

Why would this administration want to increase the cost of electricity on our senior citizens, hospitals, schools, and American families?

President Obama's relentless war on coal has been an unmitigated job killer and will have a ripple effect on all industries, especially those that recycle fly ash. That's why I am proud to introduce this legislation, which has bipartisan support among my colleagues as well as over two dozen special groups.

THE PENDING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this House is at an historic moment because we look at a possible shutdown of government, a shutdown of government that you have to look and ask: Why may it occur? It's going to occur because we don't have a budget. And why don't we have a budget? Because we've got a great deficit. Why do we have that great deficit? Because the Bush tax cuts got rid of the Clinton excess we had.

During Clinton's days, we had extra money. We balanced the budget. The Bush years: a deficit for the tax cuts, which have been extended with the majority of the Republicans and some Democrats, and two wars overseas in Iraq and Afghanistan that were off budget. And they have cost us much.

In the future, we are going to see a political Armageddon here about this continuing resolution and the budget of this country. And the issue is going to be whether we deal with the superrich or we guarantee America's past and care for everybody to have opportunity and a chance; whether we care about the oil companies that make record profits and give them continued deductions or whether we care about people that need education and health care. Medicare is at risk, Social Security will be at risk, and there's no jobs plan been put forward by this Congress.

And that's just the way it is.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1363, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011; AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 206 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 206

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in

the House the bill (H.R. 1363) making appropriations for the Department of Defense 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. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported before April 11, 2011, providing for consideration or disposition of a measure making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 206 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1363, which is a bill providing 1 week of continuing appropriations, a full year of funding for the Department of Defense, and cuts \$12 billion in wasteful Federal spending.

Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that we are at this juncture nearly 7 months into fiscal year 2011, considering the bill that this House will soon consider. We are seeing a stunning lack of leadership on behalf of Washington Democrats, including Senate Majority Leader REID and President Obama, who have refused to do the work that Americans sent them here to do. They have exhibited willful disregard for our troops and their families, who are uncertain about their paychecks with a government shutdown looming.

The bill we will debate and pass funds the Department of Defense for the remainder of the year, while cutting another \$12 billion in wasteful Washington spending. Lest we forget, the reason this problem exists at all is because the liberal Democrat elites were so incapable of governing in the last Congress that they couldn't even pass a budget for the first time since modern congressional budgets were first created over 30 years ago.

□ 1020

They didn't do that because of their lack of leadership then and their appar-

ent realization that the American people had tired of big spending, big government policies streaming out of Washington, which is why the Republicans now control the House of Representatives.

Today with real leadership in the House we have real solutions to these real problems. House Republicans have passed H.R. 1, which is a continuing resolution that takes us to the end of the fiscal year.

The Democrat response? In another display of their lack of leadership, Senator REID sits on his hands while Senator SCHUMER tinkers in his game of manipulating the liberal political message in a phone call with reporters.

House Republicans then took the lead in crafting two short-term continuing resolutions, H.J. Res. 44 and H.J. Res. 48, providing for an additional 5 weeks of funding authority while cutting \$10 billion in wasteful Federal spending along the way.

Realizing that the stubborn liberal elites in the Senate and White House are using the threat of a government shutdown to continue their failed wasteful spending policies, House Republicans last week passed H.R. 1255, the Government Shutdown Prevention Act, which provided for enactment of H.R. 1 in the event that the liberal malaise continues to stymie progress on fiscal 2011 appropriations.

After all of these gestures of good faith made by House Republicans, the time has now come for the hapless liberal Democrat elites in the Senate and the White House to make a decision. It's time to decide between acting responsibly, abandoning favored political alliances, or continuing their failed Big Government policies as a solution to all earthly problems.

These points aside, there is one truth upon which everyone could probably agree: that the new Republican House leadership has changed the discussion in Washington, D.C., and across the country.

Whereas the previous discussion in Washington revolved solely around how much more money we should spend, today the discussion is how much more money we should cut.

Americans can now rest easy knowing that their message was received by responsible adults here in the House, and we will work to reflect their support for a leaner Federal Government focused on finding solutions to problems, rather than political gamesmanship and perpetual misguided adventures in social engineering.

Speaker BOEHNER has told the President that the House will not be put in a box and forced to choose between two options that are bad for the country, like accepting a bad deal that fails to make real spending cuts or accepting a government shutdown due to Senate inaction, and that is why House Republicans, in lieu of an agreement in which the White House and Senate agree to real spending cuts, are offering this third option: another good-faith gesture that funds our troops through the

end of the fiscal year while cutting an additional \$12 billion in wasteful government spending and keeps the government running for another week.

Real leadership is long overdue in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, and it's refreshing to see the new House Republican majority step in and fill the void left by such a devastating lack of leadership that has resulted from liberal Democrat domination of this city for far too long.

Let's start by voting for this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, my friend, Dr. FOXX, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the misguided underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Enough political posturing. Enough governing by press conference. Enough finger-pointing press releases, Facebook updates, and Tweets.

Democrats have already agreed, reluctantly, to tens of billions of dollars in cuts. Many of these cuts are from programs that are very near and dear to us. We have come more than halfway.

I am pleased that Speaker BOEHNER agreed to attend a negotiating session with President Obama and Senator REID last night. The truth, Mr. Speaker, is that it shouldn't be this hard to come up with a budget to finish this year. President Obama and Senator REID are trying to work with Speaker BOEHNER to come up with a bipartisan agreement that moves this country forward.

But that's what we see coming from the Republican Party in the House. Unfortunately, as of right now, the Republican leadership is continuing with their "my way or the highway" obstructionism.

Let's be clear about what's really going on here. Let's at least be straight with the American people. This impasse is not because of disputes between Democrats and Republicans; it's because of an intraparty feud between sensible, pragmatic Republican legislators and angry, take-no-prisoner Republican activists.

Now, I know that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle would like to accept the billions and billions of dollars in cuts that the Democrats have offered and declare a victory.

Unfortunately, their Republican Party has been hijacked by people who relish a shutdown of the Federal Government, people who refuse to take "yes" for an answer. They are more interested in making a point than in making law. And unless and until the Republican leadership in this House is willing to stand up to that radical element and stop moving the goalposts, we will not be able to move forward.

My friends on the other side of the aisle talk a good game about wanting

to come up with a compromise. Unfortunately, this bill before us today does nothing to achieve that goal. In fact, it is a step backwards. This bill, like H.R. 1 before it, isn't going anywhere. The Senate leadership and the White House have already made it very clear that yet another short-term continuing resolution is not acceptable.

Further, this bill continues the misguided priorities that we have seen from the Republican leadership of the House for the last several months. It cuts vital domestic programs that families, communities, and States rely on during these difficult economic times.

Let me just give you a few examples of the cuts to programs that will directly affect the people in Massachusetts that I am honored to represent.

H.R. 1363 would cut the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which helps preserve open space, by another \$71.5 million. It cuts \$700 million from the Clean Water and Drinking Water Revolving Funds. I don't know of a community in this country that doesn't have infrastructure needs, and the State revolving fund is one of the few areas where they can get money to help repair sewers and deal with storm water and a bunch of other issues, but they cut it by \$700 million more.

Most egregiously of all, it cuts \$390 million from the LIHEAP contingency fund. That's fuel assistance for poor people, mostly elderly, who need it as fuel prices continue to rise.

So there it is, Mr. Speaker. There is the clear difference of priorities between the two parties. The Republicans would rather shut down the government than provide heating assistance to some of the most vulnerable people in this country. I should also note that this bill would provide funding for the Department of Defense for the rest of the year, but nothing else.

Every Member of this House believes that making sure our troops get their paychecks is a top priority. The men and women who serve this country in uniform deserve our support.

But, Mr. Speaker, so do the seniors of this country. So do the children of this country. So do the poor and the hungry of this country. So do the people who can't afford hot-shot lobbyists and multimillion dollar ad campaigns. We are supposed to represent them too.

A couple of days ago we saw where the Republican priorities are. They made them crystal clear in their budget proposal. Eliminate Medicare as we know it. Eviscerate Medicaid. Cut funding for education. Cut funding for medical research, health care, environmental protection, and infrastructure in order to make sure that the wealthiest individuals and companies can keep their special interest tax breaks.

Oil companies continue to get their taxpayer subsidies. Why they need them, I don't know, but they continue to get them. And they are protected. Donald Trump continues to get his tax cut under their proposal, but they go after programs that impact working

people and people who are the most vulnerable. That may fly on Wall Street, but it sure isn't going to fly on Main Street.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, I say that enough is enough. It is time for serious people to do some serious legislating. The bill before us is a million miles away from that.

I would urge my colleagues to reject this closed rule and to reject the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Massachusetts and I are actually, I think, getting fairly fond of each other, spending so much time in the Rules Committee as we do. However, I really have to call into question a couple of comments that he has made.

Is this bill really a step backwards when we're funding our troops for the rest of the year, taking away the uncertainty that they have just in case the government votes to shut down or the Senate doesn't act as it should and allows the government to shut down?

□ 1030

Do we really need to continue all the appropriations for LIHEAP, the funding for helping people pay their heating bills, when we are in April this year? This is money that goes until the end of September. I hardly think that we're going to have people freezing to death in this country between now and September 30.

Do we need to be looking after seniors and children? Obviously, we do. Republicans are not heartless people. But we have to look after them in a responsible way. Cutting spending is the way to be responsible to them.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have to remind my colleague again that we are here to fix a problem that they left for us last year: funding the Federal Government for the rest of this year.

Yesterday in the Rules Committee, one of our colleagues said, Let's stop talking about the past and talk about the future, when we brought this up. Well, Mr. Speaker, Republicans would like nothing more than to do that, but we're doing all that we can to avoid a government shutdown, and that is what this rule and bill are all about this morning.

Republicans understand that unless we change course, higher taxes, inflation, interest rates and unemployment will cripple our economy and rob our children of the opportunity to pursue the American Dream. Let's be clear. We don't have deficits because Americans are taxed too little. We have deficits because Washington spends too much. We've got to stop spending money we don't have. Right now, we're borrowing 43 cents for every dollar that we spend.

I want to talk a little bit about the long-term effects of what we're planning to do in this Congress this spring under Republican majority. The budget

resolution introduced by Budget Chairman PAUL RYAN and passed out of the Budget Committee last evening will spur job creation, stop spending money we don't have, and lift the crushing burden of debt. It's a plan that puts the budget on a path to fiscal stability and our country on a path to prosperity by cutting \$6 trillion in Federal spending over 10 years and takes government spending below 20 percent of GDP.

Mr. Speaker, historically, our government spending has been between 18 and 20 percent of GDP. Once we go over that, we are endangering our country, and that's where our colleagues across the aisle have been for a long time. The White House predicts that their proposal will reduce the deficit by only \$1.1 trillion over the same period of time.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, President Obama's budget would generate more than \$9.5 trillion in additional deficits between fiscal years 2012 and 2021. I actually have a visual here, Mr. Speaker, that shows exactly what is going to happen under President Obama's budget.

In contrast, the Republican budget resolution provides us with a path to prosperity by limiting the Federal Government to its core constitutional roles, keeping America's promises to seniors, and unleashing the genius of America's workers, investors and entrepreneurs. The Republican budget has a projected real GDP growth of \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years.

With this budget resolution, we're taking direct aim at wasteful Washington spending as opposed to the Obama budget that spends more than \$46 trillion over the next decade.

Since January of 2009, there has been a 24 percent increase in non-discretionary spending, a number that jumps to 84 percent when stimulus funds are included, Mr. Speaker. Democrats promised if we paid for their stimulus, unemployment would stay below 8 percent. Then it soared to 10 percent. One trillion dollars in debt later, Americans know they didn't get what they paid for.

The 2009 stimulus law has gotten the most attention with considerable focus on the billions of dollars it wasted on dubious government projects as well as the many promises it broke with respect to job creation and economic growth. The Republican budget resolution projects an unemployment rate of 4 percent by 2015, Mr. Speaker.

If we continue on the wrong path that we're on now, Americans will not be able to rely on Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security in order to plan for retirement if we don't take action. Republicans want to serve as good stewards of the investment of millions of Americans paying into Social Security. Republicans will save \$750 billion through Medicaid reform in the form of block grants to States, giving Governors greater and much needed flexibility in their budgets.

As it stands, the share of the budget that goes to these entitlement programs is growing rapidly, and demographics, economics and skewed political incentives are driving Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare into bankruptcy. Alice Rivlin, the former Clinton OMB Director, has called Medicare's current policy "not sustainable."

Cutting spending is about ending wasteful spending, making the government leaner and more efficient, showing respect to hardworking taxpayers, and making the tough choices today that save our children and grandchildren from even tougher choices tomorrow. For hardworking Americans, this isn't about politics. It's about their life and putting our economy and our Nation first.

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

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

I have no disagreement with the gentlelady from North Carolina in terms of trying to eliminate waste, fraud and abuse in government. I think we're all for a leaner government. But what we're not for is a meaner government. And that is what the Republican policies are all about—a meaner government.

There's a story that I will submit to the RECORD here. It's talking about the Republican budget. It says the Budget Office claims the GOP Medicare plan could lead to rationing, making it more difficult for our senior citizens to get health care.

By basically obliterating Medicare, you may save a few bucks in the short term, but you're going to deny them care in the long term. I don't see how that is right.

Secondly, I didn't talk about the past in my opening statement; the gentlelady did. I just want the record to be clear about the past and how we got into this mess.

When Bill Clinton left office, we eliminated the deficit and we were paying down the debt. We had all-time high job growth. George Bush comes to office. His reckless tax cuts are not paid for and hundreds of billions of dollars are added to our debt. A Medicare prescription drug bill was not paid for—wasn't paid for—and was more expensive than the Republicans advertised. Add that on to our debt, plus two wars that weren't paid for.

When the first President George Bush went to war against Saddam Hussein when Iraq invaded Kuwait, he went around and he got member nations in the area to actually pitch in to help pay for the war so that the burden wasn't only on the United States. George Bush II comes into office—two wars, we don't pay for them. There's no tax on anybody. It gets onto our credit card. That is just not right.

Men and women in uniform are sacrificing, their families are sacrificing, and the rest of us have been asked to do nothing. They just put it on the credit card. That is not right.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have a disagreement with the gentlelady not over the issue of whether we need to reduce waste and abuse in government. I have an issue with her over the way they're doing it. They protect tax breaks for big oil companies, tax breaks for Donald Trump and subsidies for corn ethanol, a big waste of money. All that's protected. And the way they balance the budget is not by going after that. They go after programs that help poor people, LIHEAP, WIC—the Women, Infant and Children's program of all things—and Pell Grants. We all know that in order to have a strong economy in the 21st century, we need a well-educated workforce, and they cut Pell Grants. They just slash them. That's where they're cutting, cutting programs that help average people, regular people and people who are vulnerable.

What government should be about is making sure that those people are taken care of and not forgotten. Instead, their budget and their priorities are protecting those who have a lot of wealth who don't need government. And I think what they're doing is misguided.

Let me just read one final thing here. This is a story that just appeared on Politico, breaking news. President Obama is calling House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID back to the White House to negotiate on the budget at 1 p.m. Just before the announcement from the White House, Senator REID said on the Senate floor that the numbers are basically there, but that the only thing holding up an agreement is ideology. He said he was not nearly as optimistic about reaching a deal as he was last night.

So, in other words, Mr. Speaker, this is no longer about numbers. And I regret that so much has had to be cut in order to satisfy my friends on the other side of the aisle.

□ 1040

But now this is about ideology. They have all these riders on these bills, riders that deal with abortion, National Public Radio, and riders that undercut EPA's ability to ensure there is safe drinking water and clean air. They are insisting on all of these ideological riders to be attached to whatever budget deal before they sign it. It is not about the numbers anymore; it is about a rigid, right-wing ideology.

So enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. I urge my Republican colleagues to go back to the negotiating table and negotiate in good faith, let's get a deal, and let's move on to next year's business.

[From NPR, Apr. 5, 2011]

BUDGET OFFICE: GOP MEDICARE PLAN COULD LEAD TO RATIONING
(By Julie Rovner)

Excerpts:

Buried deep in the analysis of the proposal offered Tuesday by Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wis.), the CBO suggested that moving Medicare beneficiaries from

public to private insurance could actually end up slowing the introduction of new and potentially life-saving medical technology . . .

The key problem, according to CBO, is that private insurance is, well, likely to be more expensive than insurance that's run by the government, competition notwithstanding. "Under the proposal, most elderly people would pay more for their health care than they would pay under the current Medicare system," the CBO said.

And because those seniors would be paying more, those private plans would be looking for ways to bring health spending down . . .

The CBO acknowledges that private health insurance plans would have cost-reduction tools available that government-run Medicare does not—things like limiting benefits, changing co-payment amounts, managing how patients use services, and controlling which doctors and hospitals are in their networks.

"(S)uch steps could serve as alternatives to limiting payments to providers in restraining health care costs and insurance premiums," the report says.

But at the same time, it warns, the higher payments could affect care. Beneficiaries might be less likely to use "new, costly, but possibly beneficial, technologies and techniques" than they do under current law.

In other words, exactly the sort of rationing that so frightened Republicans when they were fighting the health law—the health law that Ryan's proposal would repeal, by the way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My colleague from Massachusetts knows that every time he brags about what happened when Bill Clinton left office and we had a surplus, that he is going to get an answer to that because he knows full well that Republicans were in control of the Congress. Republicans came in control of the Congress in 1995, and they controlled the Congress the last 6 years of Bill Clinton's Presidency, and it is Republicans who created the surplus, not Bill Clinton. We have to remind them every time that they are trying to rewrite history.

And then they blame George Bush. It is so convenient to do that. In January of 2007, the month Democrats took control of the Congress again, the CBO projected the Federal Government would run a surplus of \$800 billion over 10 years, covering the period 2008–2017. But they took the Congress that January and, guess what, the most recent CBO projections available project the Federal Government to run a deficit of \$7.4 trillion over the same period. This is an \$8.2 trillion deterioration of the budget outlook during Democrat control of Congress.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. You can speak on your time, Mr. MCGOVERN. I will let you do that.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle talks a lot about creating a nanny state, taking care of people from birth until death. That's not what the American people want. We see that over in Europe, and it has failed. What the Federal Government does and what school children should learn, if they

learn the Preamble to the Constitution and if they read the Declaration of Independence, is that we are here to secure the blessings of liberty for the people. Creating a nanny state does not secure the blessings of liberty for the people.

He talks about how we are not now talking about numbers, but we are talking about ideology. I am happy to debate ideology with my colleague from Massachusetts any day. The American people do not want taxpayer-funded abortions. That's part of what we are talking about. That's part of our ideology. No, we should not be taking money from hardworking Americans and using that money to fund the killing of unborn babies. That is our ideology. Again, the majority of the American people agree with us, and we are going to stand on that ideology every day.

The American people have, Mr. Speaker, the right to a fact-based conversation on the budget. We demand an end to budget gimmicks and accounting tricks used every year to make budgets look responsible when in fact they add to the debt. That is part of our problem with what President Obama is recommending. He wants us to take mythical numbers that he projects instead of real numbers that we have been using.

Passing a short-term measure is a step in the right direction to cut spending while keeping the government open, but it is far from being enough. Excessive government spending has economic consequences for all Americans: higher cost-of-living, higher interest rates, higher taxes. But, Mr. Speaker, we didn't get into this overnight and we will not get out of it overnight. Investors in small businesses need confidence that Congress will use commonsense American principles to cut spending and ensure a secure economic future.

The Republican budget resolution can create 1 million private sector jobs over the next year. We are not going to create these high-paid government jobs that our colleagues have created. America's solution for job creation won't come by raising taxes to pay for even more wasteful Washington bureaucracy. Democrats tried that approach with the stimulus, and it failed.

Republicans, on the other hand, estimate that with the Path to Prosperity budget resolution introduced this week and passed out of the Budget Committee, wages will go up by \$1.1 trillion over the next 10 years, yielding an average increase in income of \$1,000 per year for each American family.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do in this House what the American people expect us to do: be reasonable stewards, responsible stewards of their money and adhere to the ideology which has made this the greatest country in the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, just two points. One, on the issue of abortion. The law of the land under the Hyde language is that no Federal funds can be used to finance abortion. Introducing abortion into this budget debate is divisive and doesn't belong there. But it is all about ideology, and I get it. So don't say it is about numbers anymore. It is about this kind of right-wing ideology, going after National Public Radio, trying to undercut the EPA. You know, I get it. There is a time and place to do that; this is not it.

The other thing I would say, when I listen to my colleague from North Carolina, the question I was going to ask, if Republicans are responsible for deficit reduction under Bill Clinton, then who is responsible for the increase in deficit when they were in charge of the Presidency, the House and the Senate, when they had all three branches of government? At some point you have to take some responsibility, and at some point you have to live up to the fact that some of the policies that my colleagues pursued when they were in charge here drove this economy into a ditch and added significantly to our deficit.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. I listened to what the gentlewoman on the other side said, and I was really amazed because she was harking back to when we had a Democratic President, Bill Clinton, and a Republican Congress and how we worked together to accomplish certain goals. Well, that is exactly what is missing now. If you listen to what my colleague from Massachusetts said, he said once again the President is calling the Speaker, the Republican Speaker, and the Democratic majority leader in the Senate back to the White House to try to work something out. That's what is happening here. But it is the House Republicans and their leadership that refuse any kind of negotiation. They keep saying: Oh, yeah, they're going to work it out. But they don't. And they keep insisting on this draconian H.R. 1, this continuing resolution that really hurts Americans and kills jobs.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. No, I will not yield at this time.

So I say to the gentlewoman, yes, let's go back to those times. Let's have the Republicans here in the House work together with the President and with Senator REID on the other side.

Now, you said before that this CR that is up now would prevent a government shutdown. Just the opposite is true. It is a step backward. It is going to lead directly toward a government shutdown because Republican leadership knows that this bill will not pass the Senate. It doesn't have any cuts in defense. It actually says we will keep the level of funding for defense until

the end of the year. Well, aren't defense cuts on the table? And it continues with this ideological battle. There is actually abortion language in this CR, is my understanding. And the gentlewoman actually said: Well, that is an issue here that we need to resolve, that we should deal with. Well, no, that is not the case because if you continue on this path, no defense cuts, bring up abortion, this bill will certainly not pass the Senate, the President will not sign it, and so we are just simply wasting our time.

What is happening here is the Republicans are ignoring the fact that there are Democrats in the majority in the Senate and there is a Democratic President. You can't have it my way or the highway, and that's what we have been hearing for the last 3 months: my way or the highway.

Now, I just want to mention another thing. I was glad that the gentlewoman brought up the budget, which is to follow, because we know that this bad CR, or spending bill, that we are dealing with now, is a precursor to an even worse budget bill that the Republicans have proposed.

And I want to tell you, you talked about a previous error. The problem with the Republican budget, there are so many, but the biggest problem is it is going to put an end to Medicare. I was here when Speaker Gingrich became Speaker, and he said he wanted Medicare to wither on the vine. And that is what the Republican budget will do. It will end Medicare as we know it because there will be no guarantee. Seniors will go back to the old days when they had to try to find their own private health insurance, and maybe the government will give them some help with it. But for the most part, they won't be able to find health insurance.

So there won't be Medicare; they won't be able to get health insurance. And what are they going to do? They're going to be out on the street; they're going to end up in the emergency room again, which is what happened with the elderly before we passed Medicare.

□ 1050

The gentlewoman went on to say that she's going to reform Medicaid. Well, she's reforming Medicaid by basically giving a block grant to the States. And what does that mean? The States won't have enough money to pay for seniors' nursing home care. So nursing homes will close or they won't provide quality services. We'll see seniors getting bedsores again, if they can even find a nursing home. So essentially we're also going to end Medicaid. Sixty-five percent of Medicaid goes towards seniors and the disabled.

You look at this Republican budget, and this is just a precursor to what we're going to see next week: It will end Medicare as we know it by eliminating its guaranteed coverage. It slashes Medicaid for seniors in nursing homes, health care for children, and

Americans with disabilities. It increases the cost of a college education for close to 10 million middle class students. It gives away billions in subsidies and tax breaks to Big Oil.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chair of the Rules Committee.

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Grandfather Community, North Carolina, for her superb management of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, we are here with a couple of very important priorities:

Number one, we want to ensure that the government doesn't shut down, and that's why we have come forward with this continuing resolution that will provide funding to keep the government open for another week and, first and foremost, to ensure that our men and women in uniform have what they need and their families are not going to be victimized by what has taken place over the past several months.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to my friend from New Jersey talk about this, I don't like to engage in finger-pointing. I really don't. But I think it's very key—and the reason I don't like to engage in finger-pointing, as my friend from Worcester laughs at that, is the moment you point your finger at someone, I was always taught that there are three pointing right back at you. And I think it's important for us to not point fingers, but I think it's instructive for us to look at what it is that got us here.

I suspect that my friend from Grandfather Community probably explained the fact that for the first time in our Nation's history since the Budget Act has existed, we went through a Congress without a budget having been passed. That's what happened last year. And for the first time ever, we had no appropriations bills passed. Now, I'm not pointing fingers, but I will say that there was not a Republican in the White House, there was not a Republican Senate, and there certainly was not a Republican United States House of Representatives.

So this was dumped onto the laps of the new majority here in the House of Representatives, which, as we all know, if we look at the challenges that are ahead of us, we still have a Democrat in the White House and we still have a Democrat-controlled United States Senate. So of the three levers of power legislatively, we have control of only one-third of those. And in light of that, we're trying to do the best that we can under somewhat challenging circumstances.

Now, last November 2, the American people sent a very strong and powerful message to Washington, D.C. My party happened to see the largest gain in nearly three-quarters of a century; 1938 was the last time we saw the kind of

change in favor of the Republican Party that we did last November 2.

So in light of that, there is a powerful message, and I'm happy to say that that message has been heard by both Democrats and Republicans. Why? Because with the 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending that we saw under Speaker PELOSI, the American people said we need to bring an end to that nonsense. And guess what? We have Democrats and Republicans alike talking about the need for spending. Since we've passed H.R. 1, we have had \$2 billion in spending cuts every single week. But it is a drop in the bucket. It is a drop in the bucket.

Over the last 2 days, I have had the chance to meet with a very bright, dynamic, new member of the British Parliament, a man called Matthew Hancock. I've just had a chance to meet with "Facebook girl," who was one of the leaders of the tremendous, tremendous change and revolution that has taken place in Egypt. I'm going to be meeting in just a few minutes with leaders from Mongolia. And, Mr. Speaker, I have to say the world is looking at us as we deal with this terrible situation today, and it's critical for us to step up to the plate and provide strong leadership.

Now, what has happened is we have, as my friend from New Jersey underscored, come forward with a budget. It was just unveiled this week. Mr. RYAN, the chairman of the Budget Committee, is going to be bringing it to the Rules Committee, and we will consider it next week. And it is absolutely horrifying to hear the characterizations that have been provided.

Mr. Speaker, obviously encouraged by fear tactics, my constituents in California have been saying, Please, please, please don't support the Republican budget, which will abolish Medicare. That message over and over again has been coming: Don't support the Republican budget, which will abolish Medicare.

And, Mr. Speaker, the thing that's so disturbing is that there are senior citizens, elderly Americans, who are out there and they are very emotionally distraught over the fact that people are telling them from the other side of the aisle, and it's very close to the remarks that my friend from New Jersey just offered, that we are going to abolish Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's very important for the American people to understand that we are seeking to save Medicare. Saving Medicare is what this is all about.

We all know, if you look at the history of Medicare, it was established in 1965. In 1970, Mr. Speaker, the cost of Medicare was \$7 billion. In 1970 it was \$7 billion. Four decades later, last year, 2010, the cost of Medicare was \$528 billion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in light of that, there is realization that since we've seen Medicare expand to address the needs of the disabled and so many

other areas, there needs to be reform so that future generations will be able, since they're compelled to pay their FICA tax, to receive the benefits they deserve from Medicare.

But, Mr. Speaker, the idea of frightening senior citizens today by leading them to believe that our budget is going to abolish Medicare is outrageous. And I believe that the American people are smart enough, smart enough, to understand that these fear tactics can't stand. We have a responsibility, I believe now, an obligation, to counter the lies that are being put out there claiming that we're trying to abolish Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that's important for us to note is that the American people are hurting all the way across the board. We have an unemployment rate, which we're all encouraged by the fact that it has dropped by a full percentage point, down to 8.8 percent, but it is still unacceptably high. And that's why we need to focus on job creation and economic growth. Mr. Speaker, if we had 2 percent more GDP growth in this country, we would be in a position where we would, in fact, not be having to anguish over the kind of spending that we see right now.

Obviously, it's important for us to recognize that the role of government has become way too big and needs to be dramatically reduced, not only because of spending but because of the encroachment on individual liberty that exists. But we need to realize that government does have things that it needs to do, and we need to generate an increase in the net flow of revenues. A \$1.6 trillion national deficit, which is in the President's budget, coupled with \$14 trillion in accumulated debt is unacceptable. That's why our goal is to focus on job creation, economic growth.

Our colleague DAVE CAMP of the Ways and Means Committee is focusing on reducing that rate on job creators in this country, the highest of any nation on the face of the Earth, now that Japan has reduced their rate, and that top rate on individuals.

□ 1100

Doing that, coupled with reducing the regulatory constraints that it has imposed, will address the needs of the poor.

Now, my friend from Worcester last night in the Rules Committee was talking about the fact that no one is focused on the plight of the poor in this country. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is our priority, to make sure that we have opportunity so that people who are truly in need have their needs met, but also to ensure that we have opportunity. Creating jobs for individuals is what we need to do.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we are committed to keeping the government open, supporting our troops, and bringing about, with this continuing resolution, a \$12 billion reduction in spend-

ing. It's something that, if we can pass it here, the Senate should pass it. Everyone is saying they know the Senate isn't going to pass it. The fact of the matter is the Senate should pass it. But we hope that it's not necessary. We hope that Speaker BOEHNER, Leader REID, and President Obama are able to come up with an agreement that will ensure that we don't go through what would be a very difficult thing, that is, shutting down the government.

So I urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I thank my friend for yielding.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for giving us his itinerary for the day. I'm glad he's meeting with the leaders of Mongolia, because this is a budget only the people of Mongolia would love because it is a tough budget on the people of the United States of America.

He talks about their commitment to helping the poor in this country. I don't know how you do that when you cut WIC, when you go after Pell Grants, when you go after LIHEAP.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say, I mentioned the 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending. If we look at the increases that have taken place in WIC, LIHEAP, and a wide range of other areas, the notion of slightly paring that back will in no way jeopardize the needs that need to be addressed.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, I will just remind my friend, as I did last night, right now there are 30,000 people in this country that are fasting in protest of the cuts that adversely impact the poor. A former colleague, Tony Hall from Ohio, Jim Wallis from Sojourners, David Beckmann from Bread for the World are highlighting the fact that the cuts in this budget are going to be devastating to the most vulnerable people in this country.

What I said in the Rules Committee last night is that sometimes we forget to understand that there are real people behind these cuts, and people are going to be hurt. And, unfortunately, the people who are sacrificing are the people who can least afford to sacrifice. You're not asking Donald Trump to sacrifice. You're not asking big oil companies to sacrifice or those big agri-businesses that receive corn ethanol subsidies. No. It's all focused on working people and poor people.

I don't know when, in the minds of the Republicans, that average working people and people who are vulnerable became the bad guys. It was reckless Wall Street behavior that created this financial crisis, and they get everything, and everyday people get nothing except the bill. That's wrong.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 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, as we meet this morning, the top priority of the American people continues to be the jobs crisis in our country. There are too many people out of work and too many people worried that they are next.

Last week, the welcome news came that last month the economy had created about a quarter of a million new private sector jobs. That's a good start, but it's not nearly enough. Shutting the government down just when the economy is starting to get back on its feet would be the worst possible mistake, but we're on the verge of that.

It's important that people understand that the President has gone three-quarters of the way toward the majority party to settle this matter—didn't meet halfway; he has gone three-quarters of the way—but they won't go the full way because there is a fight here about values. This is a fight about what you value.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, we value Medicare. We believe that after someone has worked their entire life and paid taxes into that Medicare fund that they should not have to worry that a trip to the radiologist will be followed by a trip to the bankruptcy court. This is what Medicare accomplished for our moms and our dads and our grandparents. It said that after a lifetime of hard work, if you have medical worries, they will just be medical worries, not financial worries, because Medicare will pay the bill.

The gentleman from California talked about how they're not destroying Medicare; they're saving it. Let's talk about what they're really doing. Here's what happens:

Today, if a senior goes to the radiologist of her choice, Medicare pays most of the bill and she pays a little bit of it. She decides what doctor to pick. She and the doctor decide what happens next, and no private insurance company gets in the way. Medicare pays the bill.

What they are proposing is to end that system. So now what will happen under their plan is that the taxes that we pay into the Medicare fund will all be paid to health insurance companies. So we will trust the good hands that so gently guide our health care in the health care industry. We will give them the money, all of it, and trust them to do the right thing with the health of America's senior citizens. That is the wrong thing to do with the health of America's senior citizens.

There is a fight here about values. It's a fight that shouldn't take place. We should settle the budget fight. The President has gone three-quarters of the way to the Republican proposal. Settle it today on that basis. But by all means, we will never yield, we will

never concede, we will never concede the point that Medicare should be replaced by private insurance companies.

The Congressional Budget Office has said, in analyzing Chairman RYAN's proposal, that the out-of-pocket health care costs for most retirees in America will go up. This isn't spending reform. This is having someone else pick up the tab. The hospitals aren't going to charge less. The doctors aren't going to charge less. The senior is going to pay more to get that coverage, and he or she is going to have to go ask permission from an insurance company as to what radiologist they can see. Then the radiologist will have to ask permission for what test he or she can order.

Medicare is not perfect, but it works. We should preserve it and defeat the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to Speaker BOEHNER, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The House is preparing to pass a responsible troop funding bill that would fund the Department of Defense through September. It would also cut spending by an additional \$12 billion and keep the government running for an additional week.

There is no policy reason for the Senate to oppose this responsible troop funding bill that keeps the government running. It reflects a bicameral, bipartisan agreement that was reached in December regarding the troop funding bill, and no Senator has objected to the policy in this bill. I think it is past time that we get this responsible troop funding bill enacted, especially when the U.S. has become engaged in a third war.

To support job creation in America, we are working to make real spending cuts. We are also working on common-sense policy restrictions when it comes to how our taxpayer dollars are spent.

Talks to resolve last year's budget are progressing, but there is no agreement yet, no agreement on numbers, and no agreement on the underlying policies that were passed by this Chamber.

Now, I think we all know that no one wants a shutdown. There is absolutely no policy reason for the Senate not to follow the House in taking these responsible steps to support our troops and to keep our government open.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of the Speaker of the House, but I would remind my colleagues that when we talk about national security, it needs to include, as well, the health and well-being of our senior citizens here in the United States. It needs to include the health and well-being of our children here in the United States.

□ 1110

It needs to include our infrastructure, our education, the quality of our environment. All those things are part of our national security. We all support

funding our troops. What we don't support are reckless policies that are aimed at undercutting programs like Medicare and putting our senior citizens at a disadvantage where they will pay more and get less.

I mean this is an ideological battle that we are, unfortunately, engaged in where my Republican friends believe that Medicare should be ended as we know it. Medicare as we know it they want to end. It is clear. If anyone doubts that, I will tell my colleagues to read the bill, to read the stuff that is coming out of the Budget Committee. Read the bill. For anybody who doubts that Republicans are targeting Medicare, look at what the Budget Committee is doing. It will be there in black and white when it's published, and it will state unequivocally that Medicare, as we know it, will be ended. Senior citizens, according to the CBO, will pay more and get less. That is not what, I think, the American people want. I will just remind my colleagues of a new poll that came out: 66 percent of seniors reject the plan to end Medicare as we know it.

So, if you interpreted the results of the last election as going after Medicare and seniors' health care, I think you misread the results of the last election. The last election was about jobs. We all need to come together and talk about how we protect jobs and help encourage the creation of more jobs in this country. If you want to end the deficit, put people back to work. Here we are in April, and you have yet to bring one single bill to this floor that deals with jobs, that helps create jobs and that helps protect jobs.

My friends on the other side of the aisle need to kind of reevaluate their priorities here. Let's get back to what the American people want—a strong economy and good jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he is ready to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am not. I have a couple of more speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Then I will reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

Mr. DICKS. Yesterday, we met in the Rules Committee to discuss this potential CR.

The point I wanted to make was that I felt—and I wish the gentleman from California were here—that a clean CR would be more appropriate at this time, especially if we get an agreement. Because, that way, the President can sign the clean CR, which would keep funding for the troops—I want to

point that out as the ranking member on Defense Appropriations—this CR is troubled. I believe, the President will veto it. I also believe it won't be passed in the Senate.

So why are we doing this? Why are we wasting time here when we should be focused on getting a clean CR through, which the President said he would sign, which would allow a little more time for negotiations on this agreement?

Now, we have got to get an agreement. The idea of shutting down the Federal Government in the middle of this economic downturn is just the worst possible idea. Goldman Sachs says you'll lose two-tenths of 1 percent of economic growth. This will mean laying people off. Whether they will get reimbursed or not is a major question for those who are not considered to be vital—and I think all workers are vital, but it's regarding those who are not in essential kinds of jobs.

We talked yesterday to the FAA. They will keep operating. We have troops in the field. As I mentioned before, if we did a clean CR, they would be paid. I think this is a waste of time and that every ounce of effort should be taken in reaching this agreement.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. The administration has bent over backwards, and the Senate has bent over backwards to try to reach an agreement on this, but the leadership on the Republican side keeps changing the goalposts. First, it was \$33 billion. Now it's \$40 billion. They just can't take "yes" for an answer.

The most important thing is that this will hurt the economy. Also, it shows a kind of mean-spiritedness here. When you're going after Medicare and Medicaid in the budget resolution and, in this deal, you're going after women and infant care, this is not what we should be doing. We should be helping the poor people, not taking their safety net away.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ 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. DICKS has the right idea.

What we ought to vote on today is a 1-week extension that's clean, that just gets that done and keeps everybody going in the government, including the military, and then we should resolve our differences. I think that's what we ought to be doing this morning, but what's standing in the way of that is this values debate that I talked about earlier.

Look, it's a position that we understand, which is that the majority party does not want to continue Medicare as

we've known it for all these years. We strongly disagree with them, and we are prepared to have the fight to say why America needs Medicare as it has always been; but that disagreement should not shut the government down; that disagreement over values should not mean that the functions that people have paid for in their taxes don't go forward. Let's not shut the government down over this values debate. Let's have the values debate as the government continues to operate, and by all means, let's protect Medicare.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am the final speaker on our side.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, here we go again—another closed rule, but this rule is different from others. It also includes martial law authority. This means that the Republican leadership can bring any spending bill to the floor at any time they want.

So much for “read the bill.”

This is not how the House Republicans said they were going to run the House. Open rules? Read the bill? Markups? Hearings? Their record, Mr. Speaker, is abysmal, and this bill is a perfect example of how they are doing things they said they wouldn't do—a closed rule with Martial law authority. I can't say I'm surprised. It's their way or the highway.

Yesterday, a group of tea partiers was protesting on the steps of the Capitol. It's a wonderful thing to be able to protest in the open without any threat of government violence or censorship. It's a very American thing to do. Yet, while they're entitled to their opinion, it's important to point out that they were protesting against keeping the government open.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they want to shut the government down. Just look at the front page of CQ today. It's of a tea party member on the steps of the Capitol with a sign that says, “Shut 'er down”; and Republicans in the House are doing their bidding.

Enough is enough. It is time to act like adults and negotiate in good faith. It is time to come to a deal that keeps the government open—a deal without partisan, ideological riders that prevent health groups from providing important women's health information and health screenings, riders that prevent the EPA from keeping our air and water safe, riders that prevent independent, nonpartisan news agencies from reporting in places like Afghanistan, Egypt and Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it's time that the Republican Party does the right thing for its country and not just for the extremist wing of its party.

At the end of this debate, I will oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to provide a clean CR for 1 week. No harmful cuts or ideological riders like those that are included in the Republican bill. The government stays open while President Obama,

Speaker BOEHNER and Senator REID continue to negotiate. Now that they're at the table, it's time to let them do their jobs and come to a deal without a continual moving of the legislative goalposts that's going on under the Republican bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and to defeat this closed rule.

My friends on the other side of the aisle need to get serious about negotiating an end to this impasse, and need to stop the ideological riders that are attached to this bill. Let's get serious, and let's get this passed so we can begin to deal with next year's budget.

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

□ 1120

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself the balance of my time.

As our colleague across the aisle said, “Here we go again.” Here we go again with the Democrats misleading the American people about what this rule is about, what this bill is about, the underlying bill. Mr. DICKS said he wanted the rule as it is. Our colleagues across the aisle don't want us to be able to take up another bill in case there is an agreement with the President on a long-term CR.

There is only one rider on this bill, Mr. Speaker, and that is to not allow taxpayer funding for abortions in Washington, DC. My colleague across the aisle says national security should include paying for all of these government programs. The Federal Government is the only branch of government that can handle national security, and that means funding our troops. That's exactly what this underlying bill does.

Mr. Speaker, also our colleague says, “It's time for people to read the bill.” How interesting that when they were in control, they didn't want anybody to read the bills, and they said you wouldn't be able to know what was going to be in the bill until after it was passed.

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. There are words for that. I'm afraid I should not use those on the floor today for fear it might slow down our debate here.

But I want to say that I am particularly concerned that our colleagues have brought up the issue of values. I'm pleased they brought up the issue of values.

Our colleague from New Jersey says what this is, it's about the value of Medicare. Well, Mr. Speaker, it shows what they value are government programs. What we value are life and freedom. There is a distinct difference, Mr. Speaker, in the values of the two par-

ties in this country—one wants more government funding, one wants government control of our lives; the other wants freedom for the American people and life for unborn children.

Mr. Speaker, they are misleading the American people. There's nothing about Medicare in this rule or in this underlying bill.

We've discussed at great length why America needs this rule and this bill. In the face of a government shutdown, our economy is struggling, people are looking for jobs, they demand accountability and belt-tightening in Washington, DC. They need the Federal Government to stop draining job-creating resources from the private sector to fund misguided adventures in social engineering. They demand action. They deserve answers.

It's for these reasons I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying bill so we can begin to restore the trust Americans have in their Federal Government and restore this economy.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 206 TO BE OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

(1) In section 1, insert “and any amendment thereto” after “ordered on the bill”.

(2) In section 1, strike “and (2) one motion to recommit”, and insert:

“(2) the amendment printed in section 3, if offered by Representative Dicks of Washington or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions”.

(3) At the end of the resolution, add the following:

“SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 1 is as follows: . . .”.

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 111-242) is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting “April 15, 2011”.

(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. 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. 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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 206, if ordered; and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 185, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]

YEAS—238

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

NAYS—185

Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Clarke (MI)
Altmire	Braleigh (IA)	Clarke (NY)
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Clay
Baca	Butterfield	Cleaver
Baldwin	Capps	Clyburn
Barrow	Capuano	Cohen
Bass (CA)	Cardoza	Connolly (VA)
Becerra	Carnahan	Conyers
Berkley	Carney	Cooper
Berman	Carson (IN)	Costello
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Blumenauer	Chandler	Critz
Boren	Chu	Crowley
Boswell	Cicilline	Cuellar

Cummings	Kind	Rangel
Davis (CA)	Kissell	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Richardson
DeFazio	Langevin	Richmond
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ross (AR)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Levin	Rush
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Doggett	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda T.
Donnelly (IN)	Loebsock	Sánchez, Loretta
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Sarbanes
Edwards	Lowey	Schakowsky
Ellison	Lujan	Schiff
Engel	Lynch	Schrader
Eshoo	Maloney	Scott (VA)
Farr	Markey	Scott, David
Fattah	Matheson	Serrano
Filner	Matsui	Sewell
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Fudge	McColum	Shuler
Garamendi	McDermott	Sires
Gonzalez	McGovern	Slaughter
Green, Al	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Green, Gene	McNerney	Speier
Grijalva	Meeks	Stark
Gutierrez	Michaud	Sutton
Hanabusa	Miller (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Heinrich	Moore	Tierney
Higgins	Moran	Towns
Himes	Murphy (CT)	Tsongas
Hinchee	Nadler	Van Hollen
Hinojosa	Napolitano	Velázquez
Hirono	Neal	Vislosky
Holden	Olver	Walz (MN)
Holt	Pallone	Wasserman
Honda	Pascrell	Schultz
Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)	Waters
Inslee	Payne	Watt
Israel	Pelosi	Waxman
Jackson (IL)	Perlmutter	Weiner
Jackson Lee	Peters	Welch
(TX)	Peterson	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Woolsey
Johnson, E. B.	Polis	Wu
Kaptur	Price (NC)	Yarmuth
Keating	Quigley	
Kildee	Rahall	

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (NY)	McMorris	Schwartz
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Tonko
Giffords	Ruppersberger	Young (AK)
	Schock	

□ 1145

Messrs. HIGGINS, CARDOZA and Ms. DEGETTE 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.

Stated against:

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 242, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 242, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 189, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

AYES—228

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

NOES—189

Ackerman	Butterfield	Connolly (VA)
Altire	Capps	Conyers
Andrews	Capuano	Cooper
Baca	Cardoza	Costa
Baldwin	Carnahan	Costello
Barrow	Carney	Critz
Bass (CA)	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Berkley	Chandler	Cummings
Berman	Chu	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline	Davis (IL)
Blumenauer	Clarke (MI)	DeFazio
Boren	Clarke (NY)	DeGette
Boswell	Clay	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	Deutch
Braley (IA)	Clyburn	Dicks
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Dingell

Doggett	Levin	Ross (AR)
Donnelly (IN)	Lewis (GA)	Rothman (NJ)
Doyle	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Edwards	Loebsack	Ruppersberger
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Rush
Engel	Lowey	Ryan (OH)
Eshoo	Lujan	Sánchez, Linda
Farr	Lynch	T.
Fattah	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta
Filner	Markey	Sarbanes
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Schakowsky
Fudge	Matsui	Schiff
Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader
Gonzalez	McCollum	Schwartz
Green, Al	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Green, Gene	McGovern	Scott, David
Grijalva	McIntyre	Serrano
Gutierrez	McNerney	Sewell
Hanabusa	Meeks	Sherman
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Shuler
Heinrich	Miller (NC)	Sires
Higgins	Miller, George	Slaughter
Himes	Moore	Smith (WA)
Hinchev	Moran	Speier
Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)	Stark
Hirono	Nadler	Sutton
Holden	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Holt	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Honda	Olver	Tierney
Hoyer	Owens	Tonko
Inlee	Pallone	Towns
Israel	Pascrell	Tsongas
Jackson (IL)	Pastor (AZ)	Van Hollen
Jackson Lee	Payne	Velázquez
(TX)	Pelosi	Visclosky
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Walz (MN)
Johnson, E. B.	Peters	Wasserman
Kaptur	Peterson	Schultz
Keating	Pingree (ME)	Waters
Kildee	Polis	Watt
Kind	Price (NC)	Waxman
Kissell	Quigley	Weiner
Kucinich	Rahall	Welch
Langevin	Rangel	Wilson (FL)
Larsen (WA)	Reyes	Woolsey
Larson (CT)	Richardson	Wu
Lee (CA)	Richmond	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Austria	Garrett	Pompeo
Bishop (NY)	Giffords	Rogers (MI)
Cole	Harper	Stearns
Courtney	McMorris	Young (AK)
Fortenberry	Rodgers	
Frelinghuysen	Nunnelee	

□ 1152

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. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 243 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 243 on agreeing to the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1363, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, I had briefly stepped off the floor and was unintentionally delayed and missed the vote on the Rule. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform our colleagues that the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business tomorrow. As the Members know, this is a change from the original calendar.

Due to ongoing negotiations, Mr. Speaker, surrounding continued appropriations for the remainder of fiscal year 2011, I believe it is both appropriate and necessary for this House to be in session tomorrow. I expect legislative business to include, but may not be limited to, H.J. Res. 37, a resolution of disapproval regarding the FCC's recent Internet and broadband industry practices regulation ruling.

Votes are possible at any time after noon tomorrow. At this point, it is too early to tell whether the House will need to be in session this weekend. In the case of lapse in appropriations, however, I fully expect the House to meet.

Mr. Speaker, we will not leave town until we have fulfilled our obligation to cut spending, to begin getting our fiscal house in order, and to keep the government functioning. Therefore, Members should keep their schedules for this weekend as flexible as possible.

Mr. HOYER. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader for yielding, and I share his view that we ought to keep the government running for not only the sake of our economy, but for the sake of all those that rely on the Federal Government. My friend has made the observation in the past that shutting down the government, and I believe the Speaker has made the same observation, was not a rational policy for us to pursue.

I ask the gentleman, because I believe that the resolution that we will be considering will not either pass the Senate nor be signed by the President, in light of that, and in light of the fact that the majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker have both indicated that negotiations are ongoing, would the gentleman agree to a unanimous consent, as we have done so often in the past when the majority Democrats that were in control of the House and the Senate disagreed with President Bush, that we would have a hold-in-place unanimous consent continuing resolution, not changing the status on either side of the negotiations, for 7 days, which would give the parties the opportunity to come to an agreement. My understanding from the leader of the Senate is that we have agreed to some \$70 billion in cuts, which is a substantial way towards what you wanted and a show that we share the view that we need to have fiscal restraint.

So I ask my friend, if I made a unanimous consent request that we continue the government authority to stay running until next Friday without changing the status quo so that neither party would be disadvantaged and that our government would, in fact, as the gentleman observes is his objective, be able to stay in service to the American people?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'd respond to the gentleman to say that there is no indication in a definite