterday in Rules, I also proposed an amendment that would have reduced our troop presence in Europe, which would have saved $415 million. Our European allies, Madam Speaker, are some of the richest countries in the world. It's time they paid their fair way. What is the strategic rationale for an ongoing presence in Germany? The Nazis are gone. The Soviets are gone. Even former Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld has questioned the ongoing presence of our troops in Europe. I also proposed an amendment eliminating the drug czar. The drug czar's office spends $21 million a year; yet drug use has gone up since its inception.

Madam Speaker, we are never going to balance the entire budget just by reducing the funds Congress spends each year as part of the appropriations process—clearly, we all can agree we need to look at revenues and entitlements—and you're not going to make even the slightest dent in the deficit if you exempt defense spending from any cuts.

In this continuing resolution before us, Republicans have exempted more than half of the domestic discretionary spending from any cuts, and it becomes very clear that the Republican plan isn't so much about serious deficit reduction than it is about protecting their favorite Big Government spending while simultaneously slashing away at their favorite targets, like education, the environment and the safety net.

Here is what we could potentially accomplish if we work together: This shows the Republican cuts in this CR. We even add in, for the sake of argument, the hokum cuts. We put them in here too—it's the Wall Street Journal's term, not mine—and we include the proposed Democratic amendments. I think this is something that we could be proud of. Do you know what, Madam Speaker? I think more Democrats would support a program that didn't only cut the program which so many on my side of the aisle feel strongly about but that also makes some of the difficult decisions with where the real money is with regard to defense and security spending.

Yes. Just like that American family that we raised, digging its way out of a $127,000-a-year loss, we need to make a real impact on reducing the Federal budget deficit. This will take action across the aisle to make sure that we can leave our country in a better situation and that we can help the next generation fight its way out from the burden of debt that we risk placing upon them if we continue the big spending policies of the Republican Party.

[From the Wall Street Journal, April 13, 2011]

SPENDING CUT HOKUM

A mini-revolt is brewing among Republican backbenchers on Capitol Hill now that the specific spending cuts in Friday's budget deal are being revealed. After separating out the accounting gimmicks and one-year savings, the actual cuts look to be closer to $20 billion than to the $38 billion that both sides advertised. This is not going to help Speaker John Boehner's credibility with the tea party.

Even $20 billion is worthwhile, and the genuine reductions include cuts in high-speed rail, Pell grants, highway projects, renewable energy programs, housing subsidies, low-income home energy assistance, agriculture programs, contributions to the United Nations, and many more. There is also an immediate across the board 0.2% reduction in all nondefense accounts.

But the continuing resolution also saves money on paper through phantom cuts. The whopper is declaring $6.2 billion in savings by not spending money left from the 2010 Census. Congress also cuts $4.9 billion from the Justice Department's Crime Victims Fund, but much of that money was tucked away in a reserve fund that wouldn't have been spent this year in any event.

The budgeteers claim $630 million in cuts from what are called ''orphan earmarks,'' or construction that never started, and $2 billion more for transportation projects, some of which were likely to be canceled. The Associated Press reports that $350 million in savings comes from a 2009 program to pay dairy farmers to compensate for low milk prices. Milk prices are high this year, so some of that money also would never have been spent.

An estimated $17 billion comes from one-time savings in mandatory programs. The cuts are real, but the funding gets restored by law the next year, which means Republicans will have to refight the same battles. States lose some $3.5 billion in bonus money to enroll more kids in the Children's Health Insurance Program, but many states failed to qualify for that extra funding. These cuts don't reduce the spending baseline, so there are no compound savings over time.

None of this is enough to defeat the budget at this point, but it is infuriating given the GOP leadership's flogging of that $38 billion top-line figure. On Sunday we heard the leadership might lose 30 backbenchers on the budget vote, but yesterday we were hearing it may be closer to 50 or 60. This will only heighten skepticism over the next budget showdown, and Mr. Boehner will have to drive a harder bargain. Above all, the hokum belies the House GOP's promise to usher in a new era of lawmaking candor and transparency.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, let me begin by congratulating my friend from Boulder, my Rules Committee colleague, for his very thoughtful remarks, and I would like to respond with a few important points.

First, I was struck by the fact that he went through the litany of amendments that were debated on H.R. 1, underscoring again that we have, for the first time in decades, seen a free and flowing debate and an opportunity for votes to take place here in this institution. It hadn't happened before on a continuing resolution as we saw it in our consideration of H.R. 1.

□ 1250

I also want to say that while my friend continued to point the finger of blame somehow characterizing this as a Republican plan, I'd like to remind him, Madam Speaker, that this happens to be the result of a negotiation that has taken place with three Democrats—the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the majority leader of the United States Senate—and one Republican, the Speaker of the House of Representatives. By a 3–1 margin in the negotiation process, the Republicans were outnumbered. And so I think that it's a mischaracterization to describe this as somehow a Republican plan that is before us.

Now to the issue that was raised about a cut being a cut, Douglas Holtz-Eakin, the former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, made it clear, and he called it that—a cut is a cut. I know this attempt is being made to somehow characterize the fact that dollars have not been spent so that means you're not actually cutting them. Well, last night in the Rules Committee, the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, my good friend Mr. DICKS, pointed out something that everyone in this institution should know, and that is the process of reprogramming takes place within government agencies. We know full well that the movement of money, since money is fungible, that takes place within these different agencies, is standard operating procedure. So, Madam Speaker, to claim somehow that if dollars haven't actually been spent that they're not being cut is just plain wrong.

Now, Madam Speaker, while I talked about the negotiating process that ended up with the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the majority leader of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House, leading up to that, we had our very, very diligent and hardworking new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend, Mr. ROGERS, who has stepped up to the plate and taken on the responsibility, in fact, some call it tongue in cheek, but he has been very serious about being the ''enforcer'' of ensuring that we cut spending, and he has actually renamed his Appropriations Committee the ''Disappropriations Committee'' by virtue of the fact, Madam Speaker, of the recognition that if we don't get our fiscal house in order, we are going to be in deep, deep trouble.

So, Madam Speaker, I want to say that, again, he was one of the negotiators leading up to the final process here.

I would like to now yield such time as he may consume to my very good friend, the chair of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for the time here. And I thank him for the diligent work that he continues to do as chair of the Rules Committee, the sort of traffic cop for the bills that reach this floor.

I want to expand a bit, Madam Speaker, on a point that Chairman DREIER alluded to earlier, and that is the historic nature of the bill that we will be considering on the floor. As the chairman pointed out, under Speaker PELOSI, discretionary spending in those 2 years increased by 82 percent—a record. With this bill, we not only are arresting that growth, but we are receding actual discretionary spending by a record amount, nearly $40 billion in actual cuts in spending. That has not ever been accomplished by this body in its history, in the history of the country. The cuts in this bill exceed anything ever passed by the House. It's the largest cut ever—by four times. The largest previous single cut was in 1995, when we cut around $9 billion. With this bill, you cut almost $40 billion.

Now I don't understand sometimes my friends on the other side of the aisle when they criticize this bill. It's being supported by your President. He says, pass the bill. It's what we agreed upon. It's being supported by Senator REID, the leader on the Senate side. It's being supported by the Speaker of the House. And it's being supported by an overwhelming number of Members on this side of the aisle, and I predict a great number of Democrats likewise support the bill.

Now on the Defense portion of this bill, let me briefly refer to it. The provisions in this bill about the Defense budget are much like they were when all parties last December on both sides of the aisle in this body and on both sides of the aisle in the Senate body agreed to the expenditures for the Department of Defense. We simply lifted those agreed-upon provisions for the Defense Department and dropped them into this bill.

There are two people in this body that know more about Defense spending than any of the rest of us, and that's the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on Appropriations, BILL YOUNG of Florida, and my good friend, NORMAN DICKS, the ranking member of that subcommittee and the ranking member on the full Appropriations Committee. He worked long and hard with BILL YOUNG for these provisions. And I salute him for it. It's good work. It does the right things. It cuts back on the President's request for Defense. It does increase in real dollars, about $5 billion, over the current spending rate. But we're in three wars. And there's no reason at all for us to shirk from the responsibility to provide adequate funding for our troops in combat. And that's the reason why, one of the big reasons why we support this bill, why the President supports the bill, and why Senator REID and the Senate supports the bill.

And so let's focus on actual cuts in spending. We all profess that we want to cut back on the deficit for the year and for the ensuing years. The deficit this year, $1.4 trillion in just 1 year, the largest in history, adding to a debt that exceeds all of our fears of some $14.2 or $14.3 trillion. We all say, let's cut back on spending. Here is your chance. Here is your opportunity.

If you profess to be a fiscally responsible Member of this House, you have a chance, yea, an obligation, to vote for this bill and support it. It's historic. We've never been here before. We've reached a pinnacle and a great opportunity for us to show to the rest of the country that we're serious about controlling the free-spending nature of this body. This is your chance. Don't miss it.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 1 minute to respond.

The gentleman from Kentucky called this an historic bill. I think much more of this kind of history, and we risk making our country's solvency history by drowning ourselves in a burden of debt. Again, effectively, for a family business that lost $139,000, losing $137,000 might be nice, but it puts you out of business just the same. I continue to express our wish that we included some of the Democratic cuts in this that added up to four times the amount of the proposed Republican cuts in this bill.

As the Bard put it, the cutting in this bill is a lot of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

With that, it is my honor to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk about a different historic perspective. This bill is different, all right, and I want to try to explain that to you. But first, I want to say we weren't elected, any of us, to Congress to prove that we can barely keep the government open and alive. That was never why we were sent here. We're here to make America stronger. And looking at this bill, we are utterly failing in achieving that goal.

In addition to the unnecessary and politically driven cuts in the legislation, the process that brought the bill to the floor is a mockery of regular order. Never before, again, let me say it, in the history of our Nation has this rule—what we're doing here today are three bills under one rule. You think we're going to vote for one, that would be the budget for the remainder of the year, but there are two other bills here to be voted on that I think you might be surprised at. It certainly took us by surprise. One of them completely defunds Planned Parenthood, having nothing in the world to do about cutting the deficit.

□ 1300

The second one takes away the health care bill. A matter of that importance is added as a correction onto this bill. What they said they would like us to do is to correct legislation that has not even been passed. That takes a lot of imagination.

But what is more serious, and I believe that is what they have done here, they have added an unprecedented provision that raises serious constitutional questions. Under this rule, and pay attention here, except I don't want children to believe it. This is not the way we do things. After the House and Senate have passed this bill and it comes back over, the House will hold it and will not send it to the President. They will hold it themselves, letting the government shut down again until the Senate votes to defund Planned Parenthood and to kill America's health care.

Now, that is very similar to what we did here a few weeks ago, a couple of weeks ago. It may have been last week for all I can remember, we have been working so hard. But what we did was probably one of the silliest things done in any legislative process in the world. They really passed a bill on this floor that said: we have already passed a bill and sent it to you, Senate. The Senate took the bill up, and it failed. So then the House response to that failure was: if we don't hear from you by date certain, then we're going to just say that the House bill is the law of the land.

Now, all of you who have been to school know that what we do to pass a bill is the House passes a bill, the Senate passes a bill. If necessary, a conference committee reconciles the two bills, makes them the same, and it requires the President of the United States' signature to make it a bill. But not in this House. You can believe 10

impossible things before breakfast here easily because we're called upon to do that every day.

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

I would like to engage in a discussion with my distinguished ranking member, if she would like, on the issue that she just discussed.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Just one point. I think what the gentlelady said is that the Senate will have to vote on it, not that they have to pass it, just to be clear.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, there were several things that were said that I would like to address.

First, I would like to say that the gentlewoman began by saying that never before in our Nation's history have we had measures brought forward in this manner. Madam Speaker, that is just plain wrong. Time and time again under both political parties, we have seen the Rules Committee report out measures that do in fact cover multiple issues. So this is not unprecedented, as the gentlewoman has just said.

Second, I think it is very important for us to clarify the fact that what we are voting on is an agreement that is supported by the President of the United States and the majority leader of the United States Senate. Part of that agreement is that the Senate will not vote to defund Planned Parenthood or vote to actually bring an end to funding for the health care bill, but it will consider these measures. And I think it is important, Madam Speaker, to make it clear, the only thing we are doing in this rule is ensuring that that agreement is enforced.

So, Madam Speaker, I think that it is clear that many of our friends on the other side of the aisle are not happy with the fact that their President and the Senate majority leader have negotiated this agreement. Again, I don't like the agreement just like they don't like the agreement. I don't like it because I don't believe that it goes far enough, but it is very important for us to realize that this is simply a first step. It is a bold first step.

As the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has just said, Madam Speaker, it is a step which in fact is the largest, four times the largest, cut we have ever had in the past. It is a cut of $40 billion. By virtue of that agreement, we are making that first step. But if you extend this out, it will have cuts that total $315 billion. And as I said, we are just beginning the debate this week with this very, very important budget that will be considered in the Rules Committee today and tomorrow and Friday on the House floor.

I also have to say that one of the reasons we are having this debate on the rule today and voting on Thursday on the actual continuing resolution is because we put into place a very important change in the rules at the beginning of this Congress which states that unreported measures must in fact comply with the 3-day layover requirement that exists for reported measures. We are subscribing to that and enforcing that.

As we know, this measure was filed at 2 a.m. yesterday morning here in the House; and because of that filing, to ensure that it was put online, as the chairman of Appropriations Committee said, so that the full membership, the American people, the media have an opportunity to see this measure, we have done that. That is the reason we are going to be holding this vote on Thursday, and that is the reason we are able to have the kind of free-flowing debate that we will have.

Madam Speaker, this is an agreement that no one, no one is happy with; but it is an agreement that we have come to in dealing with the two political parties, and I am going to urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, this continuing resolution is a first step, all right. It is a first step towards bankruptcy with token cuts.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the underlying bill.

I want to reinforce the comments of the gentlelady from New York when she said that the issue of defunding Planned Parenthood or what your opinion is about the Affordable Care Act really has no place in this debate. It shouldn't be tied to anything. The fact of the matter is the Republicans are intentionally injecting these very kinds of polarizing issues, and let me say to all of my friends on the Democratic side, that's the reason you should vote against this rule.

I'm pleased that the Republican leadership of the House decided it was not in anyone's interest to shut down the government. I am also pleased that the leadership ignored the chants of ''shut it down'' coming from the most extreme elements of their party. But I am not pleased, Madam Speaker, with this so-called compromise.

This bill cuts the wrong things too deeply and ignores some of the things that could stand to be cut. The cuts target the poor and the middle class, the very people who can least afford it as we struggle to recover from the Great Recession. Meanwhile, the very wealthy and the special interests get away scot-free. Student aid programs get cut. Children's health care would be cut. Transportation funding to repair our roads and our bridges would be cut. Environmental protection would be cut. The COPS program, which helps local communities stay safe, would be cut. Investments in science and technology research would be cut.

But the Department of Defense, well, they got a $5 billion increase. Oil companies keep their sweet tax loopholes. And big agriculture keeps their subsidies. That's not fair, Madam Speaker, and that's not right.

I am all for a leaner government; but I'm not for a meaner government. I'm for balancing the budget; but I'm not for balancing the budget solely on the backs of the poor and the middle class. If you want to get to a balanced budget, there needs to be some fairness in this process. And if you think that this bill is troublesome, just wait because later this week we will be debating the Republican budget proposal for 2012, a budget that would represent the largest redistribution of wealth from the middle class to the rich in American history. It is a budget plan that ends Medicare as we know it. It is a budget plan that tells our seniors we want you to pay more, and you will get less.

Well, there are some things worth fighting for, Madam Speaker, and the protection of Medicare is one of them. So I look forward to that fight.

But in the meantime, I urge my colleagues to reject this yet again another closed rule, and I urge them to reject the underlying bill. We can do better than this.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say first to my friend from Boulder that the notion of arguing that a $40 billion cut is going to take us down the road to bankruptcy is absolutely preposterous.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Boulder.

Mr. POLIS. Again, the cut is actually somewhere in the $15 billion to $20 billion range, according to both The Wall Street Journal and the AP.

□ 1310

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, I will repeat this again so that he might be able to understand it. A $40 billion cut, or a $15 billion cut, cannot be characterized as taking us down the road toward bankruptcy. We all want to cut more in spending. I mean, it's very clear.

Now my friend from Worcester has just made this argument about the priorities that we have.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional minute, and I do so to say that I think it's important for us to look at the preamble of the United States Constitution whenever we're debating defense appropriations bills or the defense authorization bill. I'm so happy that my friend from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee and the defense appropriations subcommittee, is here. I always argue that the five most important words in the middle of the preamble of the United States Constitution are ''provide for the common defense.''

Now, with all due respect to the priorities that we have, ensuring that we do care for those who are truly in need, all of these things can be done at other levels of government. Only the Federal Government can deal with our Nation's security. As Chairman ROGERS pointed out, we are now, by virtue of a decision that the President of the United States has made, in the midst of three wars. I want to bring about spending cuts, and I believe that Governor Haley Barbour was absolutely right when he said: Anyone who says that you can't cut defense spending has never been to the Pentagon. We want to encourage defense sharing, and, in fact, we are focused on ensuring that we do get the best bang for our buck.

So, Madam Speaker, recognizing the priority that the Federal Government has for national security and recognizing that we're trying to bring about responsible cuts, I think this agreement is the right thing for us.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I appreciate the gentleman from California's willingness to look at defense spending. I know the gentleman from Kentucky mentioned we're in three wars. Perhaps part of the answer is to be in two wars or one war or, God forbid, perhaps we can be at peace again in our lifetime.

Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me and for his work on this bill.

Madam Speaker, the District of Columbia has no vote on the rule or the bill under consideration. Yet the only controversial attachments in this bill involve only the District of Columbia.

The bill is remarkably clean. Only four out of 50 or so attachments survived: one on gray wolves, one on Guantanamo prisoners, and, yes, there is the District of Columbia. These two, the only controversial amendments, violate the District's most basic right to self-government. One has to do with private school vouchers—only for the District of Columbia. A bill we didn't ask for, a bill we weren't consulted about, and a bill we don't want.

The Rules Committee refused to recognize my amendment, which would redirect the private school voucher money to the D.C. public schools and to our own public charter schools—40 percent of our children go to this alternative and our charter schools have long waiting lists—to our choice, not the Republicans' choice. My second amendment would strike a second rider that keeps the District from spending our own local taxpayer-raised funds on reproductive choice for our low-income women. Local money, local choice.

The majority proposed to close down the District government last week rather than pass my amendment to allow D.C. to spend its own local funds. Now the majority wants a closed rule for a bill with attachments that profoundly affect only the District of Columbia.

I will have no vote on this floor on the Rule or on any part of this bill.

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

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

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The majority will allow a vote of every other Member on what affects only my district. No wonder the D.C. mayor, the council and residents have taken to civil disobedience.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of my friend how many speakers he has remaining and also how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. We have three speakers. We are possibly expecting a fourth.

Mr. DREIER. Then I will reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to 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, I rise in favor of the commonsense compromise that says to the operating departments of our government, ''See if you can get by on 95 percent of the money you had last year.'' I think that makes good sense, and I commend Chairman ROGERS and Mr. DICKS for making sure that Pell Grants, title I, special education are fully funded and protected and, frankly, salute both sides for leaving aside extraneous matters like not funding Planned Parenthood and not funding the health care bill. I think this is a worthy compromise. I'm glad to support it.

I do want to note my grave concern with the rule and the rather ambiguous position we find ourselves in with respect to the actions of the Senate. About 10 days ago, the majority attempted to pass a bill where the Senate would never have to act. Now they want to say, even if the House and the Senate have both acted, apparently the bill doesn't become law. Maybe we should have put a few more education funds in for constitutional studies here because I think this is very unwise and, frankly, ambiguous. So I'm going to oppose the rule on the grounds that this very novel idea of giving the Clerk of the House the instructions not to enroll a bill that's been passed by both House and Senate I think is very troubling.

Having said that, I think that the underlying bill merits the support of both Republicans and Democrats and I will be voting ''yes.''

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. As one who voted for cutting some of President Obama's spending requests last year and who has already voted three times this year to cut spending from the budget, I believe we do need to ferret out every bit of unnecessary spending, to demand greater efficiency and to seek common ground on securing our long-term financial future by addressing our national debt. But this resolution is only a belated companion to the deal that tied a Christmas bow around another tax cut for the wealthiest few in December. It represents another unbalanced approach to achieving balance in our budget. There is no shared sacrifice here.

And like that December deal, this concession literally sets up tomorrow's demand for adoption of the House Republican budget—a pathway to less economic, educational, and health care security.

Instead of asking for a dime from ExxonMobil or other polluters, this deal makes severe cuts in the budget to assure us clean air and clean water. Instead of asking for a dollar from General Electric or another of these giant corporations that won't pay their fair share of taxes, this places the burden on hundreds of thousands of young Americans who are trying to seek a future job in the United States.

Almost one-fourth of the budget is eliminated for YouthBuild, a program that provides vital education and employment skills to young people. In Austin, I have seen up close the difference that our local YouthWorks makes in trails constructed, in homes weatherized, in the vital employment and training skills provided. With every energy efficient home for which a foundation is laid, a foundation is also laid for the future of some enterprising young Texans. Additionally, about another 100,000 young people at universities like Texas State will lose the counseling, academic instruction, tutoring and encouragement from TRIO that helps them achieve academic success.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. That's not balanced. Fair and balanced? Yes, I know it's a distorted slogan, but I think it could have real meaning for our budget. But this budget is balanced on our young people and our future. We need a budget that's fair. This is not it.

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

□ 1320

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a former member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

America is in a very dangerous place on this budget, and it's not an

unsolvable problem. We can get from where we are to where we need to be—and that is fiscal balance—if we put everything on the table and have a balanced approach. If, instead, we limit our consideration to essentially 12 percent of the budget, the so-called ''domestic discretionary''—things like low-income heating assistance, the Small Business Administration, scholarships for our kids wanting to go to college, scientific research—if we limit our attention to that 12 percent of the budget, even if we cut that entire 12 percent we would have trillion dollar deficits for as far as the eye can see. It won't work. There is a design defect here.

We have aggravated it with the deal that was made to extend the tax cuts at the high end when we were here in our special session after the last election, that $750 billion that we have to borrow in order to pay for those tax cuts for the top 2 percent.

We have to put everything on the table. It has to include the Pentagon, it has to include revenues, it has to include eliminating wasteful and unproductive, non-job-generating tax expenditures to mature and profitable industries like the oil industry. It has to include eliminating the ethanol subsidy, something that was promoted by the Member from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN). We put everything on the table. We can get from where we are to where we need to be.

One thing we also cannot do is start playing budgetary hostage taking. There is looming ahead of us the question of whether we will raise the debt ceiling or use that as a leverage point, as some are suggesting. This is not a leverage point; it's a moral obligation.

America was in fiscal balance in the 8 years of the Clinton administration. When he handed the keys over to the new President, Mr. Bush, there was a projected $5.7 trillion deficit.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I again want to bring it back to the hypothetical American family, small business we're talking about, because the $1.399 trillion figure is boggling to most people. So lop off the zeros there and say, hey, I have a small business, I'm an American family, I will lose $139,000 next year. Let me tell you, is losing $137,000 the next year a step towards solvency or a step towards bankruptcy? I would submit, Madam Chair, ask any small business man in America or small business woman, losing $137,000 instead of $139,000 is a step towards bankruptcy.

Just like that family, we in the United States Congress, we in this country need to come together and make hard choices about where to find additional income, where to cut expenditures, how to get this budget out of red and into the black. That's the difference between where the Democrats stand and the proposal of our friends on the other side. And another difference: A Democratic President has actually balanced the budget. That's a claim that the other side can't make for more than a generation.

It is clear that the Republicans are not serious about the deficit. If they were, this would be a different bill. Again, this is what we're talking about: Taking our Nation another step down the road towards fiscal insolvency and leaving a legacy of debt for the next generation.

Rather than holding the line on spending, the majority is feeding the beast. And yet, what do the Republicans cut rather than rooting out waste at the Pentagon? They cut $1.6 billion from the EPA's effort to protect public health and keep our air and water safe; $950 million from Community Development Block Grants to strengthen neighborhoods and create jobs; $815 million from FEMA grants that help communities prepare for disasters; $10 million to keep our food safe.

When you look at the winners and losers in this budget, it becomes clear what the majority party does and does not value. And they clearly do not mind leaving the next generation a legacy of deficits and debt.

What we're doing in this continuing resolution is increasing the favorite government spending of the majority party, running up the deficit, continuing big tax cuts for special interests while slashing the effort to educate our children, ensure access to health care, keep our air and water clean—oh, and while they're at it, taking away a woman's right to choose.

This is where we could be by working together, Democrats and Republicans. This process, this rule and this bill, are not examples of working together to solve our budget crisis.

We can do better, we must do better. To save America from bankruptcy, we must do better than sound and fury signifying nothing. We need to work together to make the cuts we need to make, to increase the revenues we need to increase, and to examine our entitlement programs to put our Nation on proper fiscal footing for the next generation and remove the mounting burden of debt that faces the next generation of Americans.

I don't see how anyone can argue that somehow reducing—again, at the family level, a $139,000 loss to a $137,000 loss, while it might be a fine thing to do, leaves that family in every bit as dangerous and precarious a fiscal situation as they were before—ask any small business man or small business woman in this country. And after passing this continuing resolution and keeping our government in business another year, we're just punting further down the field about making the cuts we all know we need to make to balance the budget, return to a surplus, and help remove the next generation of Americans from the legacy of debt that is threatening to crush them.

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

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, according to the schedule, in about 9 minutes, the President of the United States, at George Washington University, is scheduled to give a very important address in which he is going to talk about fiscal responsibility—the need to bring about spending cuts and all—and how to get our economy growing.

I want to congratulate the President. I want to congratulate the President for coming to this position. It obviously is much different than what we've gone through so far. As I said earlier, we've had an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending. The President proposed a budget that has deficits in excess of $1.5 trillion and would exacerbate the debt. He came out a few weeks ago and proposed a freeze in spending. We know that if we had not done what we are about to vote on here with this rule making in order a vote that will take place tomorrow, we would see an increase of $78.5 billion more in spending if we had not taken the action that this House, in a bipartisan way, is about to take.

But the reason I want to congratulate the President is that I have just taken a look at the early reports of what he is about to say in this speech, and he does call for us to look at the issue of entitlements—he specifically says Social Security, not Medicare or Medicaid, but he talks about Social Security. But I believe that is, again, a first step towards what I believe is absolutely essential, and that is, for us, in a bipartisan way, to tackle the issue of entitlement spending. As Mr. DICKS said in the Rules Committee yesterday, that's two-thirds of the spending. We know that entitlement spending is something that needs to be addressed, and there is bipartisan recognition that we need to get our fiscal house in order.

Madam Speaker, what we have before us is a measure that I don't like. I don't like it. I don't believe that it does enough to reduce the size and scope and reach of government. I believe that we need to do more. But we have to remember that we've got to take that first step.

Last November 2, the American people sent a very loud and powerful message to Washington, D.C. There are 96 newly elected Members of this House, nine of them happen to be Democrats, 87 of them are Republican. Now Madam Speaker, I think it's important for us to recognize that that's a pretty powerful message. They were saying, End the nonsense, bring an end to this dramatic expansion of government, and that's exactly what we're doing with this first step.

Margaret Thatcher, the great former Prime Minister of Great Britain, famously said, First you have to win the argument, then you win the vote. I believe that we've won the argument, Madam Speaker, because the message has come through.

□ 1330

The message has come through that we are, in fact, going to have to get our fiscal house in order if we're going to ensure the strength and the preeminence of the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm going to urge my colleagues to support this rule, and tomorrow we will have a vote on the continuing resolution itself. Then we will begin tomorrow, after we've had that vote, to debate the budget, which is going to be far reaching, it's going to be difficult, but it is clearly the right thing for us to do.

And I will say again, Madam Speaker, that I do hope that on these issues we will be able to continue to work together in a bipartisan way to solve our Nation's problems.

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1217, REPEALING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 219 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 219

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1217) to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 219 provides for a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1217, which repeals the Prevention and Public Health Fund and rescinds any unobligated funds.

Republicans are on the floor today to fulfill part of our Pledge to America that we would cut spending and we would repeal the Democrats' health care bill passed a year ago. On January 19, this House passed H.R. 2 to repeal ObamaCare completely. The ruling liberal Democrats in the Senate, however, have so far refused to consider H.R. 2, but House Republicans remain undeterred. We will repeal ObamaCare piece by piece if that is what it takes.

Because the liberal elites knew their government takeover of health care was unpopular and would likely have consequences at the ballot box, they included $105 billion in mandatory taxpayer spending in the law itself to protect their favorite programs.

Let me take a moment to explain the difference between ''discretionary'' and ''mandatory'' government spending

First, it's important to remember that the Federal Government does not have any money of its own, as it has only what it takes in taxes from hardworking Americans or money that it borrows from foreign creditors and our future generations. We are currently borrowing 43 cents of every dollar that the Federal Government spends.

Discretionary spending is appropriated by Congress annually and therefore subject to congressional oversight and review. Discretionary spending allows Congress to be wise stewards of the taxpayers' money by not funding ineffective or duplicative programs. However, what is called mandatory spending funds programs for people who meet certain criteria and occurs irrespective of congressional appropriations and must be spent whether we have the money or not.

The most recognized mandatory spending programs are Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, which operate on autopilot and have not been subject to congressional oversight from year-to-year as funds automatically stream from the Treasury to anyone who qualifies, that is, meets the criteria for a particular benefit.

The bill before us today, H.R. 1217, would repeal a portion of mandatory ObamaCare spending and eliminate a slush fund established for Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius. This slush fund, known as the Prevention and Public Health Fund, will automatically receive $1 billion when fiscal year 2012 begins in October of this year with automatic increases every year until it reaches $2 billion annually in fiscal year 2015.

However, there's a very important distinction between this funding and that for Medicare and Social Security in that this funding does not state eligibility criteria.

The liberal elites in Washington think they know how to spend the taxpayers' money better than individual taxpayers and gives Secretary Sebelius $2 billion a year until Congress acts to repeal her authority to spend without accountability.

Republicans are rejecting this slush fund by considering this bill which would repeal the fund and take back any money that has not already been spent this year. The slush fund is not subject to the annual appropriations process and therefore would not be subject to yearly congressional oversight.

The money will be made available to the Secretary regardless of how she chooses to spend it and whether or not the programs being funded are actually effective.

Again, this is not like Medicare and Social Security. There are no criteria for the spending of this money.

It's important to point out that this bill does not cut any specific program, because the slush fund is used by the Secretary to increase spending above congressionally appropriated levels for whatever program the Secretary chooses.

My colleagues across the aisle will argue that this money is being used to train primary care physicians, to prevent obesity, and to encourage healthy lifestyles. What they won't tell you is that they have absolutely no idea how the money is being used, because they abdicated the authority of Congress to an unelected bureaucrat.

The simple truth is that the money is just as likely to be spent on elective abortion as it is for any other purpose.

In the Democrats' dissenting views from the House Energy and Commerce Committee report, they say without mandatory spending for this slush fund, the programs will not be adequately funded. Well, Madam Speaker, that's what the whole process for appropriations is all about. If the programs need more money, it's up to them to come and justify that.

However, they sang a different tune when liberal House Democrats rammed through a government takeover of health care in November of 2009. They created this slush fund but made it subject to the regular appropriations process. That meant it was subject to yearly congressional oversight and direction for how the money would be spent.

□ 1340

But when the ruling liberal Democrats in the Senate sent over their version of the health care bill, which became law, the slush fund had been made mandatory. The liberal elites claim they put in a safeguard because part of the section creating this slush fund states that Congress has the authority to direct how this funding is spent. Well, as any high school junior civics student could tell you, Congress always has the authority to direct, redirect, repeal, or increase funding. Congress can always pass a new law to change the direction of any funding stream. That's our job as legislators. The need to state explicitly that we have the authority to direct spending in a slush fund is pointless.

The simple truth is that we have a spending crisis in this town in large part due to mandatory spending that operates on autopilot. Instead of working to address our unsustainable spending habits, the ruling Democrats refused even to offer a budget resolution last year or pass a single appropriations bill. The liberal elites failed to lead despite having unchecked control of all levers of power in Washington.

I brought a chart with me today to help illustrate the fact that mandatory spending is out of control in Washington. Madam Speaker, let me show you that because of mandatory spending being on autopilot, by the year 2050 the mandatory spending will absorb all revenue coming into the Federal Government, all tax revenue coming into the Federal Government. That simply is unsustainable. We cannot operate our country when we let three programs take up all of the money that comes into the Federal Government. Something has to be done. And yet the Democrats want to add another program to this, which would speed up this process. We don't need that.

As Washington liberals ignored the growing autopilot spending crisis, adding more unaccountable mandatory spending in the hands of unelected bureaucrats, House Republicans are now working hard to protect the future for our children and grandchildren by restoring congressional oversight of spending.

Now, I am sure many Americans are wondering how a slush fund with a clever title would be spent and why it must be put on autopilot. Let me give you an example. Pitt County, in my home State of North Carolina, received funding from this fund to fix prices at convenience stores so that healthy foods would be less expensive and, therefore, supposedly more attractive to the consumer. In addition, the Pitt County Health Department now plans to use some of this money to put up signs indicating the location of public parks, bike lanes, and alternate transportation.

Although I am certainly not opposed to parks or healthy eating habits, it seems quite clear that the Founders of this country did not intend the Federal Department of Health and Human Services in Washington, DC, to use taxpayer money to subsidize granola bars or purchase signs for bike lanes or parks.

The Federal Government has no business paying for local and community initiatives such as these, especially when we are borrowing 43 cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends to pay for it. The new House Republican majority is ready to lead this country out of our debt crisis. And it starts with voting for this rule and the underlying bill, which will save taxpayers $16 billion.

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

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

Obviously, this measure amends the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and seeks to repeal those provisions that establish and appropriate funds to the Prevention and Public Health Fund. It also rescinds any unobligated balance appropriated to the fund.

As I listened to my friend from North Carolina, two things jumped out at me immediately. One is her usage and the ruling Republican majority House Members' usage of the term for the Affordable Health Care Act as ObamaCare. I said earlier in the Rules Committee I guess I could call it HastingsCare, because I supported—as did many Members of this Congress who are still here and some who are not, on both sides of the aisle—health care provisions for America long before any of us knew Barack Obama's name.

When it's used the way that it is, it's in some manner attempting to be demeaning of the President. He does not bear the sole responsibility for the Affordable Health Care Act. I would assume some of that responsibility. And what I would say is he and many others in this body did not go far enough in that we did not establish universal health care for all Americans in this country.

The other thing that jumps out on this particular matter, calling it a slush fund and then allowing that it is going to be in the hands of an unelected bureaucrat. It puts us in a strange position in the House of Representatives when my colleagues with the ruling majority of the House of Representatives have sought and been successful in eliminating the opportunities for Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to seek to have appropriations earmarked for respective undertakings in their congressional districts. Rather, they would eliminate those earmarks and—guess what?—put it in the hands of unelected bureaucrats.

So I find it inconsistent to make the argument on one hand, and then on the other hand say, Oh, it's okay for the unelected bureaucrats to have some opportunities to spend our money. Quite frankly, I take umbrage with that. I think I can do a better job defining a need for a treatment plant in Belle Glade than can an unelected bureaucrat.

The burden of chronic diseases, such as cancer, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, and stroke, present a significant public health challenge to all of our communities and our Nation as a whole. In my home State of Florida, over 10 million cases of seven chronic diseases—cancer, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, stroke, mental disorders, and pulmonary conditions—were reported early on in this decade at the cost of about $17.6 billion in treatment, and resulting in $68.7 billion in lost productivity and economic cost.

Simply put, we have a sick care system, not a health care system. Tens of millions of Americans are suffering from health conditions that could possibly be preventible. This is further exacerbated by the continuing rise of health care costs. Despite the fact that chronic diseases are responsible for seven out of 10 deaths among Americans each year and that they account for 75 percent of our Nation's health care spending, less than 3 percent of our health care spending goes to preventive health care services and health promotion.

As you know, the Affordable Care Act, or the HastingsCare Act, or the Hastings and ObamaCare Act, or the Hastings and Obama and DemocratCare Act created the Prevention and Public Health Fund in order to assist State and community efforts in preventing illness and promoting health. The Prevention and Public Health Fund represents an unprecedented investment of $15 billion over 10 years to help prevent disease, detect it early, and manage conditions before they become severe. It aims to transform the focus of our system of care from primarily treating illness to maintaining long-term wellness by leveraging the power of preventive medicine.

Through the Community Transformation Grants program, for example, the fund empowers State and local governments and partners to implement community prevention interventions that help reduce chronic disease and health care disparities.

□ 1350

In fact, the fund is already being used in all 50 of our States and the District of Columbia to prevent smoking, increase physical activity, reduce alcohol and drug abuse, increase immunizations, train the Nation's public health

workforce, prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS, and help control the obesity epidemic in our country.

In addition, the Prevention and Public Health Fund provides funding for States to help develop a health insurance exchange by 2014. Footnote there: We should have had a public option, where consumers will have access to a new market of more affordable, quality health coverage, as well as funding for up to 400 school-based centers in order to provide a safety net and improved access to care for children.

Since the enactment of the HastingsCare, ObamaCare, DemocraticCare, RepublicansDon'tCare measure last year, the Department of Health and Human Services has awarded approximately $21.98 million in grants to organizations in Florida alone through the Prevention and Public Health Fund to help improve wellness and prevention efforts, including more than $9.3 million for community and clinical prevention, more than $3.1 million for public health infrastructure, and more than $9.4 million for primary care training.

If we are to reduce health care costs, we must improve the health of all Americans. Investing in proven preventive measures can significantly reduce the risk of developing these diseases, improving people's lives and saving money.

According to a report from Trust For America's Health entitled ''Prevention for a Healthier America,'' investing just $10 per person per year in proven community-based programs that increase physical activity, improve nutrition, and prevent smoking and other tobacco use could save our Nation more than $16 billion annually within 5 years.

This is equivalent to and potentially greater than the amount as estimated by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office by which H.R. 1217 reduces direct spending over a 10-year period. Furthermore, a public opinion survey by Trust for America and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation found that 71 percent of Americans favor an increased investment in disease prevention.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is supported also by nearly 600 national organizations, including the American Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, Families USA, and the AIDS Institute.

H.R. 1217, on the other hand, is nothing more than an attack on affordable health insurance, primary care and safety net care for children. This bill is yet another feeble attempt by the ruling majority Republicans to disrupt, dismantle, and ultimately destroy the HastingsCare, ObamaCare, DemocraticCare, RepublicansDon'tCare bill one piece at a time, including those programs that have already been funded and are helping millions of middle class, elderly, and working poor Americans and their families as we speak.

The misinformation that pervades the health care debate in this country never ceases to amaze me at all.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, the ruling Republican majority, would have the American people believe that the Prevention and Public Health Fund is a slush fund for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to spend money freely without congressional oversight. This is simply not true. A specific funding amount is allocated for prevention efforts through the fund each year during the fiscal year period: $500 million in 2010; $750 million in 2011; $1 billion in fiscal year 2012 and so on up to $2 billion beginning in 2015.

This gives the Secretary, whomever she or he may be, under Republicans or Democrats, the flexibility and health care providers the funding certainty that they need to implement prevention and public health interventions that help Americans make healthier decisions for themselves and their families. The Prevention and Public Health Fund is the first and only Federal program with dedicated ongoing resources specifically designed to improve the public. It represents our commitment to preventing illness and investing in our Nation's long-term physical and fiscal health.

Let me say this, Madam Speaker: Every day that I awaken, I start my day by trying to figure what can I do to follow the scriptural mandate to help the least of us. I am curious whether my friends in the ruling majority have the same feeling.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I would just like to point out one small thing to my colleague from Florida. Yes, I do begin wondering every day wondering how I can make life better for other people. But I want to say that there is no accountability whatsoever in this provision of the bill, and we want accountability for every penny of money that we are spending on behalf of the American taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you, my learned colleague from North Carolina.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the 2011 budget agreement that we have passed. We have already heard some of the aspects that this budget agreement addresses, and I am going to address some additional aspects.

I am very pleased to see this House once again value the culture of life. The FY 2011 budget now reinstates the D.C. Hyde amendment to ensure that no congressionally appropriated funds, Federal or local, are used to pay for elective abortions.

According to the Susan B. Anthony List president, Marjorie Dannenfelser, Congress will save the lives of an estimated 1,000 unborn children when it votes to restore this amendment banning the use of taxpayer dollars to pay for elective abortions in the District of Columbia.

It adjusts the U.N. Family Planning Agency funding from $55 million to $40 million. It adjusts international population control/family planning funding from $648 million to $575 million.

It adjusts title 10 domestic family planning funding to $300 million, which is a cut of $17 million.

This budget also calls for an up-or-down vote in both the House and the Senate, Madam Speaker, on the defunding of Planned Parenthood.

While the fight is certainly not over, we are making great strides in the ongoing effort to not only get our country on a strong fiscal footing but to honor the value of lives born and unborn.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Madam Speaker, you know, I was thinking we are approaching Mother's Day, and I thought of my mother. When it came to budgeting and appropriating money, she did not always have a great deal to work with, but she was a great budget analyst. She was an absolute wizard at crunching numbers, and she was an expert on knowing what worked and what did not.

As a matter of fact, she often told us that an ounce of prevention was worth much more than a pound of cure. And so she knew that when it came to health care, prevention measures are worth much more than their weight in gold. She knew that it would be penny-wise and pound foolish to cut or reduce the meager resources which we expend towards health education, health awareness, health promotion, and health screening.

□ 1400

If we don't think public health activities work, look for some cigarette smoke or cigar smoke in these Chambers. Look at the difference in the cost of treating lung cancer and cirrhosis of the liver versus preventing these diseases from occurring. In Illinois, we have a very proactive public health program, and we don't want to see it reduced, diminished or eliminated.

Yes, we do need to cut spending, and we are cutting spending, but let's not throw out the baby with the bath water. Let's not be penny wise and pound foolish. Let's vote down this rule, and let's vote down H.R. 1217.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to save taxpayers money by cutting wasteful government spending. The program that we are cutting out we cannot be sure does anything for preventative health care. It has designated that, but there is no idea as to where the money is going to be spent. Republicans certainly want to see Americans do a better job of preventing disease and of making their

health care better, but what we fear is that this money may be used for elective abortions, so we are also here today to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

This slush fund directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to invest in prevention and primary care by funding programs and initiatives under the Public Health Services Act. Title X of the Public Health Services Act provides funding for the abortion industry, including organizations like Planned Parenthood, which is the largest abortion provider in the country.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle and the liberals in Washington have really outdone themselves to ensure their favorite constituencies are provided for in their new health care law. This slush fund is yet another Democrat trick to use taxpayer money to subsidize elective abortion. Despite what they may have you believe, supporters of taxpayer-funded elective abortion cannot honestly claim this money cannot be used for elective abortion under Title X. The liberal Democrat elites relinquished all authority over this slush fund to Secretary Sebelius. For far too long, abortion providers have used Title X money to subsidize their operating costs, thereby subsidizing elective abortion.

We've heard a lot of misinformation being circulated in Washington this week about Planned Parenthood, the largest elective abortion provider in the country. As I pointed out in the Rules Committee last night, one of my colleagues across the aisle said that Republicans were ''here to kill women'' and compared us to Nazis.

Liberal Democrats maintain that women will lose access to preventative care if the government stops funding for the abortion industry. What they are not telling you is that Planned Parenthood has almost $1 billion in net assets and reported $737 million in revenues for its most recent filing year. Any big abortion organization making $737 million a year should be able to function without taxpayer subsidies, Mr. Speaker. This is not about women's health or access to preventative care. Through Federal and State Medicaid programs, low-income women have access to family planning and preventative health services at hospitals, doctors' offices and community health centers nationwide.

Another claim Planned Parenthood makes is that 97 percent of the 3 million patients they served in fiscal 2008 received preventative care services and that only 3 percent received abortions. These supporters of taxpayer-funded abortion ought to check their math. According to their own facts sheet for March 2011, Planned Parenthood clinics performed 332,278 abortions in fiscal year 2008. If they saw 3 million patients and performed 332,278 abortions, that means at least 11 percent of the services provided were abortions.

If they cannot be trusted regarding this simple math, what else are they hiding from the American people, Mr. Speaker?

Another astounding statistic I would like to share is that 97.6 percent of pregnant women who received services at Planned Parenthood clinics received abortions. Only 2.4 percent of pregnant women received only prenatal or adoption referral services at Planned Parenthood.

Elective abortion is not health care, Mr. Speaker. This is not about preventative health care or about improving access to primary care. This is about subsidizing the big abortion industry. If this slush fund remains unchecked, the Secretary could fund whatever program she chooses to the tune of up to $2 billion a year. That kind of money can purchase a lot of elective abortions, which strikes at the consciences of so many tax-paying Americans.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, that's just about the most convoluted, backward argument that I can imagine that I've heard in the 19 years that I've been here in the United States Congress.

There is not one dime in the Prevention and Public Health Fund that can or will be used for abortions. The law in this land, enunciated by a legend and an icon, among the other things that Henry Hyde was, is that Federal funds cannot be used for that purpose, and to carry us into that neverland that the previous speaker just spoke of is astoundingly wrong.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida, and I carefully and enthusiastically associate myself with his response.

We are all colleagues here. We call each other ''distinguished colleagues,'' and I call my good friend from North Carolina ''distinguished colleague,'' with whom I disagree with wide and well-versed opposition.

First of all, as we approach a sacred holiday for many of us in this country, it is one of sacrifice, and as we move into the month of May, we begin to look at how mothers sacrifice to take care of their children and not themselves. Many of us during this time frame will be fasting because we find that this draconian road that our Republican friends are on, with the minutest and the smallest of a majority that voted in this low voting election in 2010, is frightening. We need prayer, and we need to fast because this is truly the road to ruin. I just hope that my colleagues who communicate to the American people will tell the truth. The budget, the repeal of the Prevention and Public Health, the CR, all of them are the road to ruin.

Whether you agree with our President or not, he has it right: the country we can believe in.

With regard to the CR, when you have The Washington Post or any newspaper saying that more than half of the $38 billion in cuts that are used in this CR for tomorrow are taken out of education, labor and health programs while those at the top 2 percent or 1 percent of the tax bracket keep going on and on—many of whom said we are willing to sacrifice, that we are willing to offer to be able to help this country—and then when they want to repeal the Prevention and Public Health bill so that the brunt of the people going in for medical care will be in the emergency rooms because they will not have had cholesterol checks or high blood pressure checks or checks for sickle cell or diabetes—they won't have any of that. They'll go into the emergency rooms, laying out in comas—that's what the repeal of this legislation is all about.

The question you ask the Republicans is: What is the dream or the vision of America for them? It is a road to ruin, and the budget is an absurd ridiculousness that wants to cut Medicare and wants to cut Medicaid.

In going back to the CR, how can you tell the District of Columbia citizens, who pay taxes, that they cannot take their own money and use it for the dictates of their elected body?

□ 1410

How can you tell them that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. The gentleman is enormously kind.

I sat and listened to Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON who has lost a vote on this floor that she had, and the citizens of that community, the Mayor and the city council could do nothing but take to the streets to protest, How can you dictate what we do with our own dollars? And so over the next 48 hours, you will see the reason why many Americans are fasting, because they see that this country is going down the road of no return.

And it hurts my heart to think that we're going to rescind $16 billion that can be used to make a healthier country, to make a country where children can have access to health care, where a little 10-year-old doesn't die because he has an abscess.

I ask my colleagues to vote against all these rules and stop this from going down the road to ruin.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I feel I have to respond somewhat to my colleague from Florida on some of the points that he made.

He said that it is the law of the land that no Federal Government money

can be used to fund abortions. I know my colleague from Florida has been here a lot longer than I have been, and I know that he understands the difference between discretionary spending and mandatory spending, and I know that he knows that the Hyde amendment is only on appropriations bills. And as I explained earlier, Mr. Speaker, the appropriations bills are what we call discretionary spending, and that what the Democrats did in the health care bill was to put this $2 billion in that bill and call it mandatory spending, which is not subject to the annual appropriations process and therefore does not have the restriction of the Hyde amendment to apply to it.

So I would like to ask my colleague from Florida if he can guarantee on his own word to the American people today that nothing from this $2 billion that is put in for mandatory spending—it's on automatic pilot—would ever be spent for abortions.

Would the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Of course I will. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FOXX. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Please, let's have a clear understanding that no dollars from this fund are going to be used for abortions.

Ms. FOXX. Can the gentleman guarantee that?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I don't have any opportunity to guarantee whether or not I'm going to be alive in the next 30 seconds, let alone tell you what may happen. But if you ask my belief, and yours was your belief that it may be used is what you said, my dear friend, all I'm saying is it is not going to be. And the law enunciated through Henry Hyde, and almost verbatim has been included in the Affordable Care Act, precludes the use of money for abortions.

Ms. FOXX. I would like to reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman has just made my point. He cannot guarantee that this money will not be used for abortions, and neither can anyone else. And that is the point that we are making, Mr. Speaker. There is no accountability for this $2 billion. It is a slush fund for the Secretary of Health and Human Services. And it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, for us to take the hard-earned money of American taxpayers and give it to the Secretary with no accountability and with the distinct possibility that the money could be used to fund abortions.

The liberals ruling Washington the past 4 years have failed to address out-of-control mandatory or discretionary spending. In fact, under their control, discretionary spending has increased 84 percent in just 2 years.

As I mentioned earlier, discretionary spending is the money Congress decides annually to spend on programs with inherent congressional oversight. Mandatory, or autopilot, spending is the money that is automatically pulled from the Treasury without regular congressional oversight. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, when that decision was made for Congress to abrogate its responsibility, but it's a weasel way out. We should be looking at every dollar every year, because that's our responsibility.

Our debt and the liberals' insatiable appetite for perpetual government spending increases are sending America into a tailspin. In response to the complete lack of leadership and fiscal responsibility, House Republicans have been very aggressive in reducing wasteful government overspending, which is the real source of breathtaking budget deficits and private sector unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a chart that comes, I believe, from the Joint Committee on Economics, and it shows what happens when you increase government spending and when you decrease government spending when you're talking about private sector job creation. Every dollar the government takes from the private sector is one less dollar to be spent for private sector innovation and job growth. The government can create only government jobs.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to the 13.5 million Americans counted in the official unemployment rate, more than 900,000 Americans have stopped looking for a job because they think no jobs exist for them. I want to point out here that, again, when we saw increased government spending, you see a decrease in private sector jobs. When you see decreased government spending, you see an increase in private sector jobs. That's what the Republicans want to do. Americans want jobs. They want to work. We need to cut government spending and allow the private sector to grow.

More than 45 percent of Americans seeking work have been unemployed for more than 27 weeks. Real problems demand real solutions, Mr. Speaker. The track record in the House in 3 short months demonstrates that the new House Republican majority has heard the American people and is acting to provide the relief and solutions they deserve. Less government spending is crucial to encouraging private sector job creation and reducing unemployment. And where better to cut possible government spending than where money could be used for abortions?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from California (Ms. MATSUI), a former member of the Rules Committee that we miss.

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am in strong opposition to the rule and the bill before us today.

In 2008, I introduced legislation to create a Prevention and Wellness Trust Fund. Much of what I see in the Prevention and Public Health Fund resembles the goals in my legislation. I introduced the legislation and fought for these preventive care provisions during the Energy and Commerce Committee debate on the health care law. I believe investing in preventive health care is vital to helping Americans access the care they need to stay healthy, reduce their health care costs, and ease the burden on our overcrowded emergency rooms.

Mr. Speaker, we spend more than $2 trillion annually on health care, more than any other nation on Earth. Yet tens of millions of Americans still suffer from preventable and chronic diseases. In fact, approximately 75 percent of the Nation's health care expenditure is spent on treating chronic conditions. These conditions account for seven of 10 deaths in America.

For too long, the health delivery system in our country has been focused on only treating people after they get sick, not before. Prevention has been a luxury, if not an afterthought. Studies have shown that regular access to primary and preventive care can help keep people healthier, help avoid chronic conditions, catch diseases earlier, and therefore help lower costs.

Sacramento resident Tyler, an active teenager, was a picture of model health. One day he noticed that he was having heart problems during football practice. Taking precautions, his parents took him to a doctor to run tests and found that he had a cardiac abnormality. Today, after taking the necessary preventive steps, Tyler is healthy. Thankfully, he sought preventive measures early, which kept his condition from worsening and likely saved his life.

□ 1420

Not every story ends as happily as Tyler's, though. Millions of Americans every year are diagnosed with chronic diseases because they did not have such access to preventive care. That is the focus of this fund, to improve prevention. This funding will reduce individual and taxpayer cost while saving lives. However, that fact is being overlooked by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This bill before us will have a devastating effect on the future health of America, both in terms of our physical health and for our fiscal responsibility.

In order to truly improve both our health and our health care in this country, we must focus on prevention. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out again that Republicans would like to see more preventive care. However, the example that my colleague from California used says nothing about this bill because there is nothing in here to guarantee that this money will go to preventive care, absolutely nothing. There is no accountability in this legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my classmate and my good friend.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to both this rule and H.R. 1217, the legislation to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund of the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act uses Hyde-like language. I was on the Energy and Commerce Committee; I still am. We put it into the Affordable Care Act that there will not be one penny of Federal funds that will go for elective abortions.

The Hyde Act may be on appropriations bills, but the Affordable Care Act has that language in there. I know there is going to be a lot of talk during debate about the legislation and how we need to reduce our deficits, and tough funding cuts will need to be made by Congress in order to bring down our national debt, H.R. 1217 is not meaningful legislation to reduce our debt, nor is it a plan to create jobs or spur the growth in our economy. This legislation is yet another attempt by the majority to dismantle and repeal the Affordable Care Act because they do not have the support to do the straight repeal of health reform.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I know that this bill would be the first of several pieces that will mark a reversal of position by the majority on what has been previously bipartisan-supported health care concepts.

I have worked across the aisle for years with my colleagues on many prevention provisions, including Prevention and Public Health Fund that would fund the integration of primary care services into publicly funded mental and behavioral health settings. To date, Texas alone has received $495,000 for this program. I introduced this legislation for several years with bipartisan support from Representative TIM MURPHY. At the time it was called the Community Mental Health Services Improvement Act. And yet here we are today rolling back funding on these important bipartisan provisions to fulfill campaign promises.

We know that prevention programs will ultimately save our health care system in the future. What we did with the Prevention and Public Health Fund in the Affordable Care Act was to make a down payment on reducing preventable health conditions such as diabetes, obesity, strokes, and heart disease. The fund represents an unprecedented investment—$15 billion over 10 years—that will help prevent disease, detect it early, and manage conditions before they become severe. By concentrating on the causes of chronic disease, the Affordable Care Act helps move the Nation from a focus on sickness and disease to one based on wellness and prevention.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Don't let the majority fool you today by saying this legislation is a cost-saving measure. Several things that they won't be highlighting in relation to this legislation are the cost of treating these chronic diseases in Texas alone totaled over $17.2 billion, and chronic diseases resulted in $75.3 billion in lost productivity and economic costs to Texas.

If we want to have a debate on saving money and creating jobs, I would like the majority to show us their job-creating and deficit-reduction plan. They have been in power for 100 days, and we have spent most of the time by creating more debt by repealing provisions in health reform that would actually save my State billions of dollars. Today is yet another example of the majority's misguided priorities.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, please inform both sides the remaining amount of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 7 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 1354, the American Jobs Matter Act of 2011.

To address that, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, in Washington over the last few months, we have seen a lot of what we are seeing today, a lot of talk from my Republican colleagues about ideological budget cuts and about divisive social issues. And today, once more, we are here debating repeal of part or all of the health care bill.

But back home, we are hearing about one thing and largely one thing only, and that is job creation. Now, I appreciate my friend from North Carolina dressing up her remarks with some talk about jobs, but this debate today isn't about creating jobs. It is about a political agenda to take on the Democratically passed health care bill.

But we need to start plugging into where Main Street is and having a real conversation about job creation in this country, and so I am here today to talk about one idea in particular that can reach out to the 5,000 manufacturers in my State, and the tens of thousands more of manufacturing employees who are looking for good middle class work and help from Congress that hasn't been forthcoming in the last 3 months.

Since 2001, this country has shut down over 42,000 manufacturing plants. We have lost about 5 million manufacturing jobs; but during that same period of time, we have increased spending on defense manufacturing in this country by 81 percent. The problem is that 81 percent increase hasn't gone to factories in Connecticut or North Carolina or Florida or anywhere else. It has gone overseas because after building loophole after loophole into our domestic sourcing laws, like the Buy America Act, we are hemorrhaging manufacturing jobs in part because we are spending more and more taxpayer dollars overseas.

So we need to defeat this previous question so we can bring a commonsense jobs bill to the floor of the House of Representatives, the American Jobs Matter Act.

Now, let me explain what this bill does. It is pretty simple. It says that anytime a Federal agency is awarding a contract, in particular the Department of Defense, that they can give a leg up, that they can give preference to the bidder who promises and guarantees to create more U.S. jobs. Most of my constituents think that already happens. They already think we have some system in place to make sure that our taxpayer dollars are being used to give preference to American companies rather than foreign companies. It is not happening. The law doesn't allow it.

So let's pass today the American Jobs Matter Act. It will make sure that our money gets spent on our jobs here at home.

A quick story from Connecticut: I have a company that makes copper nickel tubing in Waterbury, Connecticut. They are the only American company that supplies that product to the Virginia submarine class. There is one company in Europe that makes it. But because we can't give them preference by law today, they have lost one of their two most important contracts to that European supplier, and along with it dozens of American jobs. That is our money going overseas, and we need to do something about it rather than debating the health care bill all over again.

When people really care about building back those manufacturing jobs, we should in fact be spending every day in this Congress talking about bills like the American Jobs Matter Act. Instead, we are talking about defunding Sesame Street, about destroying Planned Parenthood, and once again today talking about repealing the health care bill; and, in fact, a part of the health care bill that is going to create jobs through preventive health care services.

It is no wonder that Americans think so little of this Republican Congress, because they are not focused on what people out there are focused on, J-O-B-S, jobs. The American Jobs Matter Act, if we bring it to the floor today, is a commonsense measure to simply target taxpayer money to the creation of American jobs. We don't have to spend any more money to create American jobs. We just have to spend the money we are already spending better. We spend half the military dollars in the

world coming out of the U.S. budget, and this engine of expenditure should be used not only to make this country stronger militarily, but also to make it stronger economically.

□ 1430

The American Jobs Matter Act is one way to get there. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can get to the real business of this country—creating good-paying middle class jobs.

Ms. FOXX. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that the gentleman from Connecticut spoke to in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, no prevention and public health funds are or can be used to pay for abortions, and this bill has absolutely nothing to do with that. What it will stop, this bill as offered by the ruling Republican House, is immunization for kids and seniors, programs to stop childhood obesity and to prevent heart disease and diabetes. That's what they are stopping. Please don't be misled. No dollars from this fund will be used for abortion.

If we as legislators are to be about the business of helping Americans live healthy, productive lives, we must change our fundamental approach to health care by investing in illness prevention, not just treatment.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is the key to a coordinated, comprehensive, sustainable and accountable approach to improving our Nation's health outcomes. I would also add that at a time when Americans are looking to Congress for leadership, the Republican ruling majority in the House are continuing their assault on comprehensive health care reform that expands coverage to 32 million people instead of focusing on job creation.

It's time to stop playing games with the health of the American people and get down to business. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so that we can debate and pass a jobs bill without any further delay. I also urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would just like to say in response to my colleague from Florida that I think this rule and the underlying bill have a lot more to do with elective abortions than they do with government contracting.

Mr. Speaker, we have discussed at great length today why Secretary Sebelius does not need a slush fund set on autopilot. The American people expect their elected representatives to be wise guardians of their hard-earned dollars. They vehemently objected to the ruling Democrat agenda of Federal overreach into their daily lives and sent a clear message to Washington last November: Government must be responsible and accountable.

All across America, American families are tightening their belts, cutting their budgets and living within their means. It's time Washington did the same.

For these reasons and many more, I urge my colleagues, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bill so we can restore congressional spending oversight and save the taxpayers $16 billion over the next 10 years.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 219 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1354) to amend titles 10 and 41, United States Code, to allow contracting officers to consider information regarding domestic employment before awarding a Federal contract, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-

minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 219, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 218; and adoption of House Resolution 218, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 182, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
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
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
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
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
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 (FL)

NAYS—182

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
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)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
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
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
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Berman
Clay
Culberson
Doggett
Engel
Giffords
Meeks
Reichert
Schakowsky
Walz (MN)
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

□ 1459

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. COURTNEY and INSLEE, and Ms. EDWARDS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 180, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

YEAS—237

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
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
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
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
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
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
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
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 (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—180

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
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)
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
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
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
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
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
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Berman
Cantor
Clay
Engel
Fleming
Giffords
Hinojosa
McCarthy (CA)
Meeks
Olson
Palazzo
Reichert
Schakowsky
Velázquez
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1505

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 258, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 258, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 258, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1473, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 35, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 36, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 218) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473, 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 is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

YEAS—242

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
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
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
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 (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—183

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
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
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
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Berman
Engel
Giffords
Granger
Meeks
Reichert
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1512

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

YEAS—241

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
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
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
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 (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—179

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
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
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
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
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Berman
Engel
Fattah
Giffords
Hirono
Meeks
Reichert
Stutzman
Sullivan
Tierney
Waters
Young (AK)

□ 1519

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1217 and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REPEALING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 219 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1217.

□ 1520

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 1217) to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund, with Mr. CONAWAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Section 4002 of PPACA establishes a Prevention and Public Health Fund, which my bill, H.R. 1217, would repeal. The section authorizes the appropriation of and appropriates to the fund from the Treasury the following amounts: $500 million for FY 2010; $750 million for FY 2011; $1 billion for FY 2012; $1.25 billion for FY 2013; $1.5 billion for FY 2014; and for FY 2015 and every fiscal year thereafter, $2 billion.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services has the full authority to use this account to fund any programs or activities that she chooses under the Public Health Service Act without having congressional input, approval or oversight. HHS has already made disbursements from the fund, spending

$500 million last year, and she has $750 million available for her to spend this year to fund prevention activities, the Nation's public health infrastructure, workforce expansion, increasing immunizations, and preventing a variety of diseases.

The goals of some of these disbursements are laudable, but we must remember that this funding is over and above the amount that Congress has already authorized and appropriated for these activities. There have also been questionable projects that have been financed with these funds, including ''placing signs directing people to bike paths.''

When Secretary Sebelius testified before my subcommittee, I asked her whether she needed further congressional approval to spend the money from the section 4002 fund, and she answered no.

I then asked her if she could fund activities above and beyond the level Congress appropriated, and she stated yes.

This should concern every Member that we have created a slush fund from which the Secretary can spend without any congressional oversight or approval. No one here can tell us how this funding will be used next year or 5 or 10 or 20 or 50 years from now. We can't predict how the money will be spent—and worse, we can't even influence it.

I would suggest to my colleagues that, if you wanted more funding to go towards smoking cessation or to any other program, the health care law should have contained an explicit authorization, because you are not guaranteed that a dime of the money in this fund will go to your particular activity.

By eliminating this fund, we are not cutting any specific program or activity. I am not against prevention and wellness. This is not what this is about. This is about reclaiming our oversight role of how Federal tax dollars should be used.

I urge support for my bill, H.R. 1217.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents the Republicans' newest line of attack to disrupt, dismantle, and to ultimately destroy the Affordable Care Act. Today, they are doing so by sacrificing longstanding bipartisan policies to push a narrow partisan ideology.

For many years, Republicans have joined with Democrats in supporting programs to prevent disease, to promote health and, in turn, to cut health care costs. But today, the House will vote to end funding for the first and only Federal program with dedicated, ongoing resources designed to make us a healthier Nation.

Every State in the Union is already benefiting from the resources made available from the fund to fight chronic and costly conditions, such as obesity, heart disease and diabetes. Repealing the prevention fund is a blow against seniors. In States like California, Michigan, Iowa, Maine, North Carolina, and Massachusetts, they are using these funds to train personal home care aides who assist the elderly with Alzheimer's disease and other disabling conditions.

Terminating the prevention fund is not only extremely shortsighted; it will also prove to be fiscally irresponsible. The return on this kind of upfront investment—targeted resources to help keep people healthy for as long as possible—will over time save precious health care dollars.

We need to preserve the prevention fund because it can serve as a cornerstone for a health care system that finally recognizes that preventing illnesses is as important as treating them. Until now, prevention has too often been just a mere afterthought.

American families support prevention. They want programs to educate seniors to use preventive health services, such as mammograms and colonoscopies, which can help extend their lives; and they want programs that focus on preventing childhood obesity and diabetes, which will help their children to grow up healthy and strong. The American people want us to start working together to solve the real problems facing our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this partisan and divisive legislation.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished vice chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of H.R. 1217. The bill, as we have already heard, repeals the public health slush fund that was included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which was passed just a little over a year ago.

This fund, called the Prevention and Public Health Fund, is almost $18 billion, which accounts for the next 8 fiscal years, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services gets to spend this money on any program that he or she deems worthy. What the money will be used for and how it will be used are, essentially, unknowns. Neither this Congress nor subsequent Congresses have any earthly idea.

It is yet, once again, an abdication of our authority here in the United States Congress. It is an abdication of power in deference to the executive branch. If that's what people think we were sent here to do, to simply carve off greater and greater pieces of our authority and hand it over to the White House, then I hope I'm wrong in that; but over and over again, with the health care bill, with the financial reg bill, it seems like that is the mantra here. It does put way too much discretion in the hands of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.

□ 1530

We've got a predicted shortfall in the Nation's health care provider workforce. Some of this money is going to go for scholarships, but it sets up a big problem. Under the Public Health Fund, some of those same students could receive a scholarship for 1 year, only to find that the Secretary has bigger and better things to spend it on next year. Maybe there's a new bike path that needs a sign, and that student would find their education unfunded because all of the discretion rests with the Secretary.

Now, just a moment ago, the ranking member of the full committee stood up and said that it seems like all the Republicans want to do is defund and remove the Affordable Care Act. Well, I appreciate his noticing, because, Mr. Chairman, that is what the election of November 2, 2010, was all about. We were elected to come here and do that work for the American people.

And the duplication contained within the slush fund, the ranking member talked about smoking cessation. That's a good idea. I believe in that. I lost two parents due to tobacco-related illness. But wait a minute. What about the duplication? When the ranking member was chairman last year, last Congress, he created the Center for Tobacco Products at the Food and Drug Administration. We funded that lavishly with a brand-new tax, and now we're going to come back and fund it yet again with this public health slush fund?

The ranking member asked about what programs we wanted to cut. Really, it's a question of do we want to be accountable to the American people who elected us here to do this job. They sent us here to ensure their money was spent responsibly and that every penny would be accounted for and justified before being spent. With the current state of the economy, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure how the American people feel about the Secretary choosing to spend money on signs to direct people to bike paths. I know how they would feel about it in my district.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. BURGESS. In this law that was signed in the East Room of the White House just a little over a year ago, section 4002 takes from Congress the oversight of spending, and it becomes a blank check for the Secretary to do with as she wishes without any other input from Congress. By doing that, it takes that authority away from the American people, because we are the closest contact the American people have with their Federal Government. And by taking us out of the equation, guess what, Madam Secretary? You've got a blank check. It's all yours.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank the ranking member of my subcommittee for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1217, a bill that would defund a key strategic investment in our Nation's long-term fiscal and physical health, the Prevention and Public Health Fund. Simply put, this fund is a critical effort to make our Nation healthier and, in turn, to bring down health care costs.

This misguided bill would return our Nation to a system of ''sick care,'' a system that hasn't worked, rather than one focused on health and wellness. That's something we can't afford to do. We all know that health care costs are rising at an unsustainable rate. In fact, the Republican majority has cited these costs as a reason to propose ending Medicare as we know it, by turning it into a voucher program and by whacking away at poor people's health care by block-granting Medicaid.

But one of the key drivers in entitlement spending growth is chronic disease, the exact problem addressed by this prevention fund. Yet this bill shortsightedly cuts back our efforts to reduce chronic illness and promote wellness programs.

In California, we are putting these funds to work to slow the alarming rise in obesity rates, to train our next generation of public health professionals, to curb our tobacco use and improve our capacity to respond to disease outbreaks.

At a time when counties have laid off thousands and struggled to maintain essential public health services, the need for this fund becomes even more critical. That's why numerous local governments and national organizations, including the National Association of Counties and the American Public Health Association oppose this shortsighted bill.

Furthermore, the fund is a sound investment. Trust for America's Health Research has shown that investments in proven, community-based programs to increase physical activity, to improve nutrition, and to prevent tobacco use could save the country more than $16 billion annually within 5 years. This is a return of over $5 for every dollar invested.

Not only do these programs add to our constituents' quality of life, but it can also increase their economic output by keeping them healthy and in the workforce.

These are some of the reasons I stand with these folks and urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), who is on the Health Subcommittee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of H.R. 1217. I think this is an important bill for us to bring forward. And I want to thank the chairman for bringing it forward and for helping to lead this Congress in the repeal of ObamaCare. It is a message that the American people sent loud and clear last November. They do not want to see government coming in and controlling their health care choices. That is something that should be made by individuals, their family members, and their physicians and not by the Federal Government.

I have found it so interesting, as we have been through the hearings on this and through the markups, that we continue to hear, well, this $17¾ billion, well, it's just not that much money. Isn't that amazing that in the middle of a CR crisis and a debt crisis that we are hearing such rhetoric?

I think it is amazing that we are being told, and through what we know—yes, and some of us did read the bill and so we do know what was in that bill—that the Secretary can spend this however she wants to. She does not have to come back to Congress another time to get permission for spending this slush fund. And isn't it amazing that some of our colleagues think that a fund will make people healthier? Money doesn't make people healthier. We all know that.

And isn't it amazing that in the middle of all of this, we are out of money at the Federal level? We all know that the cost of health care is rising, and we know that one of the reasons that the cost of health care has risen so much in the last few years is government intervention. Those are some of the known components that we have.

I think it's important to realize too, Mr. Chairman, eliminating the slush fund does not cut any specific program. And proponents of this fund want to claim that we're cutting, we're cutting, we're cutting. What we're doing is saying, no, you can't allow the Secretary to have control and just give it out. This needs to go through the normal, regular funding processes. That is very important. And it's time that we realize we have to do that.

Yes, let's move forward. Yes, let's repeal ObamaCare. Yes, let's get it off the books. Let's do everything we can to get the Federal Government out of your pocket, out of the middle of your health care decisions. Let's make certain that those choices go to individuals and to their physicians and that they are not going to be dictated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, who has a slush fund of $17.75 billion to spend as she or he sees fit over the next 10 years.

We need to be changing the way health care is going to work, and we need to do it with putting individuals in charge.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Here they go again. The Republicans failed in their efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and now they are reversing course and trying to cripple implementation by attacking individual provisions of the law.

The United States has a health care system designed to treat the sick, not to prevent disease from occurring in the first place. The Prevention and Public Health Fund is a crucial component of the health reform law's effort to remedy that weakness and transform today's sick care system into a prevention-focused health system.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund will avert future illness, save lives and restrain the rate of growth of health care costs. It's a dedicated investment in community prevention and is a much-needed down payment on the health and economic well-being of all Americans.

Federal investments from the Prevention and Public Health Fund have already begun to address improvements in the Nation's health status by supporting essential and proven prevention activities, such as immunization—immunization and tobacco cessation.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund holds great promise to improve the capacities of State and local health departments to protect communities from health threats through the use of technology. It will increase numbers of highly skilled scientists and other public health professionals.

I want to be very clear, and you've heard it yourselves. This is simply another attempt by Republicans to defund the Affordable Care Act and stop its implementation. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

□ 1540

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady kept saying it will, it will, it will. The simple fact is we don't know where the money is going to go.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), who is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank my chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, at least some Members of this body can remember ads back years ago touting the miraculous benefits of Sal Hepatica and Carter's Little Liver Pills. Probably all of the Members can remember, because it was just a year ago, Andy Griffith touting the new health care reform bill. And those of us who are on Medicare remember getting those glossy mail outs, very expensive, slick-looking ads touting the benefits that ObamaCare has brought to Medicare, even though the new bill, the new entitlement creation took something like $550 billion out of Medicare, and yet they had the audacity to send these ads out, these fliers saying that it improved Medicare. ObamaCare improves Medicare; go figure. Well, that is a concern here. That is why I am standing in strong support of Chairman PITTS' bill, H.R. 1217.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, for prevention, wellness, and public health activities authorized in the Public Health Service Act and administered by Secretary Sebelius, the Secretary of Health and Human

Services. But she can use those funds in any way she deems appropriate as long as she says it is for public health.

Can it pay for political TV advertising for President Obama ahead of the 2012 elections? Absolutely she could. Nothing could stop her; the Congress couldn't as long as she deems it is necessary for public health. Pay for thousands of signs in communities all across the country declaring that PPACA is a success, nothing could stop this Secretary, or any Secretary from doing so, as long as they call it for public health. No, not even Congress.

And as the chairman said, Mr. Chairman, the amount of $17 billion, almost $18 billion, is just a down payment, if you will, because in perpetuity $2 billion a year continues to be appropriated. And you do that with a bill that quite honestly this Member thinks will be declared within a year and a half, hopefully sooner, unconstitutional. So we are spending money that is absolutely unnecessary at a time when we are sitting here with $14 trillion worth of debt and listening to the Secretary of the Treasury say within 6 weeks we are going to have to raise the debt ceiling so we can borrow more money. And here we are spending $17 billion, with a ''B,'' and that is not just chump change by any stretch of the imagination.

Last year in 2010, the CDC actually spent some of $500 million to promote an increase in the excise tax on tobacco to the States; basically saying to the States, you need to make sure you raise taxes on tobacco.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the chairman for yielding me this additional time.

Let me just conclude that clearly this is a necessary bill to let Congress once again have the opportunity to control spending. That is our responsibility. That is our constitutional right. That's what the American people want. I think the chairman is absolutely right with this bill, and I fully support it. I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking Democrat on the Labor, Health Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. It will cost money and endanger the health of the American people.

We included the Prevention and Public Health Fund in the Affordable Care Act because we know preventive health care reduces health care costs. It dramatically increases Americans' quality of life. Preventable causes of death such as tobacco smoking, poor diet, physical inactivity, and the misuse of alcohol have been estimated to be responsible for 900,000 deaths annually, nearly 40 percent of total yearly mortality in the United States. Further, 7 in 10 deaths in America are from chronic diseases. And by 2020, the U.S. may spend $685 billion a year on these chronic diseases. This fund works to bring down these numbers and to help Americans live longer, healthier lives.

Preventive care is fiscally responsible. One example that would be impacted by this misguided legislation is vaccines. Estimates indicate that we save up to $400 for every illness averted by vaccination. And that does not even take into account the costs of further transmission in the case of a serious public health epidemic.

By supporting our public health workforce and building health infrastructure, by promoting exercise, reducing tobacco use, the Prevention and Public Health Fund will go a long way towards reducing the surging costs of health care for Americans families and for our Nation. It is shortsighted folly to repeal this fund now, especially when you consider all the oil subsidies and breaks for corporate lobbyists that the majority has included in their budget. We should not be putting political ideology before public health. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1217. As members of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee, my colleagues and I have participated in a number of hearings that have explored the fiscal impact of the new health care law.

These hearings have revealed the existence of several programs and mandatory spending provisions contained in the law. Health and Human Services Secretary Sebelius said during testimony that she had the sole discretion over billions of dollars in direct, unlimited mandatory spending under the law. This means without any congressional hearings, without any language in appropriations bills, and without any oversight, the executive branch has been granted unprecedented spending authority.

Today's legislation, H.R. 1217, will repeal one of those little-known programs called the Prevention and Public Health Fund and subject it to the annual appropriations process. The aim may be worthy, Mr. Chairman, but this should be subjected to the annual appropriations process. This action, according to the Congressional Budget Office, will save American taxpayers $16 billion over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the Federal Government is $14 trillion in debt. Our deficit for this year will be at least $1.5 trillion. We must get Federal spending under control. We can start by repealing programs that run afoul of congressional oversight. I urge Members to support H.R. 1217.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I am frankly stunned to have to come to the House floor today to talk about a bill that defunds the largest investment we have ever made in our population's health: the prevention and public health trust fund. The trust fund specifically says what it is going to be used for: reducing tobacco use, expanding opportunities for recreation and exercise, bringing healthier foods like fruit and vegetables to communities in need; and helping kids to eat healthier meals at school.

All of us who have been involved in health issues for many years know that the biggest public health epidemic that we have right now is obesity. If we don't do anything to reverse these trends, then for our children and our children's children, we are not going to have good outcomes. Seventy-five percent of all health care costs are spent on the treatment of chronic diseases, many of them preventable. Our Nation's youth are confronting unprecedented levels of obesity, placing them at ever-increasing risk for those very same chronic health conditions. I think it is pathetic that we have children in this country who only have access to playgrounds at McDonald's with their 8,000 playgrounds in this country. And so what this trust fund does is it supports research that examines evidence-based practices relating to prevention, including the translation of interventions from academic settings to real-world settings.

□ 1550

This is not, as the opponents of this trust fund say, a slush fund or something that is simply willy-nilly spending. Instead what it is, it's evidence-based and it's looking at ways that we can prevent childhood obesity and nutrition, reduce tobacco use, and expand opportunities for recreation and exercise.

This is something all of us can get behind. This is something we should all support. I am sorry that it has become caught up in this partisan web, because frankly we should all support this for our kids.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I have the copy of the law the gentlelady referred to. She says the trust fund refers to spending for fresh food and vegetables and other things. There's none of that in the language. I would welcome her to point it out.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1217 is an attack on public health and disease prevention in this country. The prevention fund is our first national proactive, strategic commitment to changing the focus of our health care system from one of treatment to one of keeping Americans healthy.

This change in focus is essential, because keeping people healthy improves

the quality of their lives and that of their family, and it is our best means of controlling preventable chronic diseases, which account for seven out of 10 deaths and 75 percent of our Nation's annual health care costs, totaling $1.7 trillion.

If H.R. 1217 passes, we lose a critical opportunity to control health care costs and we lose the opportunity to reduce unnecessary suffering and death from preventable chronic diseases. Adding to the assault of H.R. 1217 on public health and prevention is the FY 2011 continuing resolution which cuts CDC's budget by over $700 million.

The result of these proposals is that millions of Americans will needlessly continue to suffer from preventable chronic diseases, costly treatments and costly hospitalizations. Prevention saves lives and prevention saves money. Defeat H.R. 1217 and continue to build a healthier America.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I cannot believe that we are here debating a bill that would repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund. At a time when we should be championing legislation to strengthen the health and well-being of Americans and this Nation, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing the exact opposite with H.R. 1217.

Currently, we have tens of millions of hardworking Americans who suffer and some die from preventable diseases, and without prevention and public health efforts, the very services this fund was created to support, tens of millions more will be affected in the future.

With so much at stake—and we are talking about human lives—we should not be here fighting about the merit and value of keeping the Prevention and Public Health Fund in place. We would do better for our country in terms of health and savings if we were instead discussing increasing it.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not moved by the disastrous human impact, then perhaps they will be moved by the equally disastrous economic impact that it will have, because not having prevention and effective public health measures in place costs money, and a lot of it.

On the other hand, the Journal of Health Affairs reported that increasing the use of proven preventive services from their current levels to 90 percent would result in $3.7 billion in savings in just 1 year. And we know from a Joint Center study that reducing health disparities, which this fund would help to do, could save as much as $1.24 trillion in direct and indirect medical costs in just a 3-year period.

This bill to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund is not just misguided legislation, it is harmful and unjust. It is contrary to our values and a disrespect of the value of human life. It will not save money. In fact, it will cost this Nation more, both in human health and wellness as well as in actual health care spending.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote to protect all Americans and the moral standing of this country by voting ''no'' on H.R. 1217.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania controls 15¼ minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey controls 17½ minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it's been 100 days of the Republicans' no jobs agenda and they've chosen to devote time and energy to bills and resolutions that would defund the Affordable Care Act, eliminate mandatory support for preventive care, and abolish any and all Federal support for Planned Parenthood. House Republicans know that these measures won't be approved by the Senate and would never be signed by the President. It's just another political gesture at a time when we should be working to create jobs and promote economic recovery.

The bill on the floor this week, H.R. 1217, would abolish the affordable care law's Prevention and Public Health Fund. This is a fund that prevents disease, that detects it early, and that helps manage conditions before they become severe. All empirical data, all experience and plain old common sense informs us that prevention and early treatment not only save lives, they also save money. In fact, the Prevention and Public Health Fund addresses one of the major deficiencies in our approach to health in America, and that's preventing illness before people get sick.

The Republican assertion that mandatory funding, which I've heard over and over again today and also in the Health Subcommittee, that this is somehow mandatory funding and it's unprecedented, that's completely not true. Medicaid and Medicare are funded with mandatory support, and there are a lot of other programs within our committee's jurisdiction and in Congress in general that are funded through mandatory funding.

I don't know how many times I'm going to come to the floor and hear about repealing the health care reform. I understand tomorrow there's going to be an enrolled bill that goes along with the CR that's going to defund the whole Affordable Care Act. Here today we're going to defund one piece, the prevention fund. Tomorrow we've got another enrollment resolution that defunds the whole bill. Again, another resolution tomorrow to defund Planned Parenthood.

How many times are we going to keep voting on the same thing over and over and over again? Meanwhile, I don't see a single piece of legislation coming to this floor that addresses jobs or the economy. When I go home, people want to know what we're doing about the economy. They know that their health care reform has passed, that they're benefiting from it, that it's gradually unfolding before them. They don't want us to continue to debate the same thing over and over again. Repeal, defund, and no suggestion about what you would do to replace it either, by the way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey and let me thank the chairman of the committee as well.

Madam Chairwoman, we just have a disagreement. I would venture to say that the bulk of sick people in America and others who every day struggle to maintain their health so they can provide for their families would vigorously disagree as well.

I think there are two points that I would like to make, and that is that what we lose when we repeal this Affordable Care Act and the funding of it is more than the glory that we get from going home and bragging that we have undermined America's health care system, or some would say that we have taken away ObamaCare. Preventative care is an unbelievable plus that this bill has generated.

I went to one of my emergency centers, a new one, that is crafted under the public health system. It is to take the load off the emergency centers, the emergency centers that ambulances go to. What an amazing sight, of people coming with broken toes and fingers and feet and bruises, maybe the beginning of heart disease and other problems. But it was a lower level emergency room, not particularly preventative care but the kind of intervention that can save millions of dollars.

□ 1600

I want to go even lower than that—and I don't use that terminology—but I want people to be able to go and check on their cholesterol, check on their high blood pressure, understand whether they have sickle cell, understand what stage of diabetes they are in or understand what stage of heart disease they are in in a preventative care cycle. And everyone knows that economists document how many billions of dollar that will save. How can we vote against that?

And then secondarily, there are two elements that the Affordable Care Act provides that is being repealed; research and training for health professionals that we absolutely need—whether you're in the private care system or not—and then of course protecting our most precious resource, and that is our children. If you can raise a

child in a healthy manner in terms of nutrition, in terms of immunization, in terms of regular doctor visits, then you are able to save billions of dollars.

This is wrong, headed in a wrong direction. Many of us are fasting. I said on this floor, we must pray because this is the wrong direction to go.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, we are simply never going to bend the cost curve on health care or improve America's quality of life until we focus much more on disease prevention, and that's what this prevention fund is for.

I always thought that both Democrats and Republicans wanted to keep people out of the hospital, off of disability, leading productive lives, and trying to prevent diseases before they occur. I never thought this was a partisan issue. Because we need to have a system of well care, not sick care, if we're really going to have success in saving money and bending the cost curve.

So I don't understand why my Republican colleagues so many times in the committee would talk about prevention, but all of a sudden now they want to abolish the prevention fund. It just doesn't make any sense.

Before the Affordable Care Act, prevention activities were chronically underfunded, accounting for only 2 to 4 percent of the national health care expenditure by some estimates. Considering that chronic diseases eat up an estimated 75 percent of our $2 trillion in annual health care spending, to spend an additional $2 billion for wellness and prevention is a wise investment.

Since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, every State has benefited from the prevention and wellness fund. This year, over $750 million in grants were dispersed—building on a $500 million investment last year—and repealing this program would mean putting the brakes on investments that are already beginning to make a difference.

In my home State of New Jersey, many of my constituents have benefited from over $15 million in prevention and public health grants, funding for such things as HIV prevention, tobacco cessation, mental health care, critical public health infrastructure improvements, as well as support for primary care training and workforce development.

I could do the same, I have a sheet here—I'm not going to read it, but I have a similar sheet for Mr. PITTS and Dr. BURGESS and others on the Republican side who specified these are the types of grants that are being made available in their States.

I simply don't understand. There are 600 national, State, and local organizations supporting the fund as a primary vehicle for making public health investments that would create jobs and help lower long-term health care costs. The Energy and Commerce Committee and the Health Subcommittee have heard me many times say that we can never calculate the huge savings that come from prevention.

We had the CBO in the other day and I said to the CBO, why don't you calculate prevention, because we would save trillions of dollars? Well, they don't do it. But the bottom line is we all know that prevention saves money. If you concentrate just on chronic diseases, this law helps move the Nation from a focus on sickness and disease to one based on wellness and prevention. And if you take away this critical new investment in prevention, it's going to be harmful to the health of Americans now and also in the future.

Madam Chairwoman—and I will address this directly to my Republican colleagues—in the last few weeks, when we had hearings in the Health Subcommittee on the various measures that the Republicans wanted to defund—and I know they want to repeal the whole bill and I know they want to defund everything, and that's what they're going to try to do again tomorrow. I understand all that. I totally disagree with it, but I understand that they're against the Affordable Care Act. They want to defund it, they want to do whatever they can to get rid of it.

But it just seems to me that to pick the one fund that deals with prevention is really the worst thing you could have done today because what we're trying to do with the Affordable Care Act—and what I've sought to do in everything that we've done in the subcommittee since I've been on it—is to really stress prevention because we can avoid people going to hospitals, we can avoid people going to nursing homes. They can lead a better quality of life and we save money.

So I just think it is really unfortunate today that after so many years of a bipartisan effort to deal with prevention, to fund prevention issues, that this is the one fund that's actually picked on today to come to the floor. I think it's really a horrible thing that that is the case.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution because if you really believe in prevention, if you really believe that we can make a difference in making people well and preventing them from getting sick, then you should vote against this bill.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, it's time for a fiscal reality check. The Federal Government is now borrowing 42 cents of every dollar it spends. Washington is spending more than $1 of every $4 this country produces and we are facing a third straight year with a $1 trillion deficit. Yet, when the subcommittee voted on this straightforward bill to strip billions in unaccountable spending from the health care law based on the simple premise that Congress should fund prevention and wellness activities by prioritizing them in the regular annual spending process, the response from the other side of the aisle was to say, we're not broke. Madam Chair, I beg to differ.

Our debate today is not about the virtue of preventive health care and wellness programs. I support prevention. The real question is whether our Nation can afford to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to spend nearly $18 billion over and above what Congress appropriates over the next decade on programs of the administration's choosing.

H.R. 1217 does not cut a single program because this fund does not guarantee funding for any particular program. Every Member who supports this fund on the assumption that it provides additional money for a project they deem worthy should understand that no one knows where this money will be spent. Perhaps it could be used to combat obesity, or for cancer screenings, or perhaps it will be used to post signs about the location of bike paths. The point is, Congress abdicates our authority and responsibility for investing in prevention by handing a perpetual blank check to the Secretary.

Governing and solving our fiscal problems is difficult; it requires hard choices. It is easy to spend. The easy choice was to assign mandatory advanced appropriations to these initiatives rather than making them a budget priority. But it's only easy until the bill is due and the credit card is maxed out. Well, the bill is due and the credit card limit is approaching fast. Congress needs to reassert its role and set spending priorities rather than give the executive branch unfettered power to spend as it wishes.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I rise to express my strong support for the Prevention and Public Health Fund and to ask my colleagues to reconsider the elimination of a program whose sole purpose is not only to improve the overall health of Americans, but to help "restrain the rate of growth in private and public sector health care costs."

If my colleagues across the aisle want to effectively cut spending and fix our long-term deficit, then I would remind them that health care costs are one of the biggest drivers of federal spending; and chronic diseases, such as heart disease, cancer, stroke and diabetes, account for 75 percent of the cost of care. If we invest in preventing these chronic diseases now, we could save our health care system hundreds of billions of dollars, reducing the costs to Medicare and Medicaid and saving countless lives.

Instead, we are taking a penny-wise and pound-foolish approach by considering H.R. 1217, which repeals investments in prevention and primary care services to combat mental illness, obesity, cancer, as well as HIV and other acquired infections. Rhode Island has already received over $800,000 to support primary care, mental health services and health information technology that will improve the health of Rhode Island families before they are forced to seek treatment in the Emergency Department.

Our nation cannot afford to cut now and worry about the consequences later. That approach has only earned our country the unfortunate distinction of being the nation with the highest adult obesity rate in the developed world with the highest mortality rates for various preventable chronic diseases. It has also done nothing to reign in our long-term deficits.

Further, we are almost 100 days into the 112th Congress and Speaker BOEHNER has not put forward a single bill to create jobs. If my colleagues in Congress are serious about balancing the budget and creating a better health care system, then I hope we will move on from trying to dismantle the health reform law and focus on job creation. I ask my colleagues to oppose this measure and bring up a bill that will put Americans back to work.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chair, today we rise to debate irresponsible legislation cloaked in fiscal responsibility, legislation that will assuredly put the nation's public health at risk.

Today's debate is not one over concerns of mandatory funding for our nation's public health investments, it is another shot at the Affordable Care Act.

Our health system is inherently designed to provide treatment for the sick and ill, but does not currently contain the incentives necessary to keep consumers from becoming sick in the first place.

Just two years ago total health expenditures in the U.S. was $2.5 trillion, and only 3 percent of that funding was spent on preventive health care services and health promotion.

If we want to cut down on the costs of hospitalizations and inappropriate emergency room visits, we have to help American families better manage their chronic diseases like diabetes or asthma and help them stay well through vaccines and screenings.

This was the purpose behind the Prevention and Public Health Fund—to make a strong investment into prevention and wellness programs and promote innovative prevention that will help to save our health system costs in the long run.

And now we are seeing the good work that the Prevention and Public Health Fund is doing in our states.

Michigan has received over $2 million for public health activities—building capacity in our health departments, hiring and training epidemiologists and scientists to study infectious diseases, improving access and quality of health services in medically underserved communities, and helping to promote better primary care for those in need.

Thus, the Prevention and Public Health Fund is not only creating much-needed jobs in my home state, but also undertaking meaningful projects that will help to improve the health of our country.

Let us be clear that this legislation will not become law, and rather than use the time of this body for valuable legislation such as creating jobs and improving our economy and the health of our nation, my colleagues choose to focus their efforts on another vehicle to defend the Affordable Care Act.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1217. This irresponsible and short-sighted legislation would repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund which is a fundamental component to the Affordable Care Act.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is a critical investment in public health and demonstrates a historic commitment to changing our health system from one that focuses on treating the sick to one that focuses on keeping people healthy in the first place. We all agree that prevention is one of the most effective ways we can reduce health costs in the long run, rather than by simply cutting spending.

My friends on the other side of the aisle claim that eliminating the fund does not cut any specific prevention programs and that the reason they want to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund is to recoup the funding appropriated for it.

I would like to know from the Majority, are the short term cost savings from this bill worth the long term costs to our financial future and health? How do they plan to solve the public health problems of the future if they intend to gut programs like this one?

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is one of a number of Affordable Care Act initiatives that is already in place and producing positive results. Currently, all 50 states and the District of Columbia are receiving Fund support. These valuable dollars are being used to support community-based initiatives to reduce tobacco use and obesity, prevent HIV infection, build epidemiology and laboratory capacity to track and respond to disease outbreaks, and train the public health workforce.

Madam Chair, I know that we face difficult economic decisions, and I would be happy to have a discussion with my friends on the other side of the aisle on how we can reduce the deficit, but I feel that H.R. 1217 is the wrong approach.

Seventy-five percent of the two trillion dollars we spend in health care costs are spent on treatment of chronic diseases. Many of which can be prevented. Obesity alone costs us 147 billion dollars a year and chronic illness can cost us an additional 1 trillion dollars each year in lost productivity. In addition, studies have shown that proven community-based diabetes prevention programs can save as much as 191 billion dollars over 10 years. So the fact is prevention saves money.

Now, those are just the dollars and cents of the value that the Prevention and Public Health Fund bring. We know that prevention saves money, but what about the improvements to the health of our nation's citizens. Prevention saves lives, improves quality of life and is the most cost-effective way to spend our health care dollars. No matter what arguments the Majority may make, we cannot put price-tag on that.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 1217.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, today we are considering a piece of legislation that will roll back important gains for public health and prevention. Specifically, today's bill proposes to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund under the Affordable Care Act.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, more than 75 percent of health care spending in the United States is due to chronic conditions, such as stroke, diabetes, and cancer. One of the ways to control health care spending is to invest ways to prevent disease and improving the public health of our nation. By investing in preventive health care services, we can reduce the number of people with chronic diseases while saving lives and money.

Currently, funding from this program is being used by states and communities to prevent smoking, obesity, heart disease, and to increase physical activity and train the public health workforce. The Prevention and Public Health Fund presents a significant opportunity to rein in our health care spending and to promote healthy lifestyles and communities. In my judgment, repealing it will only increase preventable health care costs over time.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided bill so that we can continue to protect the health of all Americans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1217, which would repeal the provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (''Affordable Care Act'') that established the Prevention and Public Health Fund, a fund which serves as a great stride toward turning our ''sick-care'' system, where we focus on treating the injured and ill, into a true ''healthcare'' system that puts focus on keeping the population well.

It is because of all that the Prevention and Public Heath Fund accomplished in its first year, the overwhelming support the Fund has received from hundreds of organizations, and how essential prevention is to reducing the overall cost of healthcare for the American people, that I oppose the repeal of this Fund.

Despite my general opposition to this bill, yesterday in the Rules Committee meeting, I offered amendments to H.R. 1217, in order to remind this chamber and emphasize to the American people the importance and benefits of preventative care for the American public.

My amendments reaffirm to the American people that we as lawmakers understand the importance of preventative care by stating that it is the sense of Congress that prevention of disease and injury is overwhelmingly effective in improving our healthcare system and keeping that system affordable. Furthermore, preventative health care is an effective means for detecting and treating illnesses before they become serious and life threatening.

My amendments also make us as lawmakers accountable to the American people who have been and would be benefitting from the services and support provided through this fund. It gives notice to the public, through the Department of Health and Human Services' website, of the rescission of funds and the amount rescinded, increasing government's accountability.

I think most of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would agree with me, as evidenced by the intense debate at the end of last week, when I say that we must address our nation's spending and growing deficit. However, it is of great concern to me that my friends on the other side of the aisle are attempting to do so by cutting cost-saving programs that are also essential to the health and wellbeing of Americans. This attempt, through H.R. 1217, to defund this essential program which was created under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is of particular concern.

Today's youth may be the first generation to live shorter and less healthy lives than that of their parents, and this is largely due to increased rates of diseases and conditions which are preventable with proper and consistent healthcare. 75% of our country's healthcare costs are attributed to treatment of chronic diseases, most of which are preventable. However, less than 5% of our healthcare

spending goes towards preventing these diseases. Loss of productivity in the workforce attributed to chronic disease is estimated to cost the United States over $1 trillion each year.

With that being said, the 111th Congress, with the intent of seeing these grim statistics changes, appropriated $16.5 billion to be used, over the next ten years to support preventative care and research. Since its establishment the Fund has already begun to strengthen the infrastructure of our healthcare system on the state and national level.

The Prevention and Public Health fund, though it has only been in existence for one year, has already been used for:

Programs to promote tobacco control and implement tobacco cessation services and campaigns;

Obesity prevention which directly decreases risk for Diabetes;

Improving nutrition and access to fresh fruits and vegetables;

Increasing opportunities for recreational and physical activity;

HIV prevention;

Support of clinical and community-based disease prevention; and

Bolstering the health workforce by increasing health care personnel.

Money towards finding health solutions, rather than treating health problems, comes back to society in terms of increasing productivity, creating jobs, and reducing Medicare, Medicaid, and overall healthcare costs. With just a $10 per person investment towards improving community based activity, nutrition, and other preventative measures would create a return of $56 per person within only 5 years. That translates to a savings of $5.60 for every $1 invested in preventative health care. Most importantly, cost benefits extend beyond government to both American businesses and families; providing savings and an improved quality of life.

As a result of the Prevention and Public Health Fund, Texas received $6 million last year that went towards creating committees, testing facilities, laboratories, and training centers which brought over $2 million to the health prevention capacity of Houston alone.

Congress must maintain that the prevention of illness, the saving of lives, and the securing of a healthy public are top priorities, and that prevention is an undeniably effective means to achieve these ends. My amendments will do just that.

The total loss of $16 billion of funding for prevention efforts, an effective total eradication of our country's prevention program, will be unfortunate, and thus I urge my colleagues not to lose sight of importance of the Prevention and Public Health Fund's accomplishments and goals. Including:

The improvement of state and local health departments, giving them the capacity to respond to infections, natural disasters, and terrorist threats;

Creating a strong and healthy workforce that will be competitive in the global market; and

Saving families, businesses, and the government money, opposed to simply cutting costs.

While I do not support what H.R. 1217 purports to do, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of these essential changes to H.R. 1217 to acknowledge the need for preventative care and hold ourselves accountable for what would most certainly be a great loss to the public.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. EMERSON). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1217

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

SECTION 1. REPEALING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11) is repealed.

(b) RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Of the funds made available by such section 4002, the unobligated balance is rescinded.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 112–61. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1610

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112–61.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 1, add at the end the following:

(c) NOTICE OF RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Not later than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall post on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services a notice of—

(1) the rescission, pursuant to subsection (b), of the unobligated balance of funds made available by such section 4002; and

(2) the amount of such funds so rescinded.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 219, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I know sometimes in the rush of legislating, many Members are faced with any number of challenges in understanding legislation, but I do know that the majority has come with their own roadmap. And I do want to respect the different viewpoints, and I don't say this in any way to malign.

First of all, I'm grateful that this amendment was made in order, but I wish it wasn't because I understand that all legislation that passes needs to have in fact—or often has those who agree with it and those who do not. And that's fair enough.

And the process that we usually use to handle that is to amend, not repeal. There are some sections here that I have looked at and have concern with. And many have heard me on the floor of the House discussing a number of issues regarding my local hospitals. But I will say to you that the repeal of this bill is putting us on the road to ruin.

And my amendment is simple. It asks the HHS to place on its Web site the moneys rescinded so that the American people can see. For some it may be to see the great success of taking away money. For others, it may be to see what has happened to the resources that they need to take care of themselves.

Very quickly, this amendment requires for fiscal years 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 to list the amount of money that is being taken away from good health care. But, Madam Chair, it will also hopefully point people to what they're losing.

For example, look at this beautiful baby here. We will not have, under the repeal of this Affordable Care Act, the bounty of preventative care. For those with chronic diseases, Americans who are subject to chronic disease such as heart disease, cancer, stroke and diabetes, their only care will be the emergency room, high-priced emergency room when they're in a diabetic coma or they're in a stroke or they have a heart attack, rather than be able to go to their doctors.

But we start early on with this little baby being able to go to wellness clinics or to their community health clinics. That's what the money that is being rescinded is going to do to you.

In addition, you will find that chronic diseases resulted in $75.3 billion loss in productivity in the State of Texas alone. This is going to be across America.

The rescissions will also impact all of the States. I have a list of almost 50 States that have begun to receive dollars from the Affordable Care Act—from Alabama, to Alaska, to Pennsylvania, to Massachusetts, to Michigan, to Rhode Island, and South Carolina, and Tennessee, and Texas. All of the States that my good friends come from, they are receiving money right now.

In addition to this issue of taking away money, Prevention for Healthy America concluded that investing $10 per person per year in proven community-based programs that increased physical activity, for example, improved nutrition, and prevents smoking and other tobacco could save the country more than $16 billion annually within 5 years.

When you see how much money was taken away, just realize that you multiply that. If it's a total of $16 billion, you're going to lose $16 billion a year because there will not be any wellness program. Community and clinical prevention, which is about $2 million. And so you will take away money from HIV

prevention, and that is a very costly proposal.

You'll take away from public health infrastructure; you'll take away from primary care residential expansion programs training residents and doctors. You'll take away from other medical assistance programs, expansion of physician assistant training. You'll take away from public health departments where they link people to needed health care. You'll take away childhood and adult immunizations and protecting the water we drink and the food we eat.

Let me just say to you that my amendment is to shine the light on what will be happening to the health care of Americans. I want my colleagues to tell their constituents, not those that are already focused on negative aspects of what we're trying to do here, but those who are just simply hardworking mothers and fathers who are trying to make a living and who need this health care.

Madam Chair, I would first like to state my clear position that I am adamantly opposed to H.R. 1217 and its repeal of the important Prevention and Public Health Fund created under the Affordable Care Act. The Fund saves lives and saves money.

If H.R. 1217 to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund provided under section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is enacted into law:

What my amendment does is: Requires the Department of Health and Human Services to post public notice on its official website of the Unobligated Funds from section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act including the amount of the funds that will be rescinded.

This amendment will provide the public with important information about Preventive Health Care funding that will no longer be available for them to receive necessary preventive health care services.

This amendment also assists my Republican colleagues by permitting them to easily show the American public that they are cutting government spending, by how much they are cutting spending, and where they are cutting government spending. So I expect that my Republican colleagues will fully support this amendment.

PURPOSE OF THE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND (SECTION 4002 OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT)

When Congress passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010 and the President signed it into law, the Department of Health of Human Services was given the power to administer the program to provide for expanded and sustained national health investment in prevention and public health programs to improve public health programs and help restrain the growth in private and public health costs. This was already a cost cutting measure.

Nearly 11.7 million cases of seven common chronic diseases—cancers, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, stroke, mental disorders, and pulmonary conditions—were reported in Texas in 2003.

The cost of treating those with chronic disease in Texas totaled about $17.2 billion.

Chronic diseases resulted in $75.3 billion in lost productivity and economic costs to Texas.

A new focus on prevention will offer Texas and the rest of our nation the opportunity to not only improve the health of Americans, but also control health care spending. A report from Trust for America's Health entitled Prevention for a Healthier America concluded that investing $10 per person per year in proven community-based programs that increase physical activity, improve nutrition, and prevent smoking and other tobacco use could save the country more than $16 billion annually within 5 years. This is a return of $5.60 for every $1 spent on preventive health care.

HOW THE FUND IMPROVES WELLNESS AND PREVENTION FOR TEXANS

Since enactment of the Affordable Care Act on March 23, 2010, the Department of Health and Human Services has awarded approximately $17.63 million in grants to organizations in Texas through the Prevention and Public Health Fund to help improve wellness and prevention efforts, including:

Community and Clinical Prevention ($2,956,000): This funding supports prevention activities that have been shown to be effective in reducing health care costs and promoting health and wellness.

Primary and Behavioral Health Integration ($495,000). Assists communities with the integration of primary care services into community-based mental & behavioral health settings.

HIV Prevention ($2,359,000). Focuses on HIV prevention in high risk populations and communities by increasing HIV testing opportunities, linking HIV-infected persons with appropriate services, and filling critical gaps in data and understanding of the HIV epidemic.

Tobacco Cessation ($102,000). Strengthens Texas's ability to move towards implementing a plan to reduce tobacco use. It also enhances and expands the national network of tobacco cessation quitlines to significantly increase the number of tobacco users who quit each year.

Public Health Infrastructure ($2,084,000): These grants strengthen state and local capacity to prepare health departments to meet 21st century public health challenges and support the training of existing and next generation public health professionals.

Public Health Infrastructure ($800,000). Supports state, local, and tribal public health infrastructure to improve information technology, workforce training, and policy development.

Epidemiology and Laboratory Capacity ($634,000). Builds state and local capacity to prevent, detect, and respond to infectious disease outbreaks.

Public Health Training Centers ($650,000). Improve the public health system by enhancing skills of the current and future public health workforce.

Primary Care Training ($12,586,000): These funds support the expansion of the primary care workforce.

Primary Care Residency Expansion Program ($7,680,000). Increases the number of residents trained in family medicine, general internal medicine, and general pediatrics.

Advanced Nursing Education Expansion Program ($1,426,000). Increases the number of primary care nurse practitioners and nurse midwives who graduate by expanding class sizes and accelerating graduation rates for part-time students.

Expansion of Physician Assistant Training ($1,980,000). Improves access to primary care by funding the training of primary care physician assistants and expanding the primary care workforce.

Nurse-Managed Health Clinics ($1,500,000). Provide primary care and wellness services to underserved and vulnerable populations through clinics that are managed by advanced practice nurses and provide valuable clinical training sites for primary care nurse practitioners.

If the Prevention and Public Health Fund is cut and its Unobligated Funds Rescinded our health care costs will soar and the results will be catastrophic. The Fund saves lives and saves money.

IF THE FUNDS ARE RESCINDED

America's local health departments need the Prevention and Public Health Fund to help prevent diseases and protect health in ways that health insurance companies or medical care providers cannot.

Local health departments:

Link people who need healthcare with ways to get it.

Detect and stop outbreaks of disease.

Help people make healthier choices in diet, exercise, and tobacco use to prevent and reduce chronic disease.

Provide childhood and adult immunizations.

Protect the water we drink and the food we eat.

Help new parents give babies a healthy start at home.

Inspect schools and day care centers for health and safety.

Conduct screenings for cancer, heart disease, diabetes, childhood lead poisoning, tuberculosis, and other infectious diseases.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is critically needed to stabilize the ability of local health departments to protect their communities from health threats and help individuals and families lead productive and healthy lives. Please oppose this attempt by H.R. 1217 to eliminate funding for the Prevention and Public Health Fund. A healthy future depends on it.

If H.R. 1217 passes this Chamber and is enacted into law, it is important for the American People to have notice of the rescission of funds for the Prevention and Public Health Fund program. Since the Department of Health and Human Services administers the Fund, it is only appropriate that public notice be given on the official HHS website and include the amount of funds rescinded. In this way, the American public will know that the public funding they rely upon has been cancelled for preventive health care and the Transparency of Spending Cuts will be further promoted in a manner that my Republican Colleagues will also appreciate.

I would urge all Members of Congress to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, at this point I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. I will just mention to the gentlelady all of the wonderful programs that she mentioned are not mentioned in this section of the law. There is no guarantee that this money will be spent for any of that.

H.R. 1217 repeals the Prevention and Public Health Fund and rescinds unobligated balances. The Jackson Lee amendment would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services

to post on the HHS public Web site a notice of the rescission of unobligated balances of the Prevention and Public Health Fund and the amount of the rescission.

I support transparency in government. I actually wish there was more transparency in how HHS has already spent the money from this fund. The lack of transparency and accountability regarding this fund is a primary reason I support H.R. 1217. And if the author feels this would increase transparency, then I support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112–61.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. GAO STUDY ON THE IMPACTS THAT FUNDING THROUGH THE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND WOULD HAVE ON PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASES AND PROMOTING HEALTH.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the impacts that providing prevention, wellness, and public health activities under the Prevention and Public Health Fund, using the funding made available under section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11), would have on preventing chronic diseases and promoting health in the United States, if such funding were not repealed and rescinded under section 1. Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the day of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the results and conclusions of the study under this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 219, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, my amendment requires a government accountability study within 90 days of enactment of the law to study the impact the Prevention and Public Health initiative has on preventing chronic diseases and promoting public health.

Madam Chair, prevention works. It's smart. It saves the taxpayers money. It saves families money. And it saves lives. The Prevention and Public Health initiative empowers communities all across this great Nation to focus on prevention and wellness and what works for them when it comes to reducing cancer cases, reducing heart disease, reducing strokes back in our own hometowns.

In Florida alone, there are over 10 million cases of the seven most common chronic diseases—cancer, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, stroke, mental disorders and pulmonary conditions. We all know our neighbors, friends, families, folks we go to church with, folks we see in the grocery store that suffer from these diseases. In a lot of these cases, if they had gotten early detection or if we had worked harder on prevention, they wouldn't have fallen into that trap of the disease and all that it brings for families and communities.

See, we have a better approach now. We are smarter in America. No longer should our health care system be focused only on taking care of folks in the hospital when they're sick or at the end stages. We're smarter. We can prevent a lot of this through education and being proactive and encouraging a healthier lifestyle.

And that's what the Prevention and Public Health Initiative does. State and local communities are able to decide what works best for them. This isn't Washington dictating what you should do. This is saying to our local hometowns and communities, What do you think works best for you?

□ 1620

So I would encourage all of my colleagues to take a look at the grants that are being made. How are your local communities making these investments work in your own districts to invest in the long term health of our neighbors and the economic prosperity of our communities?

For example, in my hometown in my district, the Pinellas County Health Department has brought together neighborhoods and all the nonprofits to determine—you know what's going to work best in Pinellas County is encouraging healthier lifestyles, because we have an obesity epidemic. So they want to build sidewalks, trails, bike lanes, better lighting to encourage people to exercise. They are going to make improvements to parks so children have the opportunity to get out and play after school instead of sitting in front of the television.

I also have a great public university, the University of South Florida, in my district. They are training the modern health care workforce in Florida. These are professionals fighting on the front lines of our communities, and yes, creating jobs. This is creating jobs to encourage the healthier lifestyles that work. USF is able to identify where the gaps in training might be, develop updated curricula to ensure the public health care workforce receives the most up-to-date research, and then they can spread the word throughout the churches, the grocery stores, and our neighborhoods.

The Florida Department of Health is also using these grants in checking on all of our strategies Statewide to determine what works. See, this is one of the important goals of the Affordable Care Act, to promote wellness and prevention, to ensure healthier outcomes for our families and neighbors. And the examples I have just shared with you are only a few of what's happening all across the country.

We are smarter, Madam Chair. Prevention works. It saves taxpayers money. It saves families money. It saves lives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Castor amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, the amendment before us directs the GAO to pontificate on the effectiveness of unspecified prevention, wellness, and public health activities financed by funds under section 4002 of PPACA.

As we have pointed out, section 4002 gives the Secretary of HHS complete discretion to spend the slush fund with little limitation. Any program within the Public Health Service Act, regardless of its merit or effectiveness, is eligible for funding under section 4002. How can we ask the GAO to determine the effectiveness of spending dollars when we simply don't know how those dollars will be spent? Is GAO supposed to assume that funds will be used to train doctors or build jungle gyms? Will their report make the assumption that the money will be used to advocate for soda tax increases in States or build signs that direct people to bike paths? All of these activities can be funded through this slush fund.

According to the Energy and Commerce minority views, Pitt County, North Carolina, received a grant from the fund that will be in part used to ''place signage within communities to point out public parks, other recreational opportunities, and the availability of bike lanes.''

This amendment underscores the major problem with section 4002. Rather than letting Congress weigh the relative value of programs through the annual appropriations process, my friends on the other side of the aisle decided to throw dollars to a political appointee at HHS to spend billions of dollars on any program with no oversight. The amendment also places an unrealistic timetable on the GAO to issue a report within 90 days of enactment. It is simply a waste of money to ask GAO to conduct a study with little time to complete what is clearly an impossible task.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, how much more time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 1 minute remaining and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, what a waste of money it would be if we do not act on education and knowledge, because we know that prevention works in America. When you educate someone on healthier lifestyles, the likelihood is that they are going to live a healthier life. They can prevent disease. Maybe they get early detection of their cancer. And that would save them a lot of money. You know, it also would save the government a lot of money. So let's be smart about this. Prevention works.

It reminds me now of my friends across the aisle, their proposal to end Medicare as we know it, because that is not smart. Again, like prevention, Medicare works. It saves families money. And the plan to privatize Medicare and turn it into a voucher program is not going to save any money. Indeed, it will shift the costs to families. They will have to pay more. So let's do what's smart. Prevention works.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, the simple fact is everything the gentlelady just mentioned she doesn't know will be funded. There is no guarantee to fund any of those things.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112–61.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. GAO STUDY ON THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS THAT FUNDING THROUGH THE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND WOULD HAVE ON STATES AND COMMUNITIES.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the economic impacts that providing prevention, wellness, and public health activities under the Prevention and Public Health Fund, using the funding made available under section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11), would have on States and communities in the United States, if such funding were not repealed and rescinded under section 1. Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the day of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the results and conclusions of the study under this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 219, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, my amendment requires a Government Accountability Office study within 90 days of enactment of this bill to examine the economic impact Prevention and Public Health grants have on States and local communities.

Now, I can tell you we don't really need a study to understand how important prevention is and how important it is to empower our hometowns, local governments, nonprofits, whoever can come together on a local level and make these decisions about encouraging healthier lifestyles.

The beauty of the Public Health and Prevention initiative is it's not Washington dictating all across the country a cookie-cutter approach, one size fits all. Instead, we empower our neighbors to make these decisions on what works best for them. I would say that what works best in my hometown back in Tampa probably would not work quite as well in Fargo or in Missouri.

Prevention of disease is smart. It saves families money, and it saves taxpayers money as well. Now, over time we have all gotten smarter about preventing chronic diseases. Much of this cost-saving and life-saving focus was brought to bear in the landmark Affordable Care Act and this Prevention and Public Health initiative, which is the most historic investment in public health of our communities in the history of our country.

Now, far from the extreme arguments against prevention from my colleagues across the aisle, the Prevention and Public Health initiative empowers States, hometowns, and local communities to determine what works best for them. The annual treatment cost of chronic diseases costs the United States over $270 billion. And our economy has lost over $1 trillion in lost productivity. In Florida alone, we have lost over $68 billion in lost productivity and economic costs due to chronic diseases like heart disease, diabetes, and cancer.

So not only does prevention help us reduce costs, it can be an economic boost to our communities. I can tell you back in Florida we need as many economic boosts as we can get. We still have a high unemployment rate. We have a large number of uninsured. So what could be smarter than targeting some of our communities and encouraging them on healthier lifestyles so they can get back to work?

We are creating jobs through doing this. For example, at the University of South Florida College of Public Health, they've received one of the Prevention and Public Health grants where they're hiring and training the modern public health workforce. These are the folks with the most updated knowledge that are able to go out through communities and encourage them and educate them on what it would mean if they didn't smoke, if they didn't drink. Oftentimes, these initiatives have a great impact. They can save us money, and they can save us lives.

□ 1630

In Pinellas County they are combating childhood obesity, and they are already making a big economic impact in the community. Richard Curtin is the program manager for the Communities Putting Prevention to Work—Pinellas. He informed me they have created already 18 jobs as a direct result of this lifesaving work.

So I would encourage all of you to ask your folks back home what works best for them. Apply for these grants. We can make a difference all across America, save taxpayers money, save our families money, and save lives while we are at it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, the Castor amendment directs the Government Accountability Office to make assumptions on the economic impacts of providing prevention, wellness, and public health activities under section 4002 of the PPACA. However, section 4002 gives the Secretary of HHS complete discretion to spend this slush fund with little limitation. The amendment asks the GAO to determine the economic impact of spending when no one except the Secretary knows how those dollars will be spent.

What will GAO base their assumptions on? Does placing signage for bike paths produce economic activity or does advocating higher soda taxes benefit the economy? These activities have been financed by programs eligible for funding under section 4002.

Members and the GAO cannot determine the economic impact of the fund because the Secretary controls how it is to be spent. Will GAO be charged with determining whether borrowing 42 cents of every dollar this fund spends has a positive economic impact?

This amendment underscores the major problems with section 4002. Rather than letting Congress weigh the relative value of programs through the annual appropriations process, my friends on the other side of the aisle have decided to throw dollars to a political appointee at HHS to spend billions on any program with no oversight.

The amendment also places an unrealistic timetable on the GAO to issue a report within 90 days of enactment. Like the previous amendment, we are not spending our resources wisely when we ask the GAO to conduct a study

with little time to complete what is clearly an impossible task.

I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, we are spending our dollars wisely when we are investing in prevention and wellness because prevention works. Prevention saves money, it saves the taxpayers money, it saves families money and it saves lives.

Now, there has been a great debate all across America about health care over the past few years. I think we can all agree on that. Part of the importance of the health care debate was that our health care system for too long has focused and spent money at the end game on sickness, when people have cancer, and that's fine, but we can be smarter about it. We have a lot more knowledge and a lot of experts that have advised us all that if you invest in prevention to encourage folks not to smoke, not to drink, those easy things, very easy in lifestyle, but oftentimes they need a little extra help. Parents should turn off the TV and the kids should go out and play. They should exercise.

But sometimes it's that little extra push. And if we can make a dent in childhood obesity, diabetes, cancer, a stroke, because we have encouraged healthier lifestyles with this very modest investment, that will be a great accomplishment. And that's part of what the health care debate was about, taking this modest investment in public health and empowering our communities to make those decisions on what works for them. Prevention works. It's smart.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, once again the gentlewoman made my point. She has no guarantee that in the year 2015 the Secretary will fund programs like cessation of smoking or obesity. She has not a clue. What if the Secretary decided to use the whole $2 billion for abstinence education in 2015? She has no clue what it will be used for.

I urge the Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112–61 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 237, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—187

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
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
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, 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
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
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
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)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—237

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
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
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
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
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
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
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—8

Bass (CA)
Culberson
Giffords
Maloney
Meeks
Reichert
Richardson
Rogers (MI)

□ 1701

Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. HANNA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, McINTYRE, DINGELL, SMITH of Washington, ISRAEL, HINOJOSA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms.

PINGREE of Maine, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained earlier today and therefore was not present to be recorded on rollcall vote No. 261. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 261, I would have voted "aye" (April 13) (Castor (FL) Amendment, Requiring the U.S. Government Accountability Office to conduct a study of the impact funds awarded through the Prevention and Public Health Fund would have on preventing chronic diseases and promoting health).

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) 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 will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 238, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

AYES—188

Ackerman
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)
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
Harris
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
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
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)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
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
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
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
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
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
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Blackburn
Culberson
Giffords
Meeks
Reichert
Woodall

□ 1709

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, 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. 1217) to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund, and pursuant to House Resolution 219, 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.

The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

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

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Loebsack moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1217 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. PRESERVING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND FOR ACTIVITIES FOR SENIORS, SUBJECT TO AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''It is the purpose'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (c), it is the purpose'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking '', and appropriated''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''shall'' and inserting ''may, to the extent and in the amounts made available for use by an appropriations Act,''; and

(B) by striking ''for prevention, wellness, and public health activities including'' and all that follows through the period at the

end and inserting ''for prevention, wellness, and public health activities for individuals 65 years of age or older.''.

(b) RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Of the funds appropriated by such section 4002 before the date of the enactment of this Act, the unobligated balance is rescinded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, while I oppose the underlying bill, I am offering this final amendment on a topic that I know is important to all of us—our Nation's seniors. Our seniors have worked hard all their lives. Many of them have lived through some of the most trying times in American history, including the Great Depression and two world wars. They have also been a part of some of our country's proudest achievements and moments, like putting the first man on the Moon.

Along the way, our seniors have made incredible sacrifices for their families and for their country. My own grandmother helped take care of me while I was young, making sure that my siblings and I had a safe place to live and food on the table. That is why our seniors deserve the best care and treatment available as they age.

I have visited seniors all across my district in Iowa, delivering Meals on Wheels in Cedar Rapids and Muscatine, serving lunch at senior dining in Marion, and hosting events at senior centers and retirement communities like Westgate Towers in Ottumwa and Cedar County Senior Center in Tipton where this photo was taken.

One of my proudest moments in Congress in fact was when I met with a group of World War II veterans who were here from Iowa on an honor flight tour. I was privileged to thank them for their service.

When I talk to seniors in my district, I hear far too often that many of them are struggling. This is unacceptable. No senior should retire into poverty or have difficulty paying their medical bills. While we may disagree on the Republican budget, which would end Medicare as we know it, I think we can all agree that we owe seniors access to the preventive health care and public health efforts that the underlying bill would repeal. I am determined to fight for our seniors and to make sure that we keep our promises to them. That is why this final amendment will ensure that the repeal of the Prevention and Public Health Fund will not apply to prevention, wellness, and public health activities for individuals 65 years of age or older.

This funding can be used for programs that promote wellness, that empower seniors to take personal responsibility for staying healthy as they age. It can also be used for prevention, including screenings for cancer, heart disease, and Alzheimer's disease. The fund can also be used for public health activities to ensure that seniors have the information they need to make the best possible decisions about their health. These funds can also be used for research, so we can find ways to prevent health problems associated with aging. What's more, by focusing on public health and prevention, this fund can reduce costs in the long run.

We all know that early detection improves patient outcomes and saves money, and successful public health campaigns have demonstrated that we can decrease unhealthy behaviors by equipping people with good information. That is why I believe the underlying bill, itself, is penny wise but pound foolish. In the long run, the underlying bill only serves to hurt the Nation's seniors. It is unfortunate that some are choosing to make this shortsighted decision when the health of our seniors is at stake.

Madam Speaker, the American people, we should keep in mind, sent us here not to fight with each other over critical issues such as the one before us today but to fight together for them. I urge all Members to join me in ensuring that our Nation's seniors have access to the preventive health care that will keep them healthy, allowing them to enjoy their friends and families and remain active in their communities. We owe the seniors in our districts at least that much.

The passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If the amendment is adopted, it will be incorporated into the bill and the bill will be immediately voted upon. I believe, Madam Speaker, that now is the time to show the American people that we as a body can indeed work effectively for them, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this commonsense final amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation and rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The reservation is withdrawn, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yesterday, we heard the House minority leader say that ''elections shouldn't matter as much as they do.''

I strongly disagree. Members were brought here to get runaway spending under control; but rather than help us avoid a fiscal crisis, House Democrats have brought forward an MTR that guts the underlying bill and continues the runaway spending that the American people have rejected.

As we have pointed out, section 4002 gives the Secretary of HHS complete discretion to spend the slush fund with little limitation. Any program within the Public Health Service Act, regardless of its merit or effectiveness, is eligible for funding under section 4002.

Will section 4002 help train doctors, or will the money be used to build jungle gyms? Will the Prevention and Public Health Fund be used to advocate for soda tax increases in States or build signs that direct people to bike paths? All of these activities can be funded through this slush fund.

This MTR underscores the major problem with section 4002. Rampant spending on the Federal credit card cannot continue. The Federal Government will be borrowing 42 cents of every Federal dollar spent from this fund. We are facing a $1.6 trillion deficit. The President's irresponsible budget will double the national debt from $14 trillion to $26 trillion. This endless spending is fiscally irresponsible and morally bankrupt. Spending today is debt that our children and grandchildren will pay tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the MTR and ''yes'' on the underlying bill so we can help get our fiscal house back in order.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was 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—ayes 189, noes 234, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

AYES—189

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

NOES—234

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
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
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
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
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
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
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 (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—9

Culberson
Giffords
Herrera Beutler
Meeks
Reichert
Rogers (KY)
Royce
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)

□ 1736

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. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

AYES—236

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
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
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
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
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
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—183

Ackerman
Andrews
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
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
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
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
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
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
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Barton (TX)
Culberson
Fleming
Giffords
Honda
McMorris Rodgers
Meeks
Napolitano
Noem
Reichert
Sessions
Sewell
Sullivan

□ 1743

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL GOLF DAY

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about National Golf Day. Earlier today, I attended an event and heard the story of one of our Wounded Warriors and how the sport of golf has helped him to overcome his traumatic brain injury, and learn the sport of golf even with prostheses, and how much that's helped him.

The first small business I owned happened to be a miniature golf course. I also went to high school with the late great Payne Stewart. And no, none of his golf abilities rubbed off on me, unfortunately.

Golf is a $76 billion industry, which provides 2 million jobs in the United States. Golf courses are generally small business owner-owned golf courses. And I know the challenges small businesses face today. The estimated economic impact of the golf industry is over $200 billion. Golf course superintendents are excellent environmental stewards of the land, and among the best in the world at knowing how to care for the Earth.

Being outdoors always improves one's quality of life. Walking just a nine-hole course can give you a 2.5-mile workout, or in my case 7 miles. It is a sport that can be played by all ages, and we should take time today to recognize National Golf Day.

ROE & ROEPER 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, what started out as a small pirated radio show of two men running from the law under a bridge and turned into a successful empire today, the Roe & Roeper Show has entertained many people for a long time. Today it's reached its whole 1-year anniversary.

While many radio shows struggle to increase listenership, the majority of drive time listening Illinoisans tune in to Roe & Roeper from 2 to 6 every weekday. In addition to providing cutting-edge news, listeners tune in to hear entertaining and informative exchanges between Roe & Roeper and their callers.

But both come with a very unique and admirable trait that makes the show a success. Roe Conn has a strong level of dedication to his community, and was recently honored as the 2010 Chicago-area recipient of the FBI Director's Community Leadership Award for unwavering support of law enforcement in general. Richard Roeper is a fellow Redbird alumni of Illinois State University, and has led an outstanding career as a columnist, critic, and show host, covering topics ranging from politics to media and to entertainment.

On WLS's Roe & Roeper's 1-year anniversary, I'm honored to take this time to recognize two successful individuals who provide an outstanding show on a daily basis, but also two men whom I'm proud to call friends. Congrats, gentlemen. Here's to another year.

RECOGNIZING DR. DONALD JEANES

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a great leader, minister, and educator, Dr. Donald Jeanes, who is retiring this year as president of Milligan College in my hometown of Johnson City, Tennessee.

President Jeanes is a 1968 magna cum laude graduate of Milligan College and has lived in Johnson City most of his life, first as a minister, and then as part of Milligan College. President Jeanes was inaugurated as the 14th president of Milligan College in October of 1997. Under Dr. Jeanes' leadership, Milligan College has consistently been named one of America's Best Colleges, and has experienced phenomenal growth both in terms of the physical campus as well as the courses offered.

I would like to personally thank and acknowledge Dr. Jeanes for his commitment to faith, education, and community development. I wish he and his wife, Clarinda, the very best as he prepares for his retirement from the presidency of Milligan College. I would like to say to my friend, a job well done.

LIBYA AND THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it's been 25 days since the President began kinetic military action in Libya without congressional authorization. He made this decision despite the fact that the conflict in Libya did not represent an imminent threat to the United States. Instead, the President sought the approval of the United Nations and the Arab League before taking military action, and not Congress. This sets a terrible precedent.

By seeking only U.N. approval, the President is transferring authority that should rest with the American people through their Congress, not with an international community. The U.N. resolution is nice, but it is not a substitute for congressional authorization.

Under the War Powers Resolution, the President needs to seek congressional approval within 60 days. I have introduced a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that President Obama must adhere to the War Powers Resolution. Whether you call it a kinetic military action or war, this Congress must authorize it. If we don't, we will be setting the precedent that we are irrelevant, and the President need only seek approval from international bodies outside of the jurisdiction of the American people.

□ 1750

HONORING KGC

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because I had the opportunity to attend the KGC this last weekend, an event raising resources to battle depression. Depression affects over 20 million adults in our Nation. This is something that we all need to be paying more attention to.

I want to thank Chairman Bennett for his leadership. I also want to thank Kevin Haggard, Andrew Boyle, Phil Furse and Tom Joyce for their generous contributions to the event. I also want to extend my heartfelt thanks to Andrew Boyle for his leadership for next year's event.

THE BUDGET AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWEIKERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today we have seen a remarkable event here on floor of the House. During this discussion that's so critically important to this Nation about the deficit and how we are going to deal with our budget, this House passed a bill that will actually increase the deficit, a bill passed today with the support of the Republicans to repeal a provision in the Affordable Health Care Act that will keep Americans healthy.

Healthy Americans don't need medical care, and I suppose the idea of the Republicans here is that they ought to get sick. You take a look at the wellness issue, part of the Affordable Care Act, it provided for numerous activities specifically designed to keep Americans healthy: blood pressure screening for adults, programs for children to avoid obesity, public health programs for vaccination so that our children and, indeed, our adults don't get sick. All of these programs in the wellness portion of the Affordable Care Act would be repealed by the action that the Republicans just voted on not more than a half-hour ago.

What in the world is going on here? What's this all about? Is it some sort of ideological spiritual thing to do what is not very smart?

The Affordable Health Care Act, which they like to call ObamaCare, has many, many provisions in it specifically designed to reduce the cost of

medical care in America. If you are going to deal with the deficit, and we all talk about it here, you have got to deal with the cost of Medicare.

How do you deal with the cost of Medicare? Well, you deal with it by reducing the likelihood that seniors will get sick. You deal with it by reducing high blood pressure in seniors so they don't have strokes. One of the most expensive things that the senior population will endure is a stroke. It's not just the immediate medical care; it's the long-term effect of a stroke. So when we go out and we try to have seniors and those soon to be seniors have blood pressure checks, we reduce the cost of medical care in America. But I guess the Republicans don't see it that way.

They also see it in another way, and that is somehow they believe that we can reduce the cost of medical care in the Federal budget by terminating Medicare. It is unbelievable that the Republican budget would terminate medical care for seniors by terminating Medicare, a program that was started in 1964 to deal with the specific problem that seniors had at that period, and that was the inability to afford medical services. They would literally be into bankruptcy and poverty because they couldn't pay for their medical care.

So, in 1964, Lyndon Baines Johnson and the Democrats in this House and the Senate passed Medicare, one of the foundations of support for the senior population in this Nation. And yet in the Republican budget that will be on this floor later this week is the repeal of Medicare, the termination of it.

So I suppose this is the new way we ought to look at this issue. It's a tombstone. And what it is, it said, Medicare, 1965 to 2011, created by LBJ, destroyed by the GOP. Unbelievable.

Fortunately, today, when President Obama spoke to the Nation, he addressed this issue, and I will paraphrase what he said. He says it more as a professor. I guess I will just say it as a street fighter from California: No way, no how will, in his Presidency, Medicare be terminated.

Are you listening my friends on the Republican side? The President said ''no.'' We are not going down the path of terminating Medicare.

And I know that my caucus, the Democratic Caucus, will stand there with the President. We will fight any attempt any time, anyplace, anywhere that you or anybody else will put before this House a proposal to terminate Medicare. We will not allow it, and thankfully the President has the veto pen. He ought to go back and pull out the pen that LBJ used to sign the Medicare law in 1965 and put it to paper should, somehow, the Republican budget arrive on his desk with the termination of Medicare in it. It should not happen. It cannot happen. We cannot subject our seniors to the kind of poverty that existed prior to the implementation of Medicare in the 1960s. This is something that we will stand and fight on.

The President had also said today, as he laid out his solution for a $4 trillion reduction in the deficit, do not terminate Medicare and don't privatize Social Security. Laying it down. Not a line in the sand, but clearly a mark on the concrete. Social Security will not be privatized during his watch.

Thank you, Mr. President. And you know this, that the Democratic Caucus in this House will stand firmly with you, and we will fight every, every bill, every proposal to privatize Social Security.

Now, we know there is a budget problem. We know that there is a deficit problem here in the United States, and we know that it has to be addressed. The President has laid out two chapters in the Democratic proposal to deal with the deficit.

In his State of the Union speech, he made it clear that Federal expenditures needed to be frozen over the next 5 years, and today he took another step recommending specific reductions in various Federal programs, all to the good, and we will stand there with him and we will work on reducing those Federal expenditures.

For me, I have got one in mind, about $120 billion a year that we could save, $120 billion a year. Now, that's four times, three and a half times what is in the Republican continuing resolution that will be on floor this week.

How do you find $120 billion a year? End the war in Afghanistan. End the war in Afghanistan. Bring the troops home. Bring the money home. Balance our budget. Use that to solve the deficit, or spend that money on building those roads, those facilities here in the United States.

□ 1800

Let's talk about the deficit for a moment. Oh, yes. If you're going to talk about the deficit, you really ought to understand where the deficit came from. It didn't just come out of the blue this year. It didn't just appear during the Obama administration. The deficit is something that has built up over a long period of time here in the United States. When they say the deficit is $14 trillion and is going to increase, well, it's not if the President and the Democrats get their way. It will actually be reduced by $4 trillion.

However, as to the current deficit, where did it come from? From where did it magically appear? Who left us with huge deficits?

Let's take a look. Here are the facts.

This fellow over here, you may recognize him. He is Ronald Reagan. At the end of every year, the Congressional Budget Office makes an estimate of what is going to happen over the next 10 years. At the end of the Ronald Reagan period, his last year in office, the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, made an estimate of the Federal budget situation. Where's the deficit? They estimated that, in the next 10 years, Ronald Reagan's budget and the programs that were put into effect during his period would create a $1.4 trillion deficit.

Now, those of you who are familiar with the history of the United States would know that George H. W. Bush—the senior—followed Ronald Reagan. At the end of his 4 years in office, again, the Congressional Budget Office made an estimate. It estimated, should the Bush-Reagan policies go forward, the deficit would be $3.3 trillion in the out years.

Then along came Bill Clinton. In the first 4 years of his administration, Bill Clinton put in place, if extended forward, policies that would deal with the deficit, such things as PAYGO—a word that's common in Washington, but I'm sure, out there in the great American public, people have no idea what ''PAYGO'' is. ''PAYGO'' was the law during the Clinton administration. It required that any bill passed by Congress had to be paid for with either higher taxes or cuts in some other program. In other words, it could not create a deficit. It could not add to the deficit.

There were other programs put in place, part of which I was responsible for implementing, and that was the reinventing of government. I was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior during those years, and we were told by the Clinton administration's Office of Management and Budget that you will reduce the expenditures of the Department of the Interior, and you will continue to do the same things. Only, you will do them better. Effective and efficient government. We reduced the number of employees in the Department of the Interior during those first 4½ to 5 years by some 15,000 people—from 90,000 to 75,000 people. We performed all of the previous services as well and, in many cases, better. So it is possible to be efficient and effective in this process.

Anyway, Bill Clinton is now President, and he puts all of these policies in place. At the end of his Presidency, the Congressional Budget Office did what it always does, which is to produce an estimate of what would happen in the next 10 years if the same policies were to continue. Guess what would happen. What would happen is a $5.6 trillion surplus, enough to wipe out all of the American debt—no debt, no interest payments, everything paid off.

However, Bill Clinton was followed by George W. Bush, and immediately, in the very first year of the Bush administration, the Clinton-period policies, some of which were voted on by Republicans as well as Democrats, were terminated. Massive tax cuts were put in place not only in year one but in year two. Two wars were started—the Afghanistan war and the Iraq war—neither of which were paid for. It was the first time in American history that wars were not paid for but were, rather, borrowed. Who did we borrow the

money from? China. From other foreign countries? Yes.

Anyway, you now had two massive tax cuts, two wars, and then the Medicare drug program, which was about $700 billion a year—not paid for but, rather, borrowed, not for 1 year but for every year on into the future.

Thirdly, there was a whole set of policies where the government simply stepped back and let Wall Street do whatever it wanted to do. What it wanted to do was to engage in reckless profiteering, resulting in 2007 and 2008 with the crash of the American economy, with the Wall Street crash of 2008, bringing the American economy to its knees, to the greatest recession since the Great Depression. Those policies added up to this rather massive red zone here of $11.5 trillion of deficit, estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which projected in the next 10 years, if the same policies continued, an $11.5 trillion deficit.

President Obama came into office in January of 2009. The day he arrived in office, the budget had a $1.3 trillion hole in it. He didn't create it, but he had to deal with it—a $1.3 trillion deficit handed to him by George W. Bush and his policies.

That's the history. Now we're trying to dig ourselves out of that hole. Properly said, when you're in a hole, stop digging. A wise policy. The President couldn't do that, and this Congress couldn't do that in the face of the most serious financial and economic crisis this Nation had faced since the Great Depression. So the stimulus bill was enacted, some $750 billion, and it worked. Despite all the rhetoric, the economists looking at that today, in the cool memory of the stimulus bill, said it worked; it saved this economy; it saved this Nation.

Every other industrialized country in the world did the exact same thing—stimulated their economies. Together, the American and the international economies were stabilized, and we began to slowly grow out of that great recession. We're not out of it yet. We've got to put in place policies that end the deficit, and that's precisely what the President talked about today.

The Republicans have put a proposal before us, and we'll vote on it this week, but it is not a proposal that will help America retain its eminence as the most dynamic, the most creative, the most innovative, and the most successful economy in the world, because of the policies that are in it. It will terminate Medicare, and it will significantly reduce those programs that create future economic growth.

I would like to just take a deep breath now and turn it over to my colleague from the great northeastern part of the United States.

PETER, would you join us and carry on this discussion.

Mr. WELCH. Yes, thank you. I appreciate your historical perspective on it.

There are really two things that I want to address. Number one: What are the policies that were part of getting us to that $11.5 trillion deficit? Number two: What do we need to do now in order to get to fiscal balance?

The two policies were, one, a war of choice where the Pentagon in its activities was not subject to the same scrutiny of actually having to pay as you go, so the cost of the war in Iraq was $1 trillion. The war in Afghanistan, as you mentioned, started out as a mission to dislodge Osama bin Laden. It was transformed into nation-building.

□ 1810

And no matter how necessary or debatable either of those events were, those wars were, you do have to pay for it. It's not as though because it's in the name of national security it can be exempt from fiscal responsibility. In fact, what's unusual is that this is the first time in the history of our country where we have been at war where we actually haven't asked for shared sacrifice by the taxpayers, but we've made the entire burden be borne by our military. So we've got to pay; and we didn't do it, as you pointed out.

The second is the theory that's being advanced by many that if you cut taxes, it will create wealth and create jobs. In some places and some times and in some circumstances that will work. In fact, many standard economists say that in a recession, it's the time to cut taxes, not raise them. But the more that is focused on the middle class who are struggling—especially in a down economic time—to pay their bills, if they get a tax cut, they have discretionary income or they have income liberated, that money is going to go right back into the economy. But every tax cut does not generate jobs, and many tax cuts end up adding significantly to the deficit.

The President Bush tax cut in 2001 and the President Bush tax cut in 2003 added $2.3 billion to the deficit. So you have a Pentagon that is not subject to pay-as-you-go and you have tax cuts that don't pay for themselves. Those are two major contributing factors to that $11.5 trillion deficit on the heels of a $5.6 trillion surplus. The debate we are having now in this House is enormously consequential to the future. Republicans won this last election, and a major argument they made is that we've got to get spending under control. They're right. I agree with that. We have to get to fiscal balance.

The challenge is if we're going to get there, do we need a plan that repeats those two policies of the Bush administration, namely, keeping the Pentagon off the table and increasing tax cuts, particularly to the high end, but keeping off the table Pentagon savings, keeping off the table eliminating tax loopholes and keeping off the table the question of revenues?

Democrats, in my view, have to be willing to come forward and say, look, the programs that we have been strong supporters of have to be re-examined, we have to reform them, we have to make them more efficient; and if they are not working, we have to acknowledge that and move on. We have to do our share. The President's proposal that would freeze domestic spending for 5 years is pretty dramatic, but many Democrats would be willing to support tough medicine as long as the plan had on the table other things that are major contributors to the fiscal situation we're in. That's, of course, revenues; that's, of course, the Pentagon; and that's, of course, tax loopholes in the tax system.

We can get from where we are to where we need to be. We saw that in recent years when it happened under President Clinton. Again, as you pointed out, in those years, Tax Codes matter; but in the Clinton years when we had higher tax rates, we created 20 million jobs. In the Bush years when we had lower tax rates, we created 600,000 jobs. And also incomes were increasing.

So this has to be reviewed by this body, in my view, as a practical problem for us to solve, not an ideological argument that every tax cut is going to be beneficial anymore than every spending program is going to be beneficial. You have to apply judgment to the situation at hand. The big challenge for us is restoring the fiscal balance.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me thank my colleague from Vermont, PETER WELCH, for this presentation on the tax policy. I think we probably would want to stay with that a few moments. I know my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO) is here, and perhaps you would like to opine and to share with us your thoughts on these issues of the budget and how we can deal with the deficit.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI. And I compliment Representative WELCH for what I believe is a balanced approach to how to solve the deficit situation, the debt situation, and certainly how do we move forward with a sound budget that can invest in America at a time when other nations are investing in a clean-energy, innovation economy. We don't have the luxury to just hone in on deficit, or budget carving here that solely relies on impacts through domestic program cuts on our middle class families, our working families and the poor.

What we have seen here is trillions' worth of cuts to domestic programs, impacting the ability to pay utility bills, impacting the ability to perhaps send your adult child off to college, to dream the American Dream, to own a home and to have an affordable home budget. All of these items are at risk here. We're putting people most vulnerable at risk. We have seen almost a flat curve for the growth in household income across America, just a slight bump upward, while we've seen an exponential rise in corporate executive salaries, in millionaire and billionaire wealth. That's where the growth has been.

The recovery here has seen that happening with a downward spiral, a downward mobile quality to the comeback of our efforts here in this country. So it is important for us to make certain that there is a balance here, that we're calling upon all tools in the toolkit to make it all happen.

And this chart absolutely tells a story. Over the last 40 years, middle class wages have stagnated while millionaires and billionaires have trumped all by 256 percent.

Now, this tells a story. When people are talking about not wanting to visit a fairness in tax policy here, when we have seen the anger in America expressed via the many, many households that the great multitudes of people in this country are portrayed in the middle class, they are the population that have expressed anger, and rightfully so, that anger has got to be addressed through fairness in tax policy, through an across-the-board impact of solution here that will enable us to do what's fair and do what's correct.

I watch the savings that they talk about here with the Republican plan. The Republicans will talk about the huge amounts of savings that they produce all through cuts on the domestic programs, again impacting working families, the poor and the middle class. Well, those aren't savings because in order to be savings, they might be in a locked box or assumed to go after relieving the deficit. But instead, they take these trillions in like amounts and provide tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires and corporations and still continue to hand out mindlessly the subsidies to big oil companies. This is what is so most egregious about this budget.

Instead of working towards a balance that looks at revenues, that looks at the domestic programs that require investment, no, they are going pell-mell into an all-out attack on the middle class. That's wrong. And also in the outcome as they slide programs, assistance and investments to middle class America, as they slide it over to the millionaire, billionaire, corporate and big oil companies crowd, that community, what happens in the interim? With this Republican plan for a budget, we grow debt by $8 trillion.

So where have we gained here? This sounds like a repeat of the pre-recession years where we were not acknowledging fairness in revenues, where we were allowing for a falling apart of the system. At the same time we took the watchdog out of the equation on the financial sector on Wall Street. We allowed for working families' portfolios of investments to go to ruination where we lost $2.8 trillion in accumulated wealth on 401(k)s and various other investment materials. And this is what happened: we destroyed the economy, and now we're going to repeat history, history of the worst kind.

Let's pick up on the history of the best kind. Let's pick up on investing in jobs as we did in the FDR years where we came out of tough economic times and people knew the dignity of work and we saw projects built across America, not the trickle-down theory that didn't work during the Reagan administration and the trickle-down theory that didn't work during the second Bush Presidency. It just didn't happen.

And my question is, I can't help but rhetorically ask, why would we revisit that kind of scenario again knowing that we're just crawling out of the recession and we're growing private sector jobs to the tune of $2 million in just over a year? Why would we disrupt that progress? I ask, why would we disrupt that?

Representative GARAMENDI, I think it is great that we're bringing this information to the forefront here and allowing it to be exchanged with the people that we serve day in and day out who have expressed, rightfully, the anger about the onus, the burden and the unnecessary pain that has been placed upon households of modest annual income means.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The chart that you and I shared a moment ago is up here next to me; and it clearly shows that we have seen a middle class in America that has seen very, very little progress over the last two decades and, instead, an enormous shift of wealth and income to the top 1 or 2 percent of the Nation.

□ 1820

There has been a 256 percent increase in income to the very wealthy, and as I said, it trumps all of the income gains by the rest of the economy. Those at the bottom saw maybe a 10 to 11 percent increase. The rest, very, very little.

I look up and I see my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER). Thank you for joining us. We talked earlier today about the upcoming debt limit. Please join with us and share with us your thoughts on what we are doing here, what we shouldn't be doing, or should be doing.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate your leadership and your focusing on the issues that face us.

Having spent hours in the Budget Committee so far this Congress, I must admit that I was shocked and surprised with the profoundly negative approach that is being taken by my good friend, PAUL RYAN, the chair of the Budget Committee and my Republican friends.

First of all, there is in essence a refusal to zero in on the three areas of greatest increase in the budget. We see repeated charts that talk about Medicare going through the roof over the next 50 years. And it is true. We need to get Medicare spending under control because the past path is not sustainable. But ironically what is ignored is that the approach that is being offered by the Republicans in their budget actually ignores the major provisions that have been placed in statute now that would actually reduce the rate of Medicare spending in the future.

We have taken every significant, independently verified promising initiative to bend that cost curve, and they have been stripped away. We watched Republicans attack Democrats because there were provisions to be able to make a difference with Medicare spending, claiming it would somehow slash Medicare for senior citizens by a half-trillion dollars. Well, Congressman GARAMENDI, you and I come from areas of the country that actually have been able to reduce health care costs, they are below the national average, and in both areas we actually have higher performance; better health care, less cost. If the rest of America practiced medicine the way it is practiced in our two communities, there would not be a Medicare crisis.

What we have done with the reform act was embed those notions to be able to provide incentives to reward value over volume, not just pay for procedures. To be able to have accountable care organizations, bundling of services, to actually have some financial disincentives for unnecessary hospital readmissions. All of these, the experts tell us, could save over $1.2 trillion over the next 20 years. And, in fact, if we had the courage to actually improve and accelerate and enhance, there are greater savings because the doctors, the nurses, the hospitals in our two communities have proven that it is possible. But our Republican friends have simply decided to turn their back on that. They are going to take the Medicare savings and spend it for tax cuts for people who need it the least.

I can't help but turn back to you because you have an interesting chart there on the floor that may say it all.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you, and let's just do a colloquy here back and forth. You've talked about ways in which we can bend the cost curve for health care for all Americans, not only those on Medicare. It was in the Affordable Care Act, the health care reform. Our Republican friends like to call it ObamaCare because it actually would reduce the cost of medical services for everybody, whether you are in Medicare or Kaiser or anywhere else. And you mentioned four very, very important ways it does it. One is hospital readmissions, otherwise known as hospital infections. Our former colleague a week ago likely died of a hospital infection. The Affordable Care Act places a heavy burden on hospitals that have a high infection rate, or readmissions. It is a very, very expensive, deadly situation. It is just one of several ways in which the Affordable Care Act reduced over time the cost of medical services.

You were here on the floor. I voted ''no,'' you voted ''no'' on a bill that Republicans forced through this House that eliminates wellness. What in the world was that all about? Why would you ever eliminate wellness: obesity, blood pressure, proper eating, nutrition, public health, vaccinations—all of these things to keep people healthy. Healthy people don't cost money. They

don't run up the price of medical services. So they want to repeal that, and I'm going, that makes no sense at all. You are actually increasing the deficit by doing that. And then they take it to the ultimate step of terminating Medicare.

This has become my favorite. It's the tombstone for Medicare. In the Republican budget is a proposal that would terminate Medicare for all Americans who are less than 55 years of age today. If you are 65, maybe it would continue on. But if you look at the totality of their proposal, it is the termination of Medicare and this is what we have. ''Medicare, 1965 to 2011, created by LBJ, destroyed by the GOP.'' Unbelievable. And along with it, a significant reduction in Medicaid, which in California we call Medi-Cal.

Your expertise, Mr. BLUMENAUER, on the health care issue and the experience in Oregon on how we can reduce the cost of medical care needs to be heard by every Member of this House. So if you would continue on and share with us this issue of medical services and how we can reduce the cost, save Medicare, and simultaneously addressing the deficit.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Your point is well taken in terms of what they would do terminating Medicare as we know it for everybody under 55 years of age. We are talking about over 230 million Americans. And as a result of this, it is clear, you can look at the Congressional Budget Office, other independent experts, it is not going to reduce the cost of health care. In fact, it is going to increase the cost of health care in America. But what it does is it is going to put an ever-increasing burden on elderly Americans. It is going to have a gap because ultimately they are not going to enable people to have Medicare until they are 67. They are going to have a small voucher that is given to the insurance company. Bear in mind the reason that LBJ and the Democratic Congress in 1965 enacted Medicare was because America's elderly could not get good insurance coverage that was comprehensive and affordable. Senior citizens, like it or not, are older. They are frailer. They are less healthy than younger Americans, and they are not working as much. They don't have the income. They need help. Now, our Republican friends would lead us to believe that all of a sudden there will be a private insurance market, which by the way sounds suspiciously like the exchanges that they said were bad in the health reform act, and they would force people into them, but they would have decreasing premium support.

□ 1830

I think it is also appropriate to just reflect for a moment about what happens to the 78 million geezer baby boomers who are 55 or older who will be under Medicare. That's going to continue for years. It's going to be increasingly inefficient. It appears as though there are some extra costs that are embedded for existing and soon-to-be future Medicare recipients that are going to continue to distort, drive up costs, and, of course, nationally we're all going to pay more for the privilege.

I would suggest this tombstone is something that people should consider carefully, because it's going to mean, I sincerely believe, not just the death of Medicare but it is going to provide profound shifts and dislocations within our health care system, hurt the providers, and provide less effective health care for our elderly citizens.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me add to that and carry on a little piece of it.

The Republican budget, which we will be voting on here on the floor of Congress in the next 2 days, has provisions that are equally harmful to seniors and to wannabe seniors, people who want to get to be 65 or 67 years of age, and these are the Medicaid reductions.

In the proposal that the Republicans will bring to this floor, the Road to Ruin proposal, is a block grant to the States for Medicaid services. In California, we call it Medi-Cal. This is a program that provides benefits to the poor and those who cannot afford medical services because they are severely disabled, mentally disabled, or seniors that cannot afford services in nursing homes. The block grant is less than what is now available to nearly every State, and it is scheduled to be reduced in the years ahead, the purpose of which is presumably to deal with the deficit, but what it does is it takes that whole population of seniors, current seniors, and others who are currently served by the Medicaid program and puts them at risk. The effect will be to throw seniors out of nursing homes, seniors that are on Medicaid or Medi-Cal in California. It is the most onerous and hardhearted proposal I have yet seen. These are people that are in desperate need of services, services for the mentally ill, services for the severely disabled, services for seniors who are in nursing homes and who cannot afford the cost of nursing homes. That's another part of this provision in the budget.

What is happening here is a shift, a shift of costs from the overall American economy in the Federal budget to the individuals, not to the wealthy, not to those who have income, but rather to those who have so little. And it's not the only shift that's occurring.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If we could just follow up on this for a moment, because you are talking about something that ought to concern each and every citizen. Medicaid. In your State Medi-Cal. We've had the Oregon health plan. There are other States that have variations on that. It provides health care, as you say, for our most vulnerable populations: the elderly, disabled, extremely poor people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And the young.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is very cost effective. There are complaints that the benefits under Medicaid are actually very low, and it's hard for physicians and hospitals, medical providers, to deal with this. But by moving to a block grant that, as you say, it is designed to go down over time. And unlike the current system, which is sort of countercyclical, where the Federal Government has given more money in times of distress, which it's done to your State and my State in the last 2 years. If we hadn't got the extra payments from the Federal Government to help with Medicaid, I can't imagine what shape people would have been in in Sacramento and Salem, Oregon. The legislature would have just melted down. What this proposal is, is to continue this ratcheting down, no benefits when times are tough, and put States in a situation where too often they are either unable, or in the case of some States, unwilling to react. It's going to have a cascading effect.

You mentioned the problem that's very likely to emerge with people being literally tossed out of nursing homes. This is something that Americans need to step back and look at what is being designed as part of this very pessimistic road map that is going to have very serious negative consequences.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you for that.

I am going to shift to another very, very important part of the Republican budget proposal, and that is their total unwillingness to deal with the reality of the revenues that the Federal Government needs in order to continue to provide all of the multitude of services that are part of a modern society: everything from defense to homeland security as well as the medical and social services that we have been talking about.

I'm going to put this up, it's a little cute, but I think it pretty much illustrates one of the profound problems in the Republican budget.

''What Do They All Have in Common?'' We've got the unicorn over there, we have Bugs Bunny, and then we have this thing that says the corporate tax rate, 35 percent, large corporations like Exxon. It's a fallacy. Large corporations and small corporations in America don't pay 35 percent corporate income tax. In fact, if one were to take a look at Exxon, in 2008 they had the largest profit of any company in the world. In 2009, they had a profit of about $19 billion and their effective tax rate, how much they actually paid in taxes, was zero. Not 35 percent. Not 30 percent. Not 25, not 20, not 15, not 10, but zero.

Now it happens that they're not the only corporation. The Republican proposal actually would make this situation worse. It would take this 35 percent and reduce it to 25 percent.

What are we talking about here? Why would we want to do that? Apparently they want to do that because they want to take their savings, Medicare, by terminating Medicare, Medicaid, by

reducing Medicaid and all of the other savings, the savings that they presume they're going to get from abolishing the wellness programs, high blood pressure screenings and so forth, and on and on and on, and give it to the corporations.

Let's understand that American corporations currently get a tax break for sending American jobs overseas. American corporations currently get a tax break for oil drilling. The oil industry in the United States is the most profitable industry in the world. We just talked about ExxonMobil. All of the other oil companies in the last 10 years have had a profit of $947 billion, just under $1 trillion. Yet they continue to receive tax breaks in the order of $12 billion to $15 billion a year, of our tax money, handed over to the oil companies at a time when they are now charging us over $4 a gallon for gasoline.

And what is that all about? Well, it's all about the ability of the oil industry to maintain a subsidy, a tax break out of the American taxpayer's pocket, handed over to the oil company, and they've had that subsidy for nearly a century. I'm saying, enough of that. Bring that money back into the Treasury, use it for green energy, solar, wind, renewable energy, for research, use it for the things that we need to do, including reducing the deficit. But oh, no. Oh, no. They don't want to do that. Our Republican colleagues want to continue to give to the oil industry the kind of tax breaks that they have.

If that's not enough, our Republican colleagues want to make sure that this fellow, Donald Trump, he wants to be President, probably to maintain the extraordinary tax break that he presently has. The Republicans want to reduce the taxes for Donald Trump and for other billionaires, millionaires, from 35 percent to 25 percent.

□ 1840

You go, why should we do that at a time when we're taking money away from seniors, at a time when we're forcing the middle class to pay more, at a time when you're shifting the cost of all of these services to the middle class, at a time when you're going after the unions and trying to destroy the union movement in America? Why in the world would you give Donald Trump, why would you give billionaires, why would you give those people at the very tiptop of the American economy, those people that now control over 25 percent of all of the wealth in America, the top 1 percent of wage earners in America, why would you give them, not a 10 percent, it's about a 17 percent reduction in their taxes? It makes no sense at all.

We talk about shared sacrifice. The Republican budget proposal that will be on this floor later this week will not be shared sacrifice. It is, in fact, giving to the top of the American heap of all taxpayers, of all wealth, even more. I suppose it must be the trickle-down theory, that if these folks, if Donald Trump and the other billionaires and millionaires have more money, somehow jobs will be created. The fact is it doesn't work. Don't believe me. Take a look at the American economy from 2001 to 2009, the George W. Bush period.

George W. Bush started the first very year of his Presidency with massive tax cuts that created a 2-plus trillion dollar deficit and very few jobs. During the Clinton period, we ended with a $5.3 trillion surplus and the creation of over 22 million jobs, and the tax rate for Mr. Trump and for other millionaires and billionaires was 39 percent. It is, in fact, the history of America's economy that proves that you're not going to create more jobs by reducing the taxes for Mr. Trump and the like.

So what do these things have in common: a unicorn, Bugs Bunny, and the corporate tax rate of 35 percent? They are all fictional, every one of them.

I want to move now to another subject. I'll make this my last, and I'll make it kind of quick. If we're going to grow the American economy, we have to make the critical investments that are the foundation of economic growth in any and every country. Whether you are Singapore, whether you are China or any of the European countries, France or Britain, the United Kingdom or the United States, there are fundamental investments that the society has to make, and many of these investments are made through the general public's government. Let me just turn to those investments.

This is part of our Make It in America agenda, the Democratic agenda of rebuilding the great American manufacturing base. If America is going to make it, we must make it in America. We have to rebuild the manufacturing base of America. We can do it, but it's going to take critical investments. I want to just point them out here as we go through this and then compare these to the Republican proposal, the budget proposal that we're going to be voting on.

The first one is trade. Now, the Republican proposal doesn't deal with trade and goods because they're not going to do any more harm to it, but this is a fair trade policy. This is a policy of trade where we do not give away our manufacturing industry to places like China. I am sick and tired of going into Target or any other store in America and finding ''Made in China,'' ''Made in Europe,'' made everywhere but in America. Enough of that. We need to see ''Made in America'' once again on the store shelves in America.

In California, the California government—not my responsibility, I wasn't responsible for it at the time—when they go out and they build a new bridge from Oakland to San Francisco, a multibillion-dollar bridge, and they buy steel from China because it's 10 percent cheaper, I'm going, Stop it. Stop it. And so today, in the Resources Committee, I introduced an amendment.

Now it's ''Drill, baby, drill.'' It's our Republican colleagues who want to drill anywhere and everywhere and all the time. I think it's the wrong thing to do. We need to move to renewables. But if we're going to drill, then why don't we drill with American-made equipment? Why don't we require that those drilling rigs, those pipes, those technologies, the drill bits, the blowout preventers be made in America? I introduced that amendment. The Republicans brushed it aside saying they didn't want to go that way. Okay, fine. But we need, on trade policy, to make sure that our trade policy does not disadvantage American manufacturers.

Taxes. I just talked about taxes. Why in the world would the Republicans vote against a tax policy that actually is now law? We passed this last December. Why would they vote against a tax policy that would reduce—nearly eliminate—the tax breaks that American corporations get when they send jobs offshore? Why would you vote against that tax break that American corporations have? I don't understand it. It's over, at least partially over, there's more that needs to be done, and my Democratic colleagues and I are asking our Republican colleagues to work with us to eliminate the rest of those tax breaks that American corporations get when they send jobs overseas.

We talked about some other issues here. For example, last December, the Democrats pushed through, Obama signed a bill that allowed American corporations and businesses to write off 100 percent year one—this year—100 percent of capital investment so that we encourage American manufacturers to invest in America so that they can be more productive.

Energy policy, extremely important. We cannot any longer put our economy and our national security at risk to foreign oil producers. So I guess part of the ''Drill, baby, drill'' is to try to deal with that, but that's not going to solve the problem. We need additional and new energy sources, and that's where the green energy, the future energy comes in.

Don't take it from me. Talk to our American military. Talk to the Navy, the Air Force, the Army. They think way ahead, and they know that they cannot depend upon oil. They need to move to other sources of energy. They did it years ago. They had wind on their ships. Then they went to coal. Then they went to oil. They are now using nuclear power. But they also know that many of their pieces of equipment—a jet airplane isn't going to have a nuclear reactor. So they want to free themselves from the grip of the petro dictators around the world and they want to be able to have energy made here in America. This is biofuels, advanced biofuels of all kinds.

We ought to follow the lead of our military here, and we must create energy projects that provide us with clean renewable energy, whether it's

nuclear or the green energy: solar, wind, biofuels and geothermal, all the rest. So energy policy becomes extremely important.

Labor. It turns out, if one were to look at American economic history, you would be able to track the rise of labor in the thirties, forties, fifties and sixties tracking perfectly with the rise of the middle class in America. So as labor became more predominant in America, we saw the American middle class grow right along with the labor movement.

Beginning in the 1970s, we saw the decline of the labor movement. If you track the decline of the labor movement, you will find the decline of the American middle class tracking perfectly with the decline of the labor movement. Now we find all across the Midwest—in Wisconsin and Ohio—a major movement to take yet another shot at labor, to weaken labor or to destroy labor. In the process, you will find the further decline of the middle class of America should they succeed at that.

But this is more than just the labor movement. This is preparing the American worker to be competitive in a modern economy. This is education. This is job training. These are programs to retrain and to bring into the workplace workers who are prepared to deal with the modern machinery and the modern equipment that a well-placed and well-executed economy must have.

I want to move to the next one, which is, in fact, education. Earlier today, I met with the President of California State University, East Bay, part of my district in California.

□ 1850

And the president, Mohamoyad Qayoumi, who happens to be an Afghan, was talking about programs that they're putting in place in the East Bay of California, San Francisco Bay, to encourage the education of children—modern technology, using iPhones, using techniques in computer technology—so that the kids who are into these things in a big way will be able to learn, not going out and buying expensive textbooks every year that are out of date the next year, but rather to use online publications and be able to bring to the students all of the world.

I was going home last weekend, and I got a call from my wife. She said, Can you find a light bulb for the projector? It's out. We need a light bulb for the projector. I said, I just got off the airplane. I don't know what I'm going to do.

I got online, I punched up my Safari, and I looked for light bulbs. In a matter of moments, I found, not too far from the airport, a photo shop that had the light bulb.

The whole world is here. The whole world is available for a student who's just curious. You cannot help but be curious. All you need to do is get online, and you can find out everything about the world around us, anything you're into with science, and it turns out that this little piece of equipment, according to President Qayoumi, is also a tool for the teacher. The test can be taken on this. And in taking that test, the teacher immediately knows what the student does not know. And so the next day in class that could be dealt with.

I think I'm running out of time here, and I'm going to finish very, very quickly with intellectual property. This is the transition of all of the research into the manufacturing sector. Make It in America. We have to do this. We can do this if we have the right policies in place.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

FEDERALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the topic of enduring consequence. Last month, the members of the Constitution Caucus came to the floor to commend limited government as the guardian of human dignity. Tonight, we would like to continue that conversation by discussing one of the indispensable pillars of limited government. America's guarantee of limited government and her bulwark of liberty can be attributed to Federalism.

Federalism is the subject which we often forget here in Washington, D.C. I believe this is a tragic irony because our great Nation is the birthplace of this truly revolutionary political concept. Federalism is not an abstract philosophy. Simply, it is the separation of power between the Federal Government and State governments. It is one of the cornerstones of our American experiment in self-government.

It was unheard of before the American founding and unfortunately is all but forgotten today.

Until our Founding Fathers devised our unique system of government, nations around the globe were dedicated to the faulty idea that power or sovereignty was indivisible. The great wisdom of the American founding was to reject this notion and build a robust government with a system that carefully divided power on two different levels.

Yes, we are most familiar with the separation of three branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial; but too many in Washington have forgotten that there is another division in government—the division between States and Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we have one of the greatest documents to govern our country that has existed for over 200 years and has been one of the documents that has guided so many Americans and people across this country into personal responsibility, to the ability to take opportunities that we have been granted in this country.

The 10th Amendment sums up this structural integrity of the Constitution and the dual sovereignty of the Federal and State governments. The 10th Amendment says this: ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

As a former State legislator, I've seen this and been very frustrated at times as a State legislator in the powers that the Federal Government continues to assume and is basically overreaching the responsibilities and the powers of the State government. Federalism, as you know, was a huge debate and discussion as part of the founding of our great Nation back when our Founding Fathers were discussing what should be in the Constitution.

During the debate over States' rights and Federalism, there needs to be a balance between what the States are responsible for and what the Federal Government is responsible for. And our Constitution lays those responsibilities out and defines those responsibilities very clearly.

I believe it's very important for us, as Congress and Congressmen and Congresswomen, to refamiliarize ourselves with our Constitution and realize that the boundaries that have been laid out by our Founding Fathers are well defined. And the intent and the vision that was laid out is one that is still applicable today.

I believe that the Federal Government continues to overreach as to those boundaries—whether it's massive spending, whether it's an overreach in our health care bill that just passed last year, whether it's the stimulus package which the Federal Government is now assuming the responsibility to stimulate our economy rather than trusting in the American people.

It does not add anything to the Constitution that was not already there in its structure, but in making the principle of Federalism more explicit, the 10th Amendment underscores the importance of Federalism.

To see Federalism succeed, we must hold faith in the integrity of the Constitution. A living document is just an empty vessel. Federalism is neglected when politicians make the Constitution a blank slate for the dominant political trends.

As James Madison wrote in Federalist Number 45: ''The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite.''

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read again the 10th Amendment of our Constitution: ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are

reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

So, Mr. Speaker, I'd submit to you that many of the programs that the Federal Government currently not only operates but also is proposing under several different bills over the past several years really are overreaching into the State governments' responsibilities and also into what they are fully capable of doing.

Many times the frustration that we had of dealing with Medicaid and the mandates that were handed down to the States were tying the hands of our State governments.

Coming from the State of Indiana, I'm very proud of what has been accomplished because of those who respect not only the simple economics of balancing budgets and realizing that you can't spend more money than what you have, but as a member of the Indiana House of Representatives of 2005, I worked with our Governor and our Senate to see that Indiana passed its first balanced budget in 8 years.

As we've discussed repeatedly here in Congress already, what about balanced budgets, what about the responsibility of making sure that we do not spend more money than what we have? Our Federal Government just closed its budget with a $1.5 trillion deficit, and that's hard to imagine that we could actually spend that much more money than what we take in. Any Hoosier family knows that once that line at the bottom of the checkbook hits red, there's a problem, and we need to reevaluate what we are currently doing in our spending and our income.

□ 1900

Either you start cutting spending or you start increasing your income. As we all know with the difficult economic times that we're in, increasing income is not always as easy as we would like it to be. So what we need to do is control what we can control, and that is the spending.

Today, Indiana is squarely in the black because of very difficult decisions. It has a AAA credit rating, and is home to the fewest State employees per capita in the United States. The initiative was taken when times were difficult and in realizing that we were falling on tough economic times.

As we move forward in this Congress, I believe that we need to take the same principles and the same values that States have and local governments have and families have across the country, and businesses, who all realized that you cannot continue to spend more money than what you are taking in.

Progressivism has been the greatest foe of federalism. Progressivism believes in a government of, by, and for the experts, statisticians, and bureaucrats. Federalism believes in government of, by, and for the people and their unique communities. So, again, here I would argue that communities and people are much more capable, because they know their particular circumstances and how they are to manage not only their own dollars but their own lives, whether it's education or whether it's being involved in their church, in giving to their church or charity groups.

But instead, we're seeing a government that continues to intrude in taking more and more of those responsibilities, but also the rights that we all have as citizens, in taking those away from Americans and giving them to the Federal Government. We all know the Federal Government is never capable of fully meeting the needs that every individual has in our country.

Progressivism ends up elevating unelected experts to rule over the entire Nation. Rules promulgated by an alphabet soup of agencies choke out representative government, and Congress calls hearings to slow them down. We are seeing that repeatedly right now, Mr. Speaker, with hearings that we are having currently in our committees and in asking questions of the bureaucracies on the rule-making decisions that they are making every day. It continues to choke out not only our freedoms and opportunities that we enjoy as Americans, whether it's in business or whether it's as individuals, but also the bureaucracies are becoming much more powerful.

Now that the Congress is not passing overreaching legislation, we're seeing the bureaucracies taking on that role. And I believe that it is crucial for us as Americans to step forward and to remind ourselves what our Federal Government's responsibilities are. The Constitution clearly defines those responsibilities. And I believe it's important that we all become more familiar again with our Constitution and with the responsibilities that the Federal Government is responsible for.

Likewise, federalism today should not be confused with nullification, nor with the idea of secession. Federalism must be revived so that the rights of citizens might be upheld and their duties fulfilled. Federalism is the protector of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I can only imagine at the time, as our Founding Fathers were debating federalism and creating a Federal Government with the State governments that they had at the time, that they never imagined that the Federal Government would become as large and bureaucratic and bloated and irresponsible as it is today.

When the Federal Government exercises control over health care, welfare, housing, unemployment, and even the so-called stimulus of our economy, there is less incentive for citizens to act within their communities and States to fulfill the duties they once assumed. Civic virtue suffers as power flows to Washington, D.C. Ordinary Americans are neglected in this top-down solution.

Many argue that Washington knows better, that bureaucrats know better, that the experts know better. But I know, growing up as a son of a farmer in northern Indiana, that my parents, my grandparents, they all knew what was important for our family. They knew what was important to our community. Whether it was being involved in our school, whether it was being involved in our church community, whether it was being involved in our local economy or our government process. Families and individuals can make those decisions, what's important, and make those priorities, pass those priorities on to their families.

I believe that what's happening today in our country is that we're seeing less and less not only interest, but also responsibility is now being assumed by our Federal Government, because it continues to overreach and to continue to take away the responsibilities of local governments, whether it's a school board which would make much better decisions for their local community and their school, whether it's a county council that knows the challenges that they have with their counties.

I know for us we have a lot of lakes and rivers, a lot of sandy soil, sewer systems that need to be built to keep our environment clean and better for our children and grandchildren as we pass on the resources that we have. We are starting to have our hands tied more and more because of regulations coming from Washington, D.C.

I believe that that is what our Founding Fathers intended. They believed in ordinary citizens making extraordinary decisions for their communities and that the structure of our Constitution protected that.

In short closing here, as I want to turn it over to my colleagues, I would warn those who are in Congress that we think ourselves too wise if we believe that federalism espoused in our founding documents is an antiquated relic of the past. Governments are the products of fallen men. Human nature is the same today as it was in 1787. When the Federal Government grows beyond its original purpose, when it greedily claims powers belonging to the States and local communities, it arrogantly assumes that 535 Federal legislators and hordes of bureaucrats can direct with perfect clarity the lives of over 300 million Americans.

I would be amiss to claim that I know the daily concerns of Buckeyes, or those who are in New Jersey, or from Texas, or from Oklahoma, or from California. But I know Hoosiers because I am one. I know and believe these simple truths. The rich diversity of our Nation's 50 States impels us to greatness. There are legitimate concerns which must be addressed by a well-balanced Federal Government. Yet the Federal Government ought to defer to the States in those matters that the States are best prepared for.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. Thank you, first of all, first and foremost, for leading this caucus tonight and leading this Special Order tonight as we speak about federalism as a safeguard of a limited government. So we come here tonight to discuss that and think about it in the larger sense, to discuss basically the revolutionary principles that federalism is and its critical role in our system of government that makes individual liberties possible in this country.

As the founder of the Constitutional Caucus, I welcome a public discussion on federalism tonight. It is such a crucial discussion, a discussion of federalism, a discussion of the role of government in our lives. And it lies at the heart of the American social contract between the government and the people. You see, it's federalism that keeps the Federal Government basically within its proper boundaries. So it is crucial to an understanding of the American commitment to liberty and to freedom and how well it will safeguard this generation and future generations as well.

When we think about these topics, it's often easy to take for granted our Federal system of government and the freedoms that it affords all of us. But such a system was, by no means, preordained.

□ 1910

And if you go back some 200-plus years, ordinary colonists, armed with a desire to be free, rebelled against the world's mightiest empire to achieve our independence from an obtrusive, overcentralized and a faraway government.

And what was in its place? Well, in its place our Founders established for the first time in history a national government of defined and enumerated powers that is basically prohibited from overstepping its confined jurisdictions.

So the Federal Government's powers were to be truly national in scope, and the Founders believed that because States and local governments operated closest to the citizens, elected officials who were at that lower level, or the local level, would be the ones who were most competent to make the laws that would govern daily lives.

Now, this was a message espoused by James Madison in Federalist No. 45. You know, Madison wrote back then: ''The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and they are defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite.''

So, you see, you have established this dual sovereignty, the sovereignty of Federal and State governments. And it's underscored then how basically in our Bill of Rights, as the 10th Amendment reads, as the gentleman from Indiana already said: ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectfully, or to the people.''

The beauty of the 10th Amendment is not at first easily recognizable, as some would say, on first blush that the 10th Amendment is almost redundant. Some would say it offers nothing new from what has already been written into the confines, or four corners, if you will, of the Constitution. And so it is the limited powers of the Federal Government that are articulated throughout the three sections of the Constitution.

In fact, however, the Founders, looking at the Bill of Rights, initially believed that they were really not necessary and, actually, that they could be seen as potentially dangerous. Why was this? Well, both the Federalists and the anti-Federalists understood that the Bill of Rights limited the powers of government.

But the perceived danger here of the Bill of Rights lay where? At the potential for misunderstanding by future generations. This misunderstanding basically comes about by this, by forbidding the Federal Government from acting in certain areas, which is what the Bill of Rights would do. It was argued then, what, that the Constitution implied that the Federal Government could do what? It could act in all other areas that were not expressly prohibited from engaging in.

But let's be clear, the 10th Amendment makes clear that the Constitution provides no implied powers to the Federal Government. And so it is here that we see Federalism for what it basically is. It is the cornerstone, if you will, of the Constitution and the most effective tool for the preservation of this, our liberty.

So the 10th Amendment inclusion as the final amendment in the Bill of Rights is, therefore, no accident. It is, rather, as one might say, the culmination of the Founders' vision of American democracy. It reaffirms a commitment to a government strictly defined and with those limited powers.

It is this institutionalization of armor, if you will, of liberty and the perpetual struggle against this tyrannical government. This amendment is, in short, the realization of the principles of the American revolution.

And as we come to the floor tonight and every day here in this Congress, we are heirs to that revolution. Unfortunately, today America seems to have surrendered some of its birthright. The scope and reach of the Federal Government is growing at a disturbing pace. The incessant expansion of government has led to the bailout of the banking industry and the auto industry, sweeping financial regulation, and the proposal of cap-and-trade systems that would demand that rationing of American economic prosperity and productivity.

The tentacles, if you will, of the Federal Government are tightly wrapped around housing, education, transportation, unemployment policy—you name it—in almost every aspect of our lives. The American people, when you think about it, are controlled by the Federal Government in almost every single aspect of their lives, from morning to evening, from what light bulbs we are allowed to buy to the health insurance we have to buy. It is all required under regulations by the Federal Government.

Now, as I come to the floor, today is the 268th birthday of Thomas Jefferson. If he were alive today, I doubt that he would recognize the Federal Government as one that has remained true to the revolutionary Founders of this country. Rather, I would imagine that he would see a centralized and bureaucratic form of government that resembles the one that he and the rest of the Founding Fathers rebelled against. That is exactly what the Constitution and the amendments to it and the principles of Federalism were meant to prevent.

Out-of-control spending may be the clearest sign now of where we are today in having neglected these principles of Federalism. It is the Federal meddling into the lives of the American people. What it has done is resulted in the unprecedented and also, I would add, the unsustainable level of funding that jeopardizes the very economic well-being of the United States.

Our current path, therefore, threatens the American standard of living and our prosperity, the American Dream and the American status as a superpower.

You see, by nationalizing every issue, what we do there is we deprive the American people of the benefits that Federalism would normally bring. The Founders intended the States to serve as, as has often been called, the laboratories of democracy, which would compel the States to compete against each other to attract individuals and businesses, if you will.

This competition would result in innovations and innovative solutions, the greater accountability and transparency of public servants and the diffusion of power that limits the reach of the national government. Federalism, it's the constitutional guarantee of that good government.

So we come here tonight, and we must renew our commitment to Federalism, to the Constitution. By allowing this, our Constitution to be interpreted, though, by the whims of the judicial and executive branches, we have undermined the structural integrity of this document as well as the safeguards that a limited government describes.

To conclude, at the beginning of this year, Members of this body take an oath—to do what?—basically, to support and defend this Constitution of the United States. We owe it to the people we represent to remain true to that oath. Restoring adherence to Federalism must begin where? Well, right here in this Chamber.

I hope that my colleagues will join me, as the Members are here with me

tonight, in re-embracing this idea and this notion and this practice of Federalism, one of the great pillars of the American founding principles.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you, Mr. GARRETT.

At this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from the Fourth District of Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you to the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

I am here tonight to talk about the proper relationship between the Federal Government and State and local governments, this issue of Federalism, our Nation's founding documents.

When I was first elected, I embarked on a listening tour right after November 2, during which I met with local officials from across my district to talk about issues that they were concerned about, what was on their minds, what challenges they were facing in their offices. At each stop, local leaders talked about the problems facing their communities; and even though every county is different, every community is different, the Federal Government seemed to cause the same problems in each one of them.

In one county in my district, I was told a story by a county commissioner of the time that the commissioner asked his staff to count all of the Federal and State mandates that they placed upon their health and human services department at the county. They counted up the mandates that they were under from national, State regulators, Congress, State legislation, State legislatures. The county commissioner actually asked his staffer to quit counting when he reached 9,000 individual mandates that that one department, at the county level, was under.

On this listening tour and since then, since being sworn in on January 5, at the town meetings that we have held, it never ceases to amaze me that one of the strongest moments of bringing applause to the town meetings is when we talk about what happened on this floor when we first started the 112th Congress, the time when we read, both Democrats and Republicans, the Constitution of the United States before the American people right here on the U.S. House floor.

When I talk about how we joined together in reading the Constitution, people always applaud because it matters to them, because they believe this country continues to be guided by that most fundamental document of our country.

Those 9,000 rules, though, that that county commissioner was talking about were created by Federal and State regulators who don't understand the problems that each of our unique districts faces because they have never been there. They don't know what it's like. They don't understand that each county, each city, each school board knows how to govern their jurisdiction better than anyone in Washington ever could, and they do not understand that an unfunded mandate imposed on the entire country does not work.

□ 1920

Each State and county in this country is unique and often has far better solutions than those of the people here in Washington, D.C., can devise. The Founding Fathers understood this very well and designed a system focused on limiting the authority of the Federal Government and on putting power closer to the people. Our Federalist system has long served as the safeguard of limited government.

As a State legislator from the Eastern Plains of Colorado, I will never forget the time that I received a call from a cabinet member from the previous administration who was urging me to vote for a particular piece of legislation because there was Federal money involved and that the only way that Colorado would receive this Federal funding was if we passed a bill that the Federal Government wanted. They were dangling money out in front of us to pass a bill. That instance proved to me what we continue to see today, which is the power shifting ''away'' from the States and ''to'' the Federal Government—but to what end?

Last year, Congress passed a health care bill that places increased Medicaid obligations on already cash-strapped States, which have no way to pay for them. Regulations from agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency continue to drive up the cost of energy and force American jobs overseas. Just today, we heard Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator BEGICH, and Representative YOUNG testify before the Energy and Commerce Committee on a bill about the need to pursue energy policies in Alaska, polices that will allow them to access the resources of that great State and to release, unleash, as much as 1 million barrels of oil a day. The State is supportive. Witnesses for the Department of Natural Resources testified. Unfortunately, the Federal Government continues to block their progress. The Founding Fathers wouldn't even recognize our country today as the one that they formed over 200 years ago.

Education is another area in which there is the employing of Federalist principles. There is no better example of which we can talk about the differences between the Federal Government and the State government and how the Federal Government continues to overstep its bounds. The Board of Education in Douglas County, Colorado, has taken it upon itself to truly innovate in the area of education financing; but the problem with the system in the Federal Government is that it's a top-down approach. Since when is the Federal Government able to better communicate the needs of children in a community than that community, itself? There are some good initiatives in Congress out there, like the A–PLUS Act, by Mr. GARRETT from New Jersey, which would allow the States to opt out of No Child Left Behind funding and use that money toward programs they think deserve attention.

Along with Federal funding comes very prescriptive mandates. The more Federal funding a school receives, the less it's able to listen to its own community—to its teachers, to its parents and, yes, to its students. The more it is forced to listen to the Federal Government say ''you can use this money, but you have to use it here, and you have to use it this way,'' it's tough for a lot of States to say ''no'' to that in these cash-strapped times. I look forward to addressing some of these issues during the debates of the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind; but we must put power back in the hands of teachers and parents, who know best how to teach their children.

Health care is another challenge this country faces as Congress is imposing an individual mandate on citizens to purchase federally approved health insurance. This mandate is contrary to the Federalist principles that we are talking about this evening. The bill forces States to expand their Medicaid eligibility standards. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, by 2019, Colorado will see a 47.7 percent increase in Medicaid enrollees as compared to the estimated national average of 24.7 percent.

The health care bill was created by the Federal Government, and the cost of its expansion has shifted directly back to State budgets. Further, under the takeover of the health care bill, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has the authority to enact and to execute rules and regulations that local administrators are required to follow. This takes the power away from States and local governments and wrests it in the hands of the Federal Government.

What is more important, though, is the ingenuity and progress in health care that has been established and accomplished by the States on a State-by-State level. Through this process, they've made significant improvements to our health care industry. Unfortunately, I believe the health care bill that was passed in the last Congress is a step away from that direction.

Last week, I had the opportunity to take my 7-year-old daughter to Philadelphia to see the Liberty Bell, to visit Independence Hall, and the National Constitution Center, to talk to the people who work at Independence Hall about the great symbols of freedom in our country, about the writing of those founding documents, about what it meant to talk about freedom, about liberty, about our great Republic. I am reminded of the time when, during recent events in Libya and Egypt, my wife and daughter were watching television, watching the news, when the President spoke on TV. They were talking about the fight for freedom that continues in the Middle East, and the President mentioned how we have to continue working for freedom around the globe.

My daughter looked at my wife and said, ''But we are free.''

To that, my wife looked at her and said, ''Yes, but we must always continue to work for it, to fight for it.''

That's why we are here tonight, talking about how we can ensure those fundamental liberties, those fundamental notions of freedom, that are enshrined in our basic form of federalism.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you.

Next, I would like to yield to the co-chair of the Constitution Caucus, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you.

Tom Nevins, who is actually a social archaeologist, gave an interesting discussion about Ancient Central America in which he said, in 1521, Cortez led a group of Spanish soldiers to what is today Mexico City. There he found an Aztec society and an Aztec capital with 15 million inhabitants. Cortez gave simple instructions to Montezuma, II, who was in charge at that time, which was, either give us your gold or I'll kill you. For whatever reason, Montezuma gave him the gold, and then he proceeded to kill him. In fact, in the siege of what is today Mexico City, approximately a quarter of a million Aztecs died from starvation in that siege, and within 2 years the Aztec empire was totally controlled by the Spanish.

A decade later, the Inca civilization had the same thing happen to them, led by Pizarro, who, once again, said, Give us your gold or we'll kill you. They got the gold, and they proceeded to kill him. Also, within 2 years, the Inca civilization was totally dominated by the Spanish, which meant that both the Aztecs and the Incas were a highly centralized government, a highly centralized society, a highly centralized economic system, and because of that they were easy prey for a smaller but a very well-trained and well-organized Spanish Army.

By the 1680s, the Spanish moved into the deserts of New Mexico where they moved against the Apaches. There are two things that are different about the Spanish efforts with the Apaches in New Mexico. Number one, there was no gold to be taken. Number two, the Spanish lost. In fact, for almost two centuries, the Apaches were able to hold at bay the Spanish. One of the reasons they were is that the Apache civilization was very decentralized. They had tribal leaders. Yet, as the tribal leaders were either captured or killed, they just simply got another tribal leader. The greatest of all is the one whose name we probably mispronounce and call Geronimo.

As Nevin said, this Apache civilization was not loosey-goosey. They had customs; they had traditions; they had a very sophisticated society, but they also were decentralized. I am told that, in the Apache language, the phrase ''you should'' simply does not exist. Whereas, if we look at the thousands and thousands of pages that produced ObamaCare and cap-and-trade, you will find the concept of ''you should'' being repeatedly inserted over and over and over again, which means a centralized society has certain strengths and certain weaknesses. Its greatest strength is the concept of uniformity. Everyone can be coerced into doing the exact same thing at the exact same time. A decentralized society has certain strengths and certain weaknesses.

□ 1930

Its greatest strength is creativity, flexibility and the opportunity of its people to have options in the way they live. Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, you and probably Mr. STUTZMAN are wondering what I am actually doing here: I came into the wrong Special Order; like, what does this have to do with the topic at hand? I think it does have to do with the topic at hand because the idea at the Constitutional Convention was: Do we have a centralized or a decentralized society and government here in this country?

Indeed, they tried to separate powers horizontally between the three branches of government, but more significantly, and more importantly, vertically between national and State governments as a specific way of trying to make sure that we had a decentralized system of government, one that puts a greater emphasis on creativity, on flexibility and the ability to ensure that our citizens had what they call personal liberty, what I simply say are the options to make choices for themselves in the way they wish to do that.

The Founding Fathers had a great fear of control. That is why they rebelled against the British in the first place. They had a great fear of bureaucracy. It is why in the Declaration of Independence they talk about the swarms of officials who were sent here by the British Government to devour from us our substance.

Today, we have in our government a Federal Government that apparently tries to vacuum up as much power, as much money, and as much influence as possible. Our government bureaucracy today in Washington is one that is based on command-and-control style of leadership which builds a heavy emphasis on rules. And obeying the rules of procedure is far more important than just coming up with a commonsense solution to the problem which happens to be at hand. In fact, one of the questions that we have is, have we become, in essence, too big today? Have we become more centralized than decentralized? And does that give some inherent weaknesses to our society and our country that we have today? One of the things that we have to do is try and rethink this entire situation.

Tomorrow, Members of this House will be inviting legislators from around the country who are back here, and we will have a conference in which State legislators will meet with Members of Congress to discuss this very issue of what direction this country will be going in the future and to recognize very clearly that this is not an issue between the left and the right.

The idea of Federalism, of balancing powers of creativity and a less centralized government, is not a Republican or Democrat issue. It's an issue of the direction of this country, because it's about people. It's about whether people actually have options in their lives or whether they don't. And when we recognize this, it becomes apparent that the only way to make sense of the situation is to make sure that fewer decisions in Washington are allowed to be directed towards the States and local governments and that the people make more decisions in their lives.

As Justice Rehnquist said, surely, there can be no more important fundamental Constitution question than the intention of the Framers of the Constitution as to how authority should be allocated between the national and State governments. That's the battle which we still fight for and struggle with here. And it's the one in which we cannot afford, for the future of this country, to lose or to fail.

If sometimes when I was teaching school my students didn't quite understand the significance of the fall of the Aztecs or the Incas, then that was an annoyance. But if we, as Members of Congress, fail to recognize the distinction between the centralization of power and the decentralization of power, which was the very foundation of this country, that is not an annoyance. That becomes a tragedy.

I am very grateful to the Constitutional Caucus, especially Chairman GARRETT of New Jersey and Representative STUTZMAN from Indiana, for your leadership in organizing this. I am proud to join my good friend from Colorado and, hopefully, my good friend from New Mexico as long as he does not try and change any of my story about the Apache. That's my story, and I'm sticking to it.

But this is important. This is one of those key issues. This is one of the quintessential issues that will define where we go, either forward to a brighter future or forward into a less secure and more dangerous future. And I appreciate being able to be a part of it. I thank you for allowing me to be here for a few minutes.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you, Mr. BISHOP, for your comments.

Mr. Speaker, as I think about some of the comments that were made tonight from Mr. GARRETT and from Mr. GARDNER, as well as from Mr. BISHOP, it brings back a lot of thoughts from experiences of serving not only as a legislator but also as a farmer and as a businessowner of a small trucking operation that we have, a family business, back in Indiana. I think about how the freedom that we have comes from not the Constitution; it comes from God. The rights that we have are God-given, and the Constitution protects those rights.

I know that many times over the years we look at the Constitution as a dry document. It doesn't seem to be exciting. It doesn't seem to be one of great interest. But I can tell you today, Mr. Speaker, as we watch our

Federal Government—as we've started to do the debate of budgets, of health care, and of our military actions around the world, and of the size and the scope of our Federal Government—it is crucial for us, for all of us, to remind ourselves and to reeducate ourselves on what our constitutional role is.

As Mr. BISHOP said, many times we talk about the horizontal separations of our government with the executive, the legislative and the judicial; but also we need to remember the vertical branches of government, and we need to remind ourselves that the States actually established the Federal Government.

I can only imagine as our Founding Fathers were debating this and looking at the States that were in existence and thinking of the challenges they faced, the challenges of military action against them and how do they defend themselves, the discussion of taxation, and to come together and to establish a Federal Government that was designed to not only protect but to protect the rights, protect us physically, but to also protect the rights of us as individuals. Now looking back, Federalism is that balance of a Federal Government that complies with the constitutional guidelines, whether it's our national defense, whether it's our borders, or whether it's commerce and currency, the responsibilities are limited.

But as time has gone by, the Federal Government has continued to grow and to pursue and to take away those responsibilities from States and from our local communities. As Mr. GARDNER mentioned, the different local community visits that he has made, it reminds me of ones that I made as well in Indiana, whether it's talking with the mayor in Kendallville about the challenges with fire and police, whether it's the Topeka Town Council and the challenges they have with economic development, or whether it's Nappanee with their sewer challenges, Fort Wayne or Angola with streets and sewers and things that they know what they want to do and what they would like to accomplish that are all affected by Federal Government one way or another.

And it drives costs up for not only them but ultimately for the citizens. As spending continues to accumulate and increase, we have to remember that the American taxpayer, the American citizen, we as citizens are the ones who ultimately are going to be responsible paying that bill.

And as we come into our budget process over the next couple of days, I think that we should be reminded and would be remiss if we did not take the opportunity to look through the scope and look through the eyes of what our Founding Fathers imagined and intended for our country through the Constitution as we face $14 trillion of debt. States, local governments, and families don't have the ability to continue to borrow dollars; specifically, States and local governments don't have the same ability that the Federal Government has. And so they are disciplined. And so they realize that the decisions they make affect local communities.

The Federal Government and we in Congress need to take on that same discipline and realize that the spending that we authorize today is going to affect our children and our grandchildren. I have two children, two sons, a 9-year-old and a 5-year-old; and I know that they are going to have to assume the responsibilities and the consequences of what happens today in Congress.

And I refuse to stand by and allow for more spending and for the Federal Government to continue to grow. I want to see a country that respects the individual's life and liberty and our local communities' decision-making at the local levels and at the State level rather than a government, a Federal Government that continues to believe that they can authorize and tell the American people what to do and what they cannot do.

□ 1940

So with those thoughts in mind going into the budget process, I believe we have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to challenge the status quo. We hear a lot of comments on this floor about what the changes are that are being proposed in the budget that just passed out of the Budget Committee last week and is going to be debated here on the floor tomorrow. I believe we cannot demonize the situation that we are in and use scare tactics with the American people. We need to be factual. We need to be honest. We need to realize the realities that we are in as Americans, because we are all in this together. This is not a Republican problem; this is not a Democrat problem. We see finger-pointing on this floor all the time. And frankly, I know as a freshman Congressman, that is not why I came here. I came here to fix the problems we have because of a bloated government and because we have overstepped the boundaries of our constitutional role.

If we do not face the fact that we have trillions of dollars of debt, that we are overspending—and we have to also realize that we cannot raise taxes on the American people at a time when the economy is struggling, when American families are struggling and paying bills. By raising taxes, we only drive the cost of doing business higher and we drive the cost of living higher. Money cannot be circulated through the economy dictated by the Federal Government to stimulate or drive our economy. The American people do that much better.

I believe as we again debate the budget, we need to realize that if we want to pass on a better future for our kids and our grandkids, for our country, for ourselves, if that's the way people need to look at it, I believe we lay out the situation, whether it is with Medicare and realizing that we cannot continue down the road with the program as it currently stands. If we want to hand that off to our children and our grandchildren, some modifications have to happen.

I believe if we as Republicans and we as Congress, specifically Republicans in the majority here in Congress, lay out the plan and we make the case that something needs to be done, the American people are with us. They realize the debt that is hanging over us, and they realize the deficits that are over us cannot be sustained and we are going to have to make changes. But we cannot make progress in a bipartisan fashion if we continue to use scare tactics, and I believe that going back and looking at the constitutional role of our Federal Government, that all of us as Americans realize, as the many generations before us did in the challenges that they faced, that we are up to the challenge. So, Mr. Speaker, as we move into tomorrow, I believe that our constitutional responsibilities will be defined by what we do and what we say and what we vote on in the upcoming years.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of your comments reminded me of a story shared with me by a constituent several years ago. They talked about their time attending law school. They were talking about in their constitutional law course, they were starting with the Bill of Rights, going through the amendments reading cases. And when they approached the 9th and 10th Amendments of our Constitution, the law professor of this particular class said we are just going to skip the 9th and 10th Amendments because nobody really knows what these do anymore. And they went right on and beyond the 9th and 10th Amendments.

Our discussion tonight has been on the issue of federalism, has been on the issue of the powers that rightly rested with the Federal Government versus the States. And here we are dealing with a law school, a public law school where this individual was told we're going to skip the 9th and 10th Amendments because nobody knows what it means.

I believe the American people have a great interest in what the 9th and 10th Amendments mean. I know that many of our public law schools have audit opportunities, and I believe the people who are interested around this country in what students are being taught, what public law schools are teaching regarding the Constitution, regarding the 9th and 10th Amendments of this country, they have a right to audit that class and maybe they should start attending some of these law school courses to learn just exactly what our schools are teaching when it comes to federalism, the 9th and 10th Amendments, the liberty amendments of this great Nation.

I just thank you for the opportunity to share that story with the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you.

It is probably all too common, unfortunately, because this document, I believe, as I said earlier, is one that doesn't appear to be exciting. But when you read it and when you realize what it does for our freedom and that it protects our rights as individuals of this great Nation, it is so important for us to understand, and if we don't know, to find out, to listen to others who have gone before us, whether it is our Founding Fathers or whether it is those who have served in different capacities, whether it is in schools or whether it is in government, there is a reason for it. It is the 9th and 10th Amendments, and it is the 9th and 10th points of our Bill of Rights. I think that is what of our Founding Fathers meant. They meant it to be at the end to give those responsibilities back to the State governments because they knew that the Federal Government wasn't going to be responsible. They couldn't absolutely take care of everybody with the role and the size that the Federal Government was at that time.

We are in a situation today where I believe many Americans believe and they know in their heart what is right, and that our Constitution protects those rights and that we believe in freedom. We believe in that entrepreneurial spirit and that we can go out and make something of ourselves.

As I said, I am the son of a farmer and have the opportunity to serve in Congress, which is a humbling experience, but at the same time knowing that we have a responsibility for our kids and for our grandkids, for our country, for the freedom that we have, for the opportunity we have. I believe that this is a perfect time for us to know what the Constitution says, to understand it and to apply it. Whether you are on the school board, which is one of the most important positions I believe any individual can run for, to be involved in our children's education, whether it is on the city council, town council, county council, State government, those are all such important, township government, are all so important because an engaged person involved in the community, involved in the government, can make a difference. That is what I believe to be so fascinating is that this document empowers us as Americans. It doesn't take power away. It doesn't give power strictly to the Federal Government. It is one that believes in the American people.

As I mentioned before, with the budget debates coming forward, if we continue to go down the path of higher spending, higher taxes, of more regulation, that we only take away opportunity. We take away the empowerment that was given to the American people, and that we all should be grateful that we can go back to the Constitution and have this discussion and have this dialogue about the responsibilities of the Federal Government and making that case to those of us in Congress and to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the responsibilities and the opportunities that State governments, local governments, not only can they do, but they can do it better because they can meet the needs of their local communities because they hear from local citizens. I believe that government that is closest to the people serves the people better.

With that, I appreciate each of my colleagues this evening being part of the Constitutional Caucus discussion here on the House floor. I am looking forward to many more. I know that each of us have great responsibilities in front of us in realizing what the Federal Government's role is, according to this document, and that we take these very seriously in the upcoming days and that we don't continue to grow the size and the scope of government.

I thank the Speaker for the time.

□ 1950

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 34, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–62) on the resolution (H. Res. 223) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

POLICY OF TAXATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to address the body tonight.

I was not able to hear the President's speech today, but I was able to then get a transcript and read it. I note in the opening of that speech that he says, on page 1, that the debate that we're having here in Washington is about the kind of future that we want. It's about the kind of country we believe in, and then he describes that's what his speech will be about today.

As I read the context of the speech, I realize that the President and many Americans believe in very dramatically different models of country, and the kind of future that we believe in is dramatically different. I find in the President's speech that he centers many of his comments around taxing. Maybe it's taxing the millionaires and the billionaires. So I think that if we're going to talk about the kind of country that we live in, the kind of future that we want for the country, for our children and grandchildren, it is imperative that we begin to discuss this policy of taxation, this idea that we should and can tax the rich greater proportionate shares. It is that which I would like to address tonight.

Now as we talk about the future we believe in, understand that economic growth and vitality are critical concepts. And so one must then ask, How does the country achieve economic growth? How does it fail to achieve economic growth? That would be a key question. One of the core economic truths of economic growth is that when we tax the citizens more than approximately 23 percent, that we find an economy that will be stuck in stagnation. When we lower the taxation rate, then we find an economic vitality, creation of jobs. And so somewhere in that threshold of about 23 percent, we understand that every time we raise taxes, we kill jobs; and every time that we lower taxes, we create jobs. That was the essence of the argument that President Kennedy levied when he said we need to lower the tax rate in order to create more government revenues.

I often talk about the economic chaos that we're facing in our world right now, in our country; and it begins at this point. We begin with looking at the chart; we have basically an imbalance. We are spending $3.5 trillion every year, and we're bringing in $2.2 trillion every year. Our economy is stuck in stagnation. We don't have the ability to create jobs. And the President is talking about raising taxes in order to create revenue. President Kennedy would understand that when we raise taxes, we actually diminish the 2.2 figure, we actually lower the 2.2, because jobs are lost, productivity is lost; and, therefore, those jobs don't pay taxes to the government and the government's revenues begin to decrease.

I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle often describe the necessity to tax away Exxon's profits, that we should take every single dollar they make. In fact, we had one Presidential contender in the last race on the Democrat side saying we should tax Exxon's profits and spend them. We heard the Speaker of the House at that point using that same language, that we should tax the profits of Exxon and spend them.

Now let's take a closer look at that. Exxon makes good profits. They have a

good business. They have good investments. But almost every year, Exxon spends the majority of its profits reinvesting them in new drilling. As they drill wells, people are hired to work on the drilling rigs. They're hired to work on the logging rigs, on the cementing rigs. They're hired to do the tasks of finishing the well, putting it into productivity before Exxon can ever make a profit. So as we take away that profit from them, we take away the future drilling. We take away, then, the jobs from the economy, and that is the reason that higher taxes penalize and kill jobs.

Another example that I have about job creation was from Bill Sweat in Artesia. I asked at one of my town halls, What does it take to create jobs? He held up his hand and said, It takes me $340,000 to create one job. That's because we drive bulldozers in our work. And actually they won't let me drive the bulldozer down through the main streets of Artesia, so I have to buy a pickup truck, too. So he said basically for $400,000 that he can create one job.

When the government, when Washington taxes away those obscene profits—those obscene profits in the eyes of some—then what happens is Mr. Sweat takes longer and maybe even never gets to the point of having the $340,000 in the bank in order to pay for that new bulldozer and hire one more person.

So as the President begins to tell us that his view of this country is one where we're going to tax the people who are producing, then we have to wonder what we're going to get. Often a truism is that what you tax, you get less of; so if he's going to tax the producers, the millionaires and the billionaires, you're going to get less of them. I think that's a question we should ask: Is that a course that we want to chart for our future?

My friend from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is here tonight, and maybe he has some insights; but I would like to suspend my conversation on the idea that we can tax the rich and find prosperity for our Nation. I think the rich should pay taxes the same as everyone else, but when we raise the tax level beyond that 22, 23, 24 percent threshold, then we need to understand the result is going to be economic stagnation. That's what we're finding right now.

So when Mr. Obama concentrates his speech today on taxing, taxing the wealthy, that they would pay their fair share in the society, understand he is talking about a future that looks somewhat like Cuba's. Cuba taxes wealthy people, and they haven't had job creation for decades. The Soviet Union taxed wealthy people. They didn't have jobs. Europeans even tax at a greater rate than we do, and they've had economic stagnation up until recent times when they began to cut the cost of government, cut the size of government and lower taxes and found themselves creating jobs.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan at this point for comments that he might have.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We've seen throughout our lifetimes the argument put forward that the way out of a fiscal mess is to raise taxes. And we've learned one thing: if they tax it and take it, they spend it. Over and over and over again the same siren song: government must increase revenues, that revenues are the problem. In short, the hardworking American people are the problem because they don't pay through the nose for the Federal Government's overspending.

I think the American people understand that we have not a revenue problem but a spending problem. So as we go forward, I think it is wise to remind many of our colleagues that if taxation is the road to prosperity, why do they not have 100 percent taxation? Because they know that it does not work. They know that it is a short-term expedient that has long-term damaging consequences to the economy. And as you go forward and you try to punish productivity, you produce unemployment, you produce poverty. In short, the cycle continues anew. As productivity drops, revenues drop. Then the calls for more revenue come in because the spending never stops, because the spending as we saw with the stimulus and other legislation of the past Democratic majority is that they will then spend even more money to try to get their way out of a crisis.

□ 2000

It was disappointing to see the President buy into the logic that your prosperity comes from the government rather than from the fruits of your own hard work, and that somehow the government is entitled to whatever of your money it deems necessary to continue its wasteful spending habits. Again, this is rejected.

As the gentleman from New Mexico understands, we live in a very difficult period of time. We are making the transition from an industrialized society to a globalized, consumer-driven economy. We have seen families across America and businesses across America make the difficult decision to survive, to compete. They have not only had to discard things that they wanted, but things that at times they felt they needed. And yet one entity, one entity above all has failed to emulate the difficult decisions made by men and women across America, and that entity is Big Government. And the reason is very simple: You can only spend what you make, but Big Government can spend what it takes from you.

And so today, we saw the President again make the argument that if we just took more from the American people or a certain segment of the American people—disregarding his rhetoric that we were all in this together. Evidently that is now as pass as some of his other pronunciations. The reality remains that we have to grow our way out of this. We have to adapt to a consumer-driven economy. We have to have a citizen-driven government, one that understands that the founding principles of this country are there for a reason; that now that we have reached the height of the zenith of the industrial welfare state that fosters dependence of individuals upon it rather than fostering and facilitating self-government and liberty and prosperity, that the day will come when this government and its fiscal recklessness proves unsustainable.

The question before us now is a very simple one: Will we responsibly and constructively address this crisis by performing our constitutional responsibilities and fulfilling the promises we made to our constituents, or will we go on with the same tired tax-and-spend policies that didn't work in the seventies, which in many cases were known quite simply as ''soak the rich; spend the bread''? Bad idea.

So to the gentleman from New Mexico, I thank him for his time and point out that the fiscal debate which will continue here tomorrow is a very simple one: You can protect the Big Government policies of the past or you can look forward to a self-government, a citizen-driven government, a consumer-driven economy that unleashes the entrepreneurial genius of America and the diligence of workers and allows families to move into a future of liberty and prosperity. Or, in short, you can support the President and the politics of the past, or bankruptcy; or we can look forward and let the American people lead us into a new era of liberty and prosperity.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And he pointed out that we cannot sustain this course, that actually this course is doomed to fail. I draw attention to my chart again, the far right-hand corner of the chart in which we show here exactly what the Office of Management and Budget says.

This is the President's own economic arm of the White House that says that our prosperity through time has been increasing—that's the upward sloping line—but now it's flattening out to the red zone in the chart. But then we see the chart absolutely stops at some point in time, that's about 2038. That is the point that Mr. MCCOTTER refers to that we are on the path to stopping our economy. Our economy will actually fail because of the policies that we have now. And this is the future that is being demonstrated by our President today in his speech.

Now, as he talks about taxing, understand that we have lost jobs because of our tax policy and we've lost jobs because of our regulatory policy. Now, in the speech today, he talks about tax policy, but it's going in the wrong direction. In previous speeches, he has talked about the need to reform corporate taxes. In his State of the Union speech, he acknowledged that we are

taxed too high, that we can't create the economic growth that we need because we are taxing corporations in a fashion that exceeds other nations in the world. So he acknowledges it there.

I was hoping today in his speech that he would clarify, that he would begin to set a target, that he would set a timetable where we can start pulling back those manufacturing jobs because of a reform in tax policy. But curiously, in defining our future and in defining the way that we are looking at the values of the country—that's his declaration for what he wants to do in his speech today—he omits the job creation piece of taxation policy toward our corporations. He acknowledges that in his State of the Union speech. In his State of the Union speech he said that we are taxed at too high a rate, that he wants to cure that. He said that we must have reform. He said we need to use our savings to lower the corporate tax rate for the first time in 25 years, and that was what I think Americans were looking for.

Americans maybe can't express the companies that have left this Nation to find lower tax rates and better economic regulations in other countries, they might not be able to name them, but they implicitly know that they exist. I will look at, again, my chart.

The revenues in this Nation are $2.2 trillion. That's the accumulated taxes that we've paid to our government. The expenses are 3.5. Yes, we can cut our expenses, but we should be concentrating and growing the jobs and having people go back to work. As they go back to work, they begin to pay taxes, and our $2.2 trillion begins to increase. But as every single individual is hired, they come off welfare, unemployment and food stamps, and then they go down into the productive part of society, so we find our economic imbalance collapsing toward itself. The costs collapse as we are hiring people and putting them back to work. And that should have been the concentration of President Obama's speech today.

In the past, because of our policies, we have lost the producers in this country, a list of them: Fender Guitars, Converse, Etch A Sketch, Radio Flyer, Levi's, Craftsman tools, Stanley tools, USA flags, Rawlings baseballs, Brach's candy, IBM computer, NBA uniforms. These are just a partial list of companies that have decided that it is cheaper to manufacture somewhere else because our policies make it too difficult. If we're going to rebuild our economy, we need to rebuild that manufacturing base, and we do that through tax policy. That should be the concentration of both parties at this time in our Nation's history.

The President also mentions, on page 2, that we're amassing alarming debt levels back in the 1980s. If I look at my chart—again, I show our deficits. This year our deficit is $1.3 trillion; that is, our spending exceeds the revenues by $1.3 trillion. That deficit runs over and I show it going into our debt barrel, that accumulated debt for generations past. And Mr. Obama mentions adequately that that debt in the eighties started reaching alarming levels. But from the time of George Washington until the first President Bush—that's after 1980—we had an accumulation of about $5 trillion worth of debt. If you look at the chart, you can see that we have an accumulation today of almost $15 trillion. So we had $5 trillion back in the mid-eighties, and now we're at $15 trillion.

I would point out to the President, when he says we were amassing debt at alarming levels in the 1980s, that the debt he has accumulated in his Presidency is almost equivalent to what we accumulated from the time of George Washington to the first President Bush. That is alarming.

It's an alarming statistic that we have a deficit today in this budget of $1.3 trillion, but in 2007—the last budget written under a Republican Congress and with President Bush as President—the last deficit was under $200 billion. That would be the equivalent to 0.2. Today we are over $1.1 trillion, and even up into when the President came into office, our annual deficit was less than half a trillion. We now have over $1.5 trillion that the President is suggesting our debt levels should be next year. So in his time alone we have increased deficits from the billion dollar category, increased them to the trillion dollar category, and that is alarming debt.

□ 2010

That is what has got other nations pointing to us and saying that is not sustainable. They're afraid when they loan us money, that it is not going to be paid back. So nations are increasingly reticent to lend us money.

That then results in the Federal Reserve buying most of our debt. This year, our Federal Reserve is on track—now keep in mind they get much of their money from the government and then they're loaning us money from the other hand—our Federal Reserve this year is on track to lend us about 60 to 70 percent of the money that we borrow.

Now, Mr. Bernanke expresses deep belief that there are buyers for those Treasury bills out there. There are people who are going to lend our Nation money. But as they look at the economic instability that we're facing, they understand the need that we have to, number one, correct spending but, number two, to grow the economy and create jobs.

Now, there are those skeptics who do not believe that tax cuts will create jobs. Again, I follow the example of Exxon. When you take their profits away, you tax them more, then you actually decrease the amount that they're spending with drilling companies, offshore platforms that they're spending in different communities to get services done to their wells as they drill them.

Also, I would remind the listeners today of Mr. Sweat and that $340,000 for the bulldozer. Those are the evidences that we get that tax cuts will create jobs.

But if we want to look at the other model, tax increases killing jobs, we can look no further than our own country at a time of the tax cuts of 2003. Over the next 4 to 5 years, our economy created over 5 million jobs. As the threat of taxes loomed, as the economic slowdown came in, as the uncertainty of the current administration began to take hold, then we have lost almost 3 million jobs.

So just the talk of taxes, the talk of the cap-and-trade tax permeated the discussions in 2009, it began to cause people to shy away and say we better not invest because we're afraid we're going to be taxed.

The discussions of the health care bill also related the belief that the people had that Washington was going to raise taxes in the health care field. And so again, consumers began not to purchase as much, investors began not to buy new equipment, people everywhere were becoming more cautious, and we slipped into stagnation. Our economy began to stagnate and lose jobs and has not yet been creating those jobs at any significant rate. We're still above 8 percent unemployment, and that was to be the floor we would find if we spent the money on the stimulus in a previous vision that the Obama administration gave to us.

As we think about other examples, I always like to use the example of Ireland. Fifteen or 20 years ago, Ireland began to lower its corporate tax rates. They believed, as I'm saying tonight, that if they would lower tax rates to corporations, that the companies would actually come flooding into the country. They would come there to produce. And it created the Irish miracle, the economic miracle of growth that was caused by Ireland cutting its corporate tax rate from about 36 percent down to around 12 percent. A significant decrease.

Companies began to flood into Ireland. The contrast is also given by Ireland. As they began to find prosperity, they began to spend more than they bring in, this same model that we're looking at here. They began to raise taxes. And now corporations are flooding away.

Just today I was visiting with the managers of a cheese plant that is on the east side of New Mexico. They're an Irish company. They've come here to produce because it is just too difficult, too high, the taxes are too great in Ireland. My brother-in-law works for Hughes Tool. He was at Hughes Tool back when they moved factories, production facilities back into Ireland. This year, my brother-in-law went to disassemble the last plant in Ireland because they've gone up on their tax rates and no longer was it a good place to operate.

If we're interested in solving the economic chaos that we're facing, we can't

get there simply by spending cuts; we can't get there by taxing the rich. In other words, taxing the rich is going to drive us further away from the goal, further into stagnation, further into job losses. If we're going to rebuild our economy, we must concentrate on economic growth.

And the nice thing is that the actuarial tables tell us that if we will grow jobs at about 3½ percent, that this imbalance begins to disappear, that the worry of the future begins to dissipate simply because we grow the economy, we create jobs, we take people off of unemployment, we take people off of welfare, off of food stamps. Our 3.5 cost to the government begins to diminish, the 2.2 begins to grow, we find ourselves reaching balance, and over the long term, we find ourselves beginning to reduce this $15 trillion debt. We find ourselves able to sustain the $202 trillion worth of unplanned expenses—excuse me, they're not unplanned, they're simply unpaid for—the expenses of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. That's where the real threat lies.

And nowhere in Mr. Obama's plan did I see a dealing with those significant drains on our economy. His only plan is to tax the rich, the millionaires and the billionaires, by making them pay their fair share. And that, he says, is going to fix the economy.

That, my friends, is going to wreck the economy.

When we choose that course of making the rich pay more than their fair share, they owe it to us. It's only fair, he says in his speech, that they would pay a little more. When we do that, we're going to choke jobs off even more. Other nations, our 2.2 is going to be less. We're going to put those people out of work, just like we did offshore in Louisiana. We put about 100,000 people out of work there. We're on the way to putting them out of work.

Those people, instead of paying taxes, are going to pay no taxes, but they're now going to cost us unemployment benefits; they're going to cost us in Medicare, Medicaid. They're going to cost us in food stamps, welfare. And they're not going to be producing.

So with this vision of taxing the rich, we're going to move more to an unproductive society because you cannot create more productivity by taxing it. If that were the case, every nation would be productive. Every nation can always go up on taxes. But not every nation can create the environment to where innovators are allowed to produce.

The innovations in the oil and gas industry have been dramatic, and yet that's the single area it appears that President Obama is going to kill first, that whole specter he refers to as ''yesterday's fuel,'' ''yesterday's energy.''

If it is yesterday's energy, let the President take the lead and cease using it. Use the energies of tomorrow. Stop using that energy of the past. Let him fly an airplane on something besides jet fuel. Please. Give us that bold vision and courage and leadership. Let him show us the way if fossil fuels are a thing of the past.

But I suspect, like you and me, that the President is going to continue to drive his limousine on petroleum-based products. He's going to continue to fly Air Force 1 not on solar power, but on jet fuel. I suspect that all of Americans are going to do it. The only thing that we're going to have as an outcome is less plentiful energy, fewer jobs, a greater imbalance in our government and our government spending, greater uncertainty for the future.

□ 2020

That's a shame that that's the leadership that we're getting. Because at this point in our world's history, it would be possible, if we are literally looking to recreate our economy, to draw back the manufacturing jobs of the past, to put them back to work here, to rekindle the industries that are gone so that we do have a bright future, so that people have not just jobs, but careers to face; that they are able to plan for their future; that they are able to save for a house, save for the kids' education; that they are able, truly, to live the American Dream.

That's what has made this country great in the past, and I think that Americans at this point in time will find that leadership for the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 4 p.m. on account of family medical reasons.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 307. An Act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the ''W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

S.J. Res. 8. Joint Resolution providing for the appointment of Stephen M. Case as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 14, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1248. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army Case Number 10-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1249. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Demand Response Compensation in Organized Wholesale Energy Markets [Docket No.: RM10-17-000; Order No. 745] received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1250. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 5-11 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1251. A letter from the Acting Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1252. A letter from the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's annual report for Fiscal Year 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1253. A letter from the General Counsel, General Accountability Office, transmitting the annual report on the implementation of Section 203 of the ''Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002'' (No Fear), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1254. A letter from the EEO Director, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report about the Commission's activities in FY 2010 to ensure accountability for antidiscrimination and whistleblower laws related to employment; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1255. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Antidrug and Alcohol Misuse Prevention Programs for Personnel Engaged in Specified Aviation Activities; Supplemental Regulatory Flexibility Determination [Docket No.: FAA-2002-11301; Amendment No. 121-315A] (RIN: 2120-AH14) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1256. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Henderson, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0937; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-35] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1257. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Charleston, WV [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1010; Airspace Docket No. 10-AEA-24] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1258. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Moratorium on New Exemptions for Passenger Carrying Operations Conducted for Compensation and Hire in Other Than Standard Category Aircraft received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1259. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Bryce Canyon, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0961; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANM-12] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1260. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Newport, VT [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0938; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANE-108] received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1261. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lancaster, NH [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1009; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANE-111] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1262. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wolfeboro, NH [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1007; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANE-109] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1263. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Colebrook NH [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1008; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANE-110] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1264. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Easton, MD [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0936; Airspace Docket No. 10-AEA-23] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. DREIER: Committee on Rules. Supplemental report on House Resolution 218. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473 (Rept. 112–60, Pt. 2).

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 223. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 (Rept. 112–62). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1504. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for engineering, final design, and construction of the Altamont Corridor Rail Project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 1505. A bill to prohibit the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture from taking action on public lands which impede border security on such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Homeland Security, 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. RANGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. CHU, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 1506. A bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 1507. A bill to implement a comprehensive border security plan to combat illegal immigration, drug and alien smuggling, and violent activity in the southwest border of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Natural Resources, Armed Services, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Appropriations, and Foreign 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. POSEY:

H.R. 1508. A bill making appropriations to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard are paid during any period of lapsed appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1509. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prohibit the inclusion of Social Security account numbers on Medicare cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1510. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit a pat down search of minor for purposes of air transportation security without the consent and presence of a parent of the minor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1511. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program and to expand the program to include more small businesses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1512. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to remove the representatives of the Federal Reserve banks from membership on the Federal Open Market Committee; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. STARK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 1513. A bill to prohibit the conducting of invasive research on great apes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1514. A bill to limit United States assistance to Egypt unless Egypt is honoring its commitments under the 1979 peace treaty between Egypt and Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1515. A bill to provide driver safety grants to States with graduated driver licensing laws that meet certain minimum requirements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 1516. A bill to authorize loan guarantees for projects to construct renewable fuel pipelines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FILNER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1517. A bill to amend titles 10 and 28, United States Code, to provide for military sexual assault and domestic violence accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. CRITZ (for himself and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1518. A bill to amend section 310 of the Trade Act of 1974 to strengthen provisions relating to the identification of United States trade expansion priorities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr.

OLVER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WU, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CHU, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FARR, Mr. REYES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BACA, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BOREN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WATT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 1519. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 1520. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that oil and gas drilling and production operations on the outer Continental Shelf must have in place the best available technology for blowout preventers and emergency shutoff equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1521. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 1522. A bill to repeal the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Oversight and Government Reform, Science, Space, and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, House Administration, Natural Resources, Foreign Affairs, Education and the Workforce, and 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 Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LATHAM, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1523. A bill to amend the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to provide for Debbie Smith grants for auditing sexual assault evidence backlogs and to establish a Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 1524. A bill to build capacity and provide support at the leadership level for successful school turnaround efforts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H.R. 1525. A bill to provide high-quality public charter school options for students by enabling such public charter schools to expand and replicate; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to except from the early distribution penalty certain qualified retirement plan distributions used to purchase a residence that has been in foreclosure for a year or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 1527. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide each individual taxpayer a receipt for an income tax payment which itemizes the portion of the payment which is allocable to various Government spending categories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 1528. A bill to protect and enhance consumer privacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 1529. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 to provide for implementation of additional recommendations of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 1530. A bill to establish the Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 1531. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for core curriculum development; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. GARRETT):

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the freedom, security, and stability of Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POLIS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WU):

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the National Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. LONG (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of the third Saturday in April as ''National Auctioneers Day''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

9. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 37 urging the members of the West Virginia Delegation to oppose any actions by the Congress to reduce funding for Community Service Block Grants; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

10. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 21 supporting the Federal Government's efforts to provide electricity to residents of the Navajo Nation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

11. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, relative to House Resolution No. 6009 urging the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to accept ''Life of the Project'' conservation easements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. McNERNEY:

H.R. 1504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1505.

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 IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States), and Clause 1 of Article 1, Section 8, which grants Congress the authority to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, and Clause 18 of Article 1 Section 8, which allows the authority to make laws deemed necessary and proper.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1506.

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. FLAKE:

H.R. 1507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, section 8, clause 1.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1508.

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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This law is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, and the 4th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 1511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause).

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H.R. 1513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution states that all legislative powers are vested in the Congress of the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 1, commonly referred to as the Spending Clause.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 1516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1517.

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 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; 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. CRITZ:

H.R. 1518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 1519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. INSLEE:

H.R. 1520.

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 IV, Section 3, which provides that Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1521.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 1522.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which reads: The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 1524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; The 16th Amendment to the United States Constitution

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 1528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1529.

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 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; 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. WOLF:

H.R. 1530.

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 ''provide for the common Defence,'' as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 1531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced under the powers granted to Congress under Article 1 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 35: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 58: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. LONG, Mr. KIND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 100: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 104: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 177: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 178: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 181: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 186: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 190: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HOLT, Ms. CHU, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 198: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 206: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 237: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 303: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 333: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MICA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 399: Ms. MOORE and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 412: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 420: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LONG, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MICA, and Mr. CANSECO.

H.R. 428: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 431: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 432: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 498: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 531: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 546: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 577: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 589: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 615: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LONG, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 631: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 645: Mr. KELLY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 652: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 674: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 721: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 740: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 743: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 750: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 763: Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 776: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 798: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 822: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 838: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 865: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CRITZ, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 876: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 885: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 894: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 904: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 905: Mr. MACK and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 995: Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 998: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1000: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1002: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1006: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1016: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1025: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. JONES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REYES, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1057: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1058: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1074: Ms. BUERKLE.

H.R. 1082: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1110: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1111: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1140: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1166: Mr. ROONEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1181: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. COLE, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1182: Mr. LONG, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KLINE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. COLE, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 1186: Mr. FLORES and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 1195: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1206: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1212: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1219: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1229: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1230: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1231: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1236: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1240: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1242: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1249: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1270: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 1286: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1287: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1288: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1297: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. COLE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 1303: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1317: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1323: Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HALL, Mr. COLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FORBES, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HECK, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1326: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1327: Mr. FLORES, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BONNER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1338: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1340: Mr. WEST.

H.R. 1341: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. CANSECO.

H.R. 1370: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1380: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1386: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1391: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1418: Mr. JONES and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1425: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1426: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WU, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1433: Mr. FORBES, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1440: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1448: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 1469: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1474: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 1475: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1477: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1488: Mr. WEINER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1501: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. LONG, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COLE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. REED, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. LUCAS.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. CAMP.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H. Res. 19: Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 137: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Res. 179: Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 180: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H. Res. 208: Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H. Res. 209: Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H. Res. 210: Mr. SIRES, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.