It's both sides of the ledger. It takes all of us working together to get this under control, and we Democrats intend to do that.

GAS PRICES

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, soaring gas prices are impacting Americans all over the country. With gas costing nearly $4 a gallon, drivers are having to rethink how they get around. With families and businesses tightening their budgets, rising gas prices are exactly what they don't need exactly when they don't need it.

That's why I am calling on the IRS to increase the gas mileage deduction, like it did in 2005 and 2008, to ease the pain at the pump for taxpayers. Taxpayers want, need and deserve this fair, simple and commonsense solution: for us to tap America's homegrown energy resources right here, right now.

Call the White House. The number is 202–456–1414. Tell them to get with it.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DAVID RICHARD FAHEY, JR.

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a sad duty: to honor the life and service of Private First Class David Richard Fahey, Junior, who was killed in the service of our Nation. He was born only 23 years ago in Norwalk, Connecticut. On February 28, his life was taken from us in Kandahar province, Afghanistan.

I never had the honor of meeting David Fahey, but I've read the remembrances of his family and friends as they mourn his passing and celebrate his life. I learned that he was a young man who was blessed with a singular sense of humor—David was always ready to cheer up others with a joke or a prank—and I learned that he was a man of faith who would spend hours comforting friends in need. David Fahey was a man who put the needs of others first, so it is no surprise that he chose to serve his country as a soldier and MP.

Today, on behalf of the people of Connecticut and the Nation, I thank PFC David Richard Fahey, Junior, and I offer our perpetual gratitude for his legacy of service and commitment to the defense of all that we cherish.

JOBS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with my colleagues to talk again about jobs.

In order to reduce the deficit, everyone in the Nation must work. But how can you work when you do not have a job? My constituents want to work. They are still hurting. Maybe we can't feel the hurt because we have jobs. I am still waiting to hear the Republican plan for jobs.

When are we going to help the people become whole again? They are losing their homes. Whole families are homeless and are not knowing what to do next. Their unemployment benefits have expired, and still they can't find work. Right now, over 50 percent of homeowners in the Miami housing market either owe more on their mortgages than their homes are worth or they're within 5 percent of that mark.

Instead of figuring out ways to help, tomorrow Congress will be voting on whether or not to end programs that offer hope to distressed homeowners. We talk about a deficit that took 8 years to create during the Bush administration. It will take us more than 2 years to peel away the layers of 8 years of bad judgment, generous tax exemptions to the rich, two wars, and a failed economy.

How can we cut so deeply, so fast, causing so many people to lose their jobs? If people can't work, they can't save their homes.

Stay on task: jobs, jobs, jobs.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 48, ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENTS, 2011

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 167 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 167

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 48) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 167 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.J. Res. 48. Keeping in line with the actions of the minority party and its CRs last year, this rule also provides for 1 hour of debate and a motion to recommit.

We are here again today dealing with the continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker, because H.R. 1 sits idly on the Senate side. As you will recall, H.R. 1 has been the singly most debated piece of legislation that we've had in this body this year. In fact, we considered more amendments on that spending bill in February than on all of the previous spending bills in the last two Congresses combined. Yet, even as the House has worked its will, even as, I think, we on both sides of the aisle identify that as one of the finest hours of this body, it sits in the Senate—unused, unexamined, undebated.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the middle of a debate on spending. It's not that we tax too little in this country. It's that we spend too much.

□ 1220

We're operating with $1.4 trillion annual operating deficits, $1.5 trillion, $1.6 trillion, and now they're saying next year it could be $1.7 trillion—spending that we do with money that we don't have.

We need to get to the big picture, Mr. Speaker. We need to have this debate about how do we move beyond what was last year's business and get on to what is this year's business. These thing that we're working on, this three-week CR, Mr. Speaker, is not the real business. The real business is yet to come. I sit on the Budget Committee. If you want to talk about real business, look at the tough decisions that are coming down the pipe from the Budget Committee. Look at what it's going to take to get this budget back in balance. Look at what it's going to take to restore integrity to our fiscal system. Look at what it's going to take to inspire confidence in our foreign creditors. These are the real issues that we have to discuss, but we can't discuss them, Mr. Speaker, because we are still working on last year's business.

Now, I think we're frustrated on both sides of the aisle that we're still working on last year's business, and candidly, it may come as a surprise to you, Mr. Speaker, but I don't blame a soul on the other side. The other side of this body has been our partner in moving H.R. 1 to the Senate. They've been our partner in making the tough decisions that had to be had, and we had Republican amendments that succeeded and Republican amendments that failed. We had Democratic amendments that succeeded and Democratic amendments

that failed, and this body worked its will.

But the Senate has yet to take up the legislation, has yet to take up legislation passed in February, has yet to be taken up as we sit here in the middle of March. Now, I don't know how in the world we have negotiations, Mr. Speaker. We have done our work here in the House. I'm proud not only that we did it but I'm proud of the way in which we did it. But now we wait on the Senate to come to the table and lay down its vision for how we fund this government through September of this year.

We continue to wait, and hopefully, these 3 weeks, Mr. Speaker, will provide the time needed for the Senate to gear up and get going, because I will say it over and over and over again today, this is last year's business, and it is distracting us from the important business that needs to happen.

I'll tell you this. This CR for 3 weeks isn't what I would have liked to have seen. What I would like to see is H.R. 1 come back to this floor. What I would like to see is H.R. 1 go to the President's desk. What I would like to see are the tough, tough, tough decisions that we made and the difficult, difficult, difficult decisions that we had on this floor be translated into the law of the land as it sits on the President's desk and receives his signature. But we cannot move to that point until the Senate acts.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to support this rule that will bring to the floor a continuing resolution that will give the Senate three more weeks to get its house in order to do the business that the American people sent the Senate here to do, to join us in doing the good work that we have done, and to move a bill to the President's desk so that we can get on to the rest of the business that the country has laid before us.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again, considering yet another short-term continuing resolution. The last CR was for 2 weeks. This is a 3-week bill. So I guess the good news is that we're heading in the right direction, but that's about the only good news, Mr. Speaker. This is no way to run a budget process. It is no way to run a government. It is like water torture: drip, drip, drip. How are governors and mayors and city councils supposed to plan if we keep passing these short-term bills? How are the financial markets supposed to have any certainty if we're passing bills that go only for 2 weeks or 3 weeks?

We all know what needs to happen. Democrats and Republicans in the House, the Senate, and the White House need to get together and figure out a sensible, bipartisan solution to this year's budget. And while it may, you know, be convenient to blame the Senate, I should remind my colleagues here that the majority leader in the Senate tried to bring up a bill, but the Republicans voted to not allow the bill to be considered. So it's not like there aren't alternatives out there.

The time for rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, is past. The time for press releases and posturing is over. The time for finger-pointing must end, because despite what some on the other side of the aisle seem to believe, a government shutdown is not in our Nation's best interests.

I look at today's Politico, and one of the leading Republican spokesmen, Representative STEVE KING, is quoted extensively in an article saying that defunding is worth a shutdown. I think the last thing the American people want is for us to shut down the government.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we should also be grateful that the bill before us today does not include some of the policy changes that were in H.R. 1, such as blocking money for health care reform and Planned Parenthood, which they voted to eliminate in H.R. 1. H.R. 1, Mr. Speaker, took a meat ax to border security, to food safety, low-income heating assistance, medical research, and I could go on and on and on. And thankfully, thankfully the Senate rejected that approach last week.

But make no mistake: H.R. 1 is what my Republican colleagues not only want but are demanding. Their ideological and rigid loyalty to H.R. 1 is what is holding up these negotiations, and the cuts in H.R. 1, Mr. Speaker, are not only egregious but they are reckless and they are damaging. According to former JOHN MCCAIN economic adviser Mark Zandi, the bill had the potential to lead to 700,000 lost jobs, exactly the wrong prescription for our recovering economy.

And speaking of jobs, Mr. Speaker, where are the Republican jobs bills? Where is the legislation to encourage investment in new technology, in infrastructure, in education, and in medical research? It's been 11 weeks and we have seen nothing, not a thing from the other side of the aisle on jobs. Let me remind my colleagues that if you truly want to achieve deficit reduction focus on job creation. Put people back to work. We can help grow out of this deficit that we have.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule. I remind my colleagues that we have yet to have a truly open rule in this House. This is a closed rule. Oppose the closed rule and oppose the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that we brought H.R. 1 to the floor under the single most open process this House has seen in 4 years—and I've only been on the job 65 days—the single most open process that this House has seen in 4 years. I'm proud of that. I'm proud of what we did together.

Are there other alternatives out there to H.R. 1? I don't know, Mr. Speaker, because I haven't seen one, haven't seen one come back from the Senate. Is the Senate over there debating things? Absolutely. Are they passing things? No, they're not, and I don't know where we go to move forward with that.

But a gentleman who might, Mr. Speaker, is my good friend, the president of the freshman class from the great State of Georgia.

And I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. To my colleague from Georgia, I want to thank you for your lead on this and for sharing your time with me.

Mr. Speaker, this past November the American people sent a clear message that they want and demand that representatives in Washington get our fiscal house in order. In fact, our very livelihoods as Americans and that of our future generations depend on it.

Now, Americans understand and we as Republicans understand that we cannot eliminate this deficit with one piece of legislation, but they do expect Congress to work continuously to reduce spending, excessive spending in all areas of the government.

Mr. Speaker, last week, it was announced that February's deficit reached a record $223 billion. The House's continuing resolution simply cut $100 billion, approximately 2 weeks' worth of February's deficit, and yet the Democrats refer to that as reckless cuts, 2 weeks worth of February's deficits that we attempted to reduce.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for this continuing resolution, which will once again reduce the Federal budget deficit, this time by $6 billion. No, it's not enough, but it is a step in the right direction.

House Republicans recognize that we need to do more to reduce the deficit. We also know that the country expects the President and Senator REID to accept their responsibility for this fiscal reality that they have helped create and to work with the House, the House as a whole, to reduce this deficit.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us are dedicated to eliminating excessive spending, wherever it may exist. The problem with H.R. 1 and the Republican approach is that all the tough choices and all the burden falls on the middle class and on the poor in this country.

The fact is that Donald Trump got his tax cut. We didn't touch that. Big Oil companies continue to get taxpayer subsidies. They wrote H.R. 1 in such a way so we couldn't get at those subsidies. Big agribusiness continues to get its subsidies, and I go on and on and on: No-bid defense contracts in the Defense Department.

□ 1230

All those special interests were protected. But they cut LIHEAP to help

people heat their homes this winter. They go after the National Institutes of Health. You want to find a way to make Medicare solvent, find a cure for Alzheimer's disease. You don't find a cure by cutting moneys to the National Institutes of Health.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on what my friend from Massachusetts said when he was talking about the cuts in H.R. 1 to research and development. We find in New Jersey, which is the third-largest State in the country for health care research and development, that every time the Federal Government spends a dollar, it creates five or six or seven private sector jobs. See, that's the problem here. The Republicans are not focusing on the issue, which is job creation. The problem with their continuing resolution—the long-term one that they adopted and they say that we should just pass in the Senate and send to the President—is that it actually destroys jobs. If you listen to the things that are actually being cut, these are the things that deal with investments in the future. R&D, research and development, infrastructure that allows commerce and allows us to fix our roads and provide for mass transit and fix our ports.

The gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned PETER KING from New York, who actually criticized H.R. 1 because he said that it really hurts port security. Well, how are we going to trade? How are we going to export products if we don't deepen our ports, if we don't provide for safe ports? And the same thing is true with education. H.R. 1 basically cuts back on education, on Pell Grants for students to go to college. All the investments that make sense because they actually create jobs are going to be eliminated with H.R. 1, with this Republican resolution. I mean, it is extremely shortsighted.

I feel like I was here 2 weeks ago with the same people, my colleague from Georgia on the Republican side. We just can't continue to go 2 weeks, 3 weeks at a time. You are actually going to go out of session and have a vacation or a break next week. Well, if you are really serious about this—because we know that the Senate basically couldn't get cloture on H.R. 1—why don't you, instead of going home next week, just spend the time here trying to work out something responsibly with the Senate so we can keep the government going? I mean, that's what we need to do. We need a consensus.

You have one point of view on the Republican side. The Democrats have another point of view. We have a Democratic President. We are never going to get through this budget year unless we actually sit down and have some consensus and some compromise. What I hear my colleague from Georgia saying is, Take it or leave it. We voted on H.R. 1. That's our Republican bill. It has all of the cuts. The Democrats don't like it because we believe strongly it is going to kill jobs. But you say, Take it or leave it. It can't operate that way. I don't believe that our constituents in November expected us to just come down here and say, Take it or leave it. They want us to go to work. They don't want us to take next week off. They want us to create jobs.

And right now, the uncertainty with these 2- or 3-week short-term spending bills is creating a lot of havoc. I think eventually it's going to create havoc on the financial markets. It is already creating havoc within the Federal agencies because they don't know whether they are going to be operating from one week to the next. It's not good for the country. It's not good for the economy. You may disagree, but we need to work together.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I just couldn't agree with him more. The House spoke. It wasn't Republicans that spoke. It wasn't Democrats that spoke. The House spoke with H.R. 1. We need to get to the negotiating table.

Now I don't know when the Senate is going to act. I hope the Senate acts today. And I will stay here just as long as it takes to work through those things with the Senate. But we can't do it alone, as much as we'd like to. As much as we'd like to do it alone, we can't, and we are being held at bay by a Senate that refuses to move something forward. I think all of the gentleman's words would be useful to our friends on the Senate side.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously proud to yield 2 minutes to my good friend and a great American patriot, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. STEVE KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I tend to agree with all the Republicans from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I am here on the floor to speak to this issue of what frames this rule and the continuing resolution that flows behind it, Mr. Speaker. And I would remind the American people, I am here to talk about ObamaCare, about cutting off the funding to ObamaCare, and keeping our pledge. We have 87 new freshmen Republicans here in the House of Representatives. I believe all of them ran on the repeal of ObamaCare. I know all of them voted to repeal ObamaCare. And I know this House has the authority to cut off the funding to ObamaCare.

We passed H.R. 2, the repeal. Every Senate Republican voted to repeal ObamaCare, and H.R. 1 was the will of the House. We stood here, and we debated over 90 hours. And the components of that that affect the policy of this country within the rule of H.R. 1 are not part of the negotiations of this CR, not the 2-week CR that passed that we are operating on now, and not the 3-week CR that is the subject of this rule that we are debating here, Mr. Speaker. So I lament that we don't have the will of the House reflected in this CR, and it is trying the patience of at least the Republicans in this House.

A growing number have said that they are not willing to vote for another temporary spending measure in order to bridge it over until we get some kind of resolution. But the House can draw the line. There is not a dime that can be spent by this Federal government without the approval of the House. And my position that was reflected by the gentleman from Massachusetts is this: I'm willing to face the President because if we're not willing to face the President, he will get exactly everything he is willing to fight for. That means we have to confront the idea of the President eventually shutting the government down or giving him what he wants. It is more important that we stand on the Constitution and fiscal responsibility than it is to hand over to the President of the United States, who has the audacity to send us a budget with a $1.65 trillion deficit, and that level of irresponsibility, to just capitulate his demands. We must shut off the funding to ObamaCare, and I am ready to do that. I will vote ''no'' on the bill but not the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, there you have it. That is the difference between Democrats and Republicans in terms of how we approach this issue. They want to shut the government down. You know, what happens to Social Security checks and veterans' benefits and National Parks, and I could go on and on and on? There are consequences to being so rigid and being so ideological.

I am going to say to my colleague from Georgia, he said H.R. 1 was not the will of Republicans; the House spoke. The House didn't speak. Three Democrats voted for H.R. 1. We have 192 Democrats in the House. It was not the House speaking. It was what Republicans wanted. So H.R. 1 is wholly owned by my friends on the Republican side. And I again will say that that bill represents some of the most reckless and heartless cuts that I have seen since I have come to Congress.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Reckless and heartless is exactly the debate that we are going to have to have. Is it reckless to pass on $14 trillion in debt to our children with no end in sight? I would say to you that it is. Is it heartless to saddle our children with that burden that is going to drain their economy dry? I would say to you that it is. Is it reckless to treat the world credit markets as if they will forever feed our voracious appetite? And I say to you that it is. We have to take these steps today.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I appreciate my good friend from Georgia yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 167 and the underlying resolution, House Joint Resolution 48. This resolution provides us with a rule so that we can consider a bill that continues to fund the Federal Government for the next 3 weeks. I want to thank the Appropriations Committee for the hard work they have done and their ability to compromise. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can follow their example.

□ 1240

Although I support this continuing resolution, and I hope my colleagues will support it as well, I don't want to keep coming back to this issue every 2 or 3 weeks. Funding the government a few weeks at a time is unacceptable.

Although my fellow freshmen and I have been here for over 2 months now, we're still cleaning up the mess that was left behind by the previous Congress. As I see it, they've kept kicking the can down the road, refusing to make hard decisions as relates to spending. Now it's up to us to say enough's enough, Mr. Speaker, with the out-of-control spending.

The House has been at the table for 2 months. We're offering solutions. The Senate and President have been sitting on the sidelines offering none.

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

What is reckless and heartless about H.R. 1 is that it attempts to balance the budget on the most vulnerable in our country, making deep cuts in the low income energy fuel assistance program to help keep people warm in the wintertime; cutting WIC, the Women, Infants and Children program to help keep pregnant women healthy so they can deliver healthy babies which, by the way, in the long run saves us money.

What is heartless and reckless are the cuts in nutrition programs and the National Institutes of Health, medical research, trying to find cures to diabetes and Alzheimer's and cancer.

And what's protected are taxpayer subsidies for oil companies. What's protected is Donald Trump's tax cut. What's protected are our subsidies to big agri-businesses. And what's not even talked about is the fact that we are fighting two wars and we're not paying for it. Everybody wants to go to war in this Chamber, but no one wants to pay for it. It is wrong and unconscionable, and that is adding considerably to our deficit.

And what's also adding to our deficit are tax cuts that are not paid for. So what's heartless about H.R. 1 is that it goes after the people who need government the most, and it leaves people who don't need any government or taxpayer subsidies alone.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, there are 15 million unemployed Americans as we meet this afternoon, and this is the 11th consecutive week that the majority has not brought to the floor a bill for us to work together to create an environment where small businesses and entrepreneurs could create jobs for our country.

Now, I do agree with the proposition that one of the ways that we could have jobs created by small businesses and entrepreneurs is to improve the country's fiscal standing and give us low long-term interest rates in the long run; and reducing our deficit is a key part of doing that. So I think the issue is not if we reduce spending; it's how we reduce spending.

And I do think we should stop sending money to the Brazilian Cotton Institute. I think we shouldn't spend $1.5 billion for the Police Department in Baghdad when American cities are laying police officers off around our country.

And I certainly don't think we should be giving $40 billion in subsidies to the oil companies that made $77 billion in profit last year and are raising gasoline to four or five bucks at the pump. I think those are areas we ought to agree on and get this budget done.

But 11 consecutive weeks without a bill that helps small businesses and entrepreneurs create jobs is 11 weeks too many.

I do, however, Mr. Speaker want to compliment the majority on a good decision I think they've made in this bill. There's an argument in this country about whether to repeal the health care bill or not. We think that would be a surrender to the insurance industry and hurt the American people, and we're against that repeal.

And there's an argument in this country about whether Planned Parenthood should continue to get funding for women's health services. Most of us think it should, and many on the other side think it should not.

These are legitimate debates. They are not debates that should result in a shutdown of the Federal Government, however. The right thing to do is to agree on the budget and then agree to disagree on repealing the health care bill and funding for Planned Parenthood later down the road.

And I would commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Rules Committee for putting on the floor this afternoon an extension that does not defund the health care bill, that leaves it in place, and an extension that does not defund Planned Parenthood, that leaves the funding for that in place.

I think that's the result that we should have in the long run. I think the budget that we adopt between now and September 30 should continue to fund the health care bill, as this bill does, and should continue to fund Planned Parenthood, as this bill does.

But I commend the majority for its decision to leave those issues out of this bill so that these issues are not wrapped up in this.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman.

Look, there is a significant national debate about whether insurance companies should be able to deny someone health coverage because they have leukemia or diabetes. We think they shouldn't be able to do that because of preexisting conditions. Others disagree with us.

We think that if a young woman needs counseling and services on her gynecological health, that there should be a Planned Parenthood clinic available to her. Others disagree with that, and we respect that debate.

But to tie up the operation of the Marine Corps and the FBI and the other aspects of this government over those social policy disputes is a big mistake. It's a mistake the majority has avoided in this resolution that's before us today, and I think that's a wise choice. I hope that the majority continues to avoid that choice.

Let's agree on a budget that creates the conditions to help small businesses and entrepreneurs put America back to work, and let's leave the political debates out.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning, these little short-term continuing resolutions are no way to run our government. And beyond the social debates that we're having here on a variety of issues, the fact of the matter is that this 2-week, 3-week continuing resolution puts an incredible burden on our local communities and our States and on our Federal agencies. They can't proceed with initiatives that they thought they had the money for. They're not sure whether next week we might cut an entire program or the following week we might cut it or sometime down the road. So there's uncertainty, and that uncertainty is having an adverse impact on our economy, and it's having an adverse impact on economic development all across this country. And so we need to get serious about negotiating a compromise with the Senate and with the White House and get this year's business done.

And, again, the United States Senate has put a number of offers on the table. The one that majority leader REID put on the table the Republicans wouldn't let come to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, one of my chief concerns about H.R. 1, which is, basically, the Republican continuing resolution, is that it has created a climate in Washington that makes it unfashionable to worry about the poor and the most vulnerable. Turning our

backs on the most vulnerable in our country doesn't make them go away. There is a cost, and all of us pay that cost.

We need to get serious about job creation, putting people back to work. That's the way you reduce the deficit. That's how we grow out of this economic crisis that we're in.

And yet, here we are in March and nobody's talking about jobs. I mean, we've talked about everything else; but the Republicans have refused to talk about jobs or bring a jobs bill to the floor.

And I would suggest to my Republican friends, rather than this ideological rigidity, this allegiance to this bill, H.R. 1, which is filled with reckless and heartless cuts, I would suggest to my colleagues that they understand that to get a deal here it requires some compromise. And I think I would urge them to get about that business.

I would also echo what Mr. PALLONE said earlier. We're going on vacation next week. Rather than a vacation, maybe we should finish the work of this year. Rather than having Members go back and go on CODELS overseas or go on vacations, let's finish the business of this year. Let's provide some certainty to our mayors and to our city managers, to our city councils and our boards of selectmen all across this country. Let us provide some certainty that some funding that they're depending on will be there.

□ 1250

Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, I would urge them to vote ''no'' on this closed rule, and I would also urge them to vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say there are really a number of things that we agree on across this body. The gentleman from Massachusetts has very strong feelings about paying for the bills that we create today. I share his passion, and I look forward to getting into the business of paying for those bills.

What I do know is that we are not paying for the bills today.

What I do know is that when I showed up for Congress on January 3 of this year, that there was no spending plan to get us past March 4. No spending plan.

Just to be clear, I showed up as a brand new Member of Congress in January to learn that getting about the business means putting together a funding bill before March 4 because the previous Congress didn't take care of business.

Now, I know my friend from Massachusetts wasn't in charge of the other side of the aisle last year. He certainly wasn't in charge of the Senate, although we all wish that we could be in charge of the Senate. But the business didn't get done, and that is why we are here today. That is the first reason why we are here today, to take care of business that didn't get done last year.

But the second reason, Mr. Speaker, and the more important reason that we are here today, is because we said when we took over this body on January 5 that we would not go along with business as usual. It would have been a nothing to pass a bill that the President would sign that would say, hey, just keep on funding the government the way you've been funding it. Keep on racking up those trillion-dollar deficits the way you've been racking them up. Don't change a thing. Fiddle while Rome burns.

It would have been easy. Except for my conscience, except for the conscience of the folks who were elected with me in November, except for our principles, it would have been easy.

We chose the road less traveled that said, no, we're not going to put it off. There is always a reason to wait Mr. Speaker. There is always a reason to wait. And we said, no, we are going to begin making the tough decisions today. Today. Now, that today was back in February, and we are still waiting for the Senate to get to the table so that we can have some of those negotiations.

But I will say to my friend from New Jersey, who was so terribly pleased that the riders were not included on this bill: If you think for a minute that I am done fighting for life, you're mistaken. If you think for a minute that I am done working to defund Planned Parenthood and its work that it is doing with Federal dollars, you're mistaken. If you think for a minute that I have given up on ripping every nickel out of the budget that belongs to ObamaCare and the nationalization of our health care system, you are mistaken. And if you think for a minute that I am going to stop trying to repeal every single one of the job-killing, energy price-hiking regulations that the EPA is promulgating across this country chaining our small businesses down, you are mistaken.

That fight might not be today. Today is about cutting $6 billion out of a budget that our children are not going to have to repay. Today is about keeping the government open for 3 more short weeks to give our friends in the Senate a chance to come to the table. But, Mr. Speaker, that day of reckoning is coming. The day of reckoning is coming because these are ideals that deserve the attention of this body. These are decisions that cannot be kicked down the road even further. These are decisions of principle on which compromise is often not an option. Sometimes you just have to take the vote, and somebody's going to win and somebody's going to lose.

I rise in strong support of this rule, and I rise in strong support of the underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 30

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, March 17, 2011, Friday, March 18, 2011, or Saturday, March 19, 2011, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, March 29, 2011, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, March 17, 2011, through Friday, March 25, 2011, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, March 28, 2011, or such time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Majority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 1 p.m.