

We need to make tough, smart choices and reduce spending now so that we don't hand our children the most regressive tax there is—an immoral national debt approaching \$17 trillion. There is no reason and should be no reason why both sides can't agree on cutting \$85 billion. Mr. Speaker, we need to replace this sequestration with responsible cuts and reforms. Let's do it as soon as possible.

STOP CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to demand that this Tea Party Congress take action to stop climate change.

Scientists agree that climate change is dangerous, and for those of you who only care about money, it's also costly. Republican skepticism of science has delayed action for far too long, but it's not too late to stop the worst of the effects. The victims of Superstorm Sandy know that we must act now.

I call on my Republican friends to reject the extreme right-wing and to also repudiate your pollution-spewing buddies and suitors. Listen to the facts, the science, and the demands of the American people. We must take action now, not during the last term, by the way, when these two measures to avoid sequestration were passed—they're not in effect now. We need to take action right now.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 933, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 99 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 99

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto 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 with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Worcester, 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

Mr. COLE. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for the consideration of H.R. 933, the Department of Defense, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013.

The rule is a closed rule, which provides for the consideration of fully conferenced Department of Defense and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs bills and a continuing resolution for other government programs at the FY 2012 levels. This rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. In addition, the rule incorporates a purely technical amendment to the bill by Chairman ROGERS.

□ 1020

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 933 accomplishes several key objectives.

First, it preserves military readiness and national security capability, while maintaining core commitments to our troops and our veterans.

Second, it ends the current uncertainty of the fiscal year 2013 budget. It seems that over the past year, we have moved from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis. Thanks to the leadership of Chairman ROGERS and Chairman SESSIONS, we are able to consider funding the Federal Government through the end of the fiscal year at this point, avoiding the threat of a government shutdown.

Additionally, by considering full-year DOD and MilCon-VA bills, we are able to establish a stable baseline for the Department to act upon, as opposed to having them rely on fiscal year 2012 priorities. This bill realigns the appropriation accounts for Department of Defense and MilCon-VA to better reflect the fiscal year 2013 execution, rather than the fiscal year 2012 levels carried forward in a CR.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation operates under the caps of the Budget Control Act of 2011 as modified by the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012. There are across-the-board reductions in security and nonsecurity spending to reach the caps of \$1.043 trillion. Addi-

tionally, there is a provision which ensures that the funding will be reduced to the post-sequester level of \$982 billion in total spending, a reduction of \$85 billion in overall Federal spending for fiscal year 2013.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a moment discussing the anomalies in this bill. Let me assure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that none of the anomalies in this legislation, on net, do anything that raise the cost of the bill above the statutory Budget Control Act caps.

Some of the anomalies in the bill are things like turning off the \$100 million in convention funding for Charlotte and Tampa, and turning off \$31 million in funding for the Eisenhower Commission, where funding has been delayed indefinitely and no funds have yet been expended.

These anomalies are limited. There are only approximately 80 in the entire bill. For reference, in the last full-year continuing resolution, there were over 600 anomalies. The Appropriations Committee has been judicious in its use of anomalies, only providing them in cases where mission-critical operations might be impacted.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I urge support for the rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we are here to consider the rule for H.R. 933, the continuing resolution for the rest of fiscal year 2013. This is a disappointing bill, Mr. Speaker, and this is a disappointing process.

This continuing resolution, quite frankly, is inadequate. It does not meet the needs of our people. And because it does not address sequestration, it actually will hurt many millions of our people. The Department of Defense and the VA are given some flexibility to deal with the devastating sequestration cuts, but no other agency is given that tool.

This is clearly, in my opinion, a tacit statement by the majority that they are going to keep this harmful sequester, one of the stupidest things ever to come out of Congress.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the disappointing part of this entire process. The majority has had plenty of opportunity to address the sequester. Time after time after time after time, Democrats, through the efforts of the ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, have offered a sequester alternative. And time after time after time after time, the Republican majority has blocked this amendment from being debated and voted on the House floor.

Yet the Republicans in Congress have yet to put forth a sequester alternative. Of course they will say that they have passed two different proposals, but that was last Congress. As many of my friends on the other side of the aisle know so well, legislation dies at the end of each Congress. Every 2 years, Congress repopulates and every bill must start over. There is no carry-over from one Congress to the next. We all learned that in the most basic political science class, Politics 101. So this claim that we did something last Congress is irrelevant to addressing the sequester that the Republicans let take effect last week.

And let's remember the context of those two bills the House Republicans are so proud of. They were the result of, once again, the Republican leadership walking away from difficult bipartisan negotiations just at the moment when a deal seemed to be within reach. They both are completely partisan bills, and they both were dead on arrival in the Senate. So they were not genuine efforts to solve problems. They were all for show. They were simply political theater.

On the other hand, at the end of the last Congress, the House Republican leadership had a bipartisan, bicameral negotiated omnibus appropriations bill that would have taken us through fiscal year 2013, the result of hundreds of hours of careful bipartisan negotiation. But the House Republicans would not let that bill come to the floor for approval, a bill that would have passed the Senate and gone straight to the President's desk for signature.

Instead, they chose to waste the House's time on its two highly touted, highly partisan budget bills that went nowhere. But as I said, Mr. Speaker, that was the last Congress, and we must now start all over to address the sequester and provide funding for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Frankly, I don't know what the Republicans in the House are scared of. Speaker BOEHNER seems to have moved past the Hastert rule, which is a silly notion that the bill must only pass if it has the majority of the majority, and he has replaced it with selective bipartisanship. That's right, Speaker BOEHNER clearly believes that the House should operate under a process of selective bipartisanship.

This means he turns to Democrats when he needs the votes to pass important bills, like he did for VAWA, the fiscal cliff, and Hurricane Sandy relief, when only 49 Republicans, only 49 Republicans out of 232 voted to help our fellow citizens on the east coast who were devastated by that storm. The Speaker should do the same thing with the sequester and allow the House to debate and to vote on the Van Hollen amendment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this is part of a broader Republican economic plan that is, to put it mildly, extremely disappointing.

First, Republicans brought us to the brink of economic mayhem with the

fiscal cliff. At the last minute, the Senate swooped in to save the day with leadership and help from the administration. Then House Republicans allowed the sequester to take effect, once again playing Russian roulette with our economy. Now we are going to consider this hybrid CR that just doesn't pass muster, despite the best efforts of the appropriators.

No one—no one—wants a government shutdown, and we all know that some kind of bill funding the Federal Government through the end of the fiscal year will pass before March 27. The real fights are going to come in the next few weeks and months when the Republicans outline their budget priorities with the new Ryan budget and when the debt limit, once again, needs to be raised.

What is clear is that the Republicans are hell-bent on cutting spending just for its own sake, no matter how mindless or senseless. We know that the economy is slowly rebounding, and we also know that these cuts in government spending—Federal, State, and local—are taking their toll on the economy. Fourth-quarter growth last year was reduced only because of reduced government spending—the cuts to cops, the cuts to firefighters, the cuts to teachers, and other workers—when that showed up in that economic report.

Now we are going to see a Republican budget that supposedly eliminates the deficit in 10 years. Call it the Ryan budget on steroids. It is going to cut Medicare, food stamps, and nearly every nondefense discretionary program funded by the Federal Government; and during the debt ceiling debate, we will see another attempt to arbitrarily cut these programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a responsible way to govern. The continuing resolution before us today is just one more example of how the House Republicans are leading with their heads in the sand. Instead of working to jump-start our economy, instead of engaging in true bipartisan negotiations, House Republicans continue to push on with misguided and ill-conceived budget cuts that do harm, but no good.

Like I said, this is a disappointing bill and a disappointing effort. We should be considering an omnibus appropriations bill. We should work to replace the sequester. We should be thinking long-term about economic recovery. We should be putting country ahead of political party. Instead, once again, we are playing games with our economy. This is no way to run a government.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I just want to make a few quick comments in reference to my good friend's remarks. You referred to an interesting phrase, "selective bipartisanship." I would suggest to my friend that we've probably

practiced that more in 2 months than they did in 2 years when they were in the majority.

These were major pieces of legislation that we did move in a bipartisan fashion. As my good friend knows, I helped on all three of those occasions, was happy to do so, and I'm sure the Speaker will continue to try and work across the aisle whenever he can.

My friend also referred to the nature of the cuts. Let me assure him of this: these are cuts, and they are going to occur; but we've repeatedly told our friends and the President and the Senate that we would be more than happy to redistribute where the cuts are going to occur. We did that twice: in May of last year and in December of last year, after the election, in good faith. In neither case did the Senate pick that up or the White House respond with a serious offer. Now my friend is asking us to do it for a third time in the hopes it will be different.

Perhaps this time you should go first. Perhaps the Senate should actually pass a plan or the President actually lay one out. I don't think we've really seen that. But again, if we see that, we'll be willing to work with our friends and try and redistribute the cuts.

But don't have any illusion that we're going to eliminate them. We're not, any more than our friends eliminated the idea of tax cuts when the Bush tax cuts ran out. This is something we feel is a first step in getting our fiscal house in order.

And let me remind my friend, as I know he knows, this bill, in itself, is an effort to work with the President and the administration. The President has said, and I think quite correctly, that we need to avoid a government shutdown. Mr. ROGERS and the Appropriations Committee are acting early and acting, I think, in a very responsible manner to put a vehicle out there and begin to move it through the process.

We are more than willing for the Senate to do the same thing, would expect that they will. They may well add other departments. Frankly, speaking only for myself, I would hope that they do. I would like to recapture a lot of the appropriations work that was done for the fiscal year 2013 and lost during the CR process, and we can have, I think, a good negotiation going back and forth between the two parties.

So this is the beginning of a process. It's the beginning of a return to regular order, and it's an opportunity to work, I think, in a bipartisan fashion.

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

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

And I have great respect for my colleague from Oklahoma, and I appreciate the efforts that he has made toward bipartisanship on a number of bills; but, quite frankly, the leadership of this House has not adhered to regular order. We haven't seen regular in order a long time.

And when he talks about trying to find an alternative to sequestration, I would remind my colleague that Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who is about to speak, has tried on four occasions—on four occasions—to be able to come to the floor and offer his alternative to sequestration that the Democrats support—I think some Republicans would support it as well—to have a debate and to have an up-or-down vote to avoid these mindless, senseless, across-the-board, indiscriminate cuts that have now gone into place. He's been denied all four times.

Now, by contrast, the Republicans have had zero alternatives. That's right, zero. They have brought nothing to the floor in this Congress to avoid sequestration. We're in March—January, February, March. We're in March, so we've had time to come up with alternatives. We've had an alternative that we have not allowed to be brought to the floor.

And let me just say, the United States Senate did actually pass an alternative with 51 votes. That's a majority. Unfortunately, I think, partly due to the influence of some of the House leadership here, the Republicans said, no, you need 60 votes to get that thing through.

So we have been trying. The White House has been trying. So the fact that we are here and that my Republican friends have allowed sequestration to go into effect, I think, is, quite frankly, unconscionable. We should not be in this mess.

And sequestration took effect last week. We should have stayed in session all week and tried to figure this out. And my friends adjourned the House, recessed the House on Thursday—no urgency, no nothing. And research to education funding to funding for roads and bridges. It will impact, in a negative way, jobs. People will lose their jobs.

This is not a good deal. This is not a good deal. And, quite frankly, we should be here today trying to find an alternative.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, and thank my colleague, Mr. COLE, for his efforts, but this bill falls short in a number of areas. But most of all, it falls short because it does nothing to prevent the loss of 750,000 American jobs that will result because of the sequester.

"Sequester" is just a fancy Washington name for hundreds of thousands of American jobs lost. That's going to squeeze middle class families; it's going to squeeze small businesses.

And that 750,000 jobs lost number, that's not the President's number, Mr. Speaker. That's not my number. That's the number from the nonpartisan, independent Congressional Budget Office, who have told us that if the sequester stays in place till the end of this cal-

endar year, you'll have 750,000 less Americans working at a time when we have a very fragile recovery going on.

Just last week, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve said that it would reduce economic growth this year by one-third. Why would we want to do that when we have an alternative?

And, as Mr. MCGOVERN said, we have now tried four times to have an up-or-down vote on the floor of this House on a plan that would replace the sequester in a balanced way. So it would achieve the same amount of deficit reduction as the across-the-board sequester, but without the massive job loss that comes with the sequester because we do it in a targeted way over a period of time.

We reduce overpayments and subsidies to the agriculture area, which there's consensus on, but we also close some big tax loopholes. We say big oil companies no longer need big taxpayer subsidies, something that President Bush proposed. And yet our colleagues are so insistent on protecting those special interest tax breaks and not allowing those funds to be used to reduce the deficit, that they haven't even allowed a vote up or down here on the floor of the House.

As my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN said, we have now tried four times. How many times have our Republican colleagues put forward a solution to replace the sequester this year? Zero. Zero when it counts.

So this is a very simple question. As part of this bill, we should have an up-or-down vote in the people's House on a choice. We're not asking our colleagues to vote for it, but I think if you look at surveys from the American people, the overwhelming majority of the American people support this replacement approach, this balanced approach to avoiding the sequester, than the huge job losses that result as a result of the sequester.

And people should not be misled when they look at the numbers in different funding categories in this bill, because it's not what it seems. They will be cut dramatically. That will mean fewer researchers looking for cures and treatments to diseases, fewer nurses taking care of veterans at our hospitals.

So, Mr. Speaker, we just ask, in the interest of openness and transparency, give us a vote. Give the American people a vote on an alternative to the sequester so we don't lose hundreds of thousands of jobs.

Mr. COLE. Just for the purpose of response, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate my good friend's offer on staying in session last week. It would have been nice if we'd have dealt with this 18 months ago. We've known it's been coming. We tried to do that twice.

I'm not sure the President would have been around last week. Frankly, he spent the last 6 weeks crisscrossing the country, campaigning and bludgeoning people, as opposed to having a

dialogue. He did not bother to invite the Speaker, the Majority Leader, or the leader of the Senate or the minority leader of this House to a meeting until the very last day—the very last day. Now, that suggests to us there wasn't a great deal of interest in serious negotiations.

So, again, this process is going to allow that to occur. We're going to advance our bill through this Chamber. It's going to have incorporated some of the work in the appropriations process. It's going to help the Defense Department a great deal.

We're waiting for our friends in the Senate to do the same thing. They're going to, undoubtedly, add some things. I think there will be a negotiation. I think we will end up in a good place. But we will preserve the spending reductions of the sequester in the final product of the bill.

With all due respect to my friend, revenue's off the table. You had revenue about 6, 8 weeks ago with no cuts. This time I suspect you're going to get cuts and no revenue.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my distinguished colleague, classmate, and a distinguished physician.

□ 1040

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is an important bill that we are considering today. It's not a perfect bill. It's not the bill that I would write if I had the power to write the bill. But it's an important bill. And as a conservative, I'm going to support the rule and I'm going to support the bill.

Mr. COLE already referenced that the most important thing that's happening this morning is the savings that began last Friday are locked in in the continuing resolution. These are savings that have been anticipated for years, delayed for months, and finally arrived last Friday. The market responded yesterday with an all-time high. It's time to let those savings work their magic on the American economy.

It does allow the Department of Defense the flexibility that they asked for to be able to manage their business with the reduced level of funding. And I think protecting our soldiers and protecting the pay of our soldiers is one of the highest constitutional functions of this body and one that we should take seriously. I believe this bill does that.

This bill also protects funding for our veterans, which is also important.

I know a lot of people on my side are concerned because the President's Affordable Care Act, the President's government takeover of health care, is not damaged in this exchange. In truth, some of the funding for implementation is reduced because it's kept at last year's levels and it is affected by the savings in the sequester. But to those on my side who would say it doesn't go far enough in restricting the Affordable Care Act, I would say that we are going

to get opportunities to fight that fight—multiple opportunities—in the few short weeks ahead. Where will they come? They will come in our budget. They will come in the appropriations bill. The appropriations bills, in the House, at least, will be run in an open fashion. There will be open appropriations bills. And in Labor-HHS there will be ample opportunity to demand of the Federal agencies involved with implementation that they share with us the data about how this thing is supposed to start October 1, when they have really been very reticent to share anything.

Speaking of reticent to share anything, how about the administration, which hid the ball before election day on all these rules that have now come forward since November 6? No wonder the Governors were reluctant to accept the exchanges. No wonder the Governors have held off in some States from accepting the Medicaid expansion. Because they weren't told what the deal would be until after the President's election was reassured. That's pretty disingenuous of the administration to run things that way, and I believe they should be held to account. And more importantly, in the 6 months between now and October 1, when every American who wants to buy in the exchange is supposed to be able to go to their computer and buy on the exchange, I don't believe they can actually build that system in the time required, regardless of how much money we give them.

It is important to hold those agencies accountable. Our committee work will do that. As an oversight committee on the authorization side, we will continue to do that. And I think that's important work.

So I ask conservatives to join me in that fight as we go forward. Let's fight this on the budget, let's fight it on our open rules in the appropriations process. Today, it's an important bill. Not a perfect bill, but it's an important bill. It protects our soldiers. It protects our veterans. And it locks in those savings for the long-suffering American taxpayer that they have waited for for so long.

I urge support of the rule and support of the underlying bill.

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

Just so there is no confusion, I think it's important that I point out to my colleagues that we have had three rounds of cuts to one round of revenue increases. The cuts have overwhelmed the revenue increases. So the notion that somehow we've engaged in a balanced process I don't think is the case. And the notion that somehow closing these tax loopholes and corporate tax loopholes that even Mitt Romney and George Bush at one time supported in order that we don't cut medical research, research aimed at trying to find cures to Alzheimer's and Parkinson's and diabetes—if we found cures for those diseases, not only would we

prevent a lot of human suffering, we'd save a lot of money.

But we're cutting medical research and we're pushing farther off the date that we're going to find breakthroughs in order to protect taxpayer subsidies to big oil companies that are making zillions of dollars? They really need a handout from the United States taxpayer? And you're cutting medical research, you're cutting Head Start, you're cutting programs that help people get an education, that protect our communities, our law enforcement officials, environmental protection. We're cutting all those things mindlessly in order to protect these corporate tax loopholes.

This is crazy. I really believe that outside of this little bubble here in Washington there is a bipartisan consensus that what we're doing here is crazy. This doesn't make any sense. This does not make any sense. Mindless, senseless, across-the-board cuts.

No urgency. We're going to go home today. There's a little snow on the ground. National Airport is closed. We can't really go anywhere until it reopens. We ought to stay here and figure out an alternative to sequestration.

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

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect bill. This is a disgraceful bill. And this process is not on the level.

Yesterday, Wall Street celebrated its highest close in history. And today it's going higher. A few years ago, they came here, hat in hand, insisting on a bailout. They got a bailout. And it was paid for by Main Street, who didn't cause the problem but suffered the consequences, and it was paid for by the middle class, who didn't cause the problem but suffered the consequences. And now we have a budget that is doubling down, grinding down on the middle class.

What economic philosophy is at work here? America has always been at its best when it has had budgets that promote economic growth and middle class opportunity. This budget has adopted a notion that austerity is a goal in and of itself. And how will we get to fiscal balance without economic growth and an expanding middle class? Our colleagues say in this budget it will be by putting the heel of austerity on the throat of middle class opportunity. That is wrong.

Forty-four percent of the cuts are focused on 14 percent of the budget. That's kids going to college; it's little kids showing up in school hungry who can get a meal; it's TSA workers who are going to get furloughed and who pay their bills month to month. This is disgraceful, and it is also a repudiation of what has made America great—a confidence that we are all in it together. And if we have a budget where we share the pain and we share the opportunity, we'll be the better for it.

Wall Street has a second reason to celebrate today because this budget is

absolutely doubling down on promoting the well-being of the haves at the expense of the middle class in the great American tradition of middle class opportunity. Profits in this country are the highest they've been since 1950. Wages are the lowest they've been since 1966. We need to stand up for the middle class.

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

Listening to my colleagues, I'm reminded of that old saying that Washington, D.C., is 10 square miles surrounded by reality.

Let's talk a little bit about the definitions we use for cuts. First of all, the Government will spend more money this year than it did last year, just as last year it spent more money than it did the year before. We're not cutting anything. We're slowing down the rate of growth. In parts of the budget there are real cuts. But in terms of overall spending, it's ever and ever higher.

According to the much quoted, much loved Congressional Budget Office, this year we will have the highest level of income for the Federal Government in history. In the history of the United States, we will have more money to spend than we have ever spent before. And yet that same CBO estimates it will run a budget deficit if we keep sequester, if we allow the revenue that occurred in January of over \$850 billion.

Now at some point you have to reconcile the highest level of income and an \$850 billion deficit. We don't have a revenue problem here; we have a spending problem of historic and massive proportions. This is one small step in the right direction to try and get that under control.

We look forward to what our friends in the Senate do. We look forward to what the administration does. And we look forward to having a conversation over not just this bill but in the next several months we're going to have that opportunity when the Senate finally presents a budget. We'll present a budget. The administration for the fourth time in 5 years will be late but surely will at some point present a budget.

□ 1050

The American people can look at all of those.

We're going to have an opportunity for a great debate, and I suspect we'll continue to try and adjust things as we move forward to get ourselves more in balance. But let's recognize the reality. We've had four trillion-dollar deficits in a row. We have, with these cuts and with additional revenue, an \$850 billion deficit, at the minimum, in front of us. Maybe that ought to be the focus.

I can assure my friends—we all talk a lot about polling and what the American people think. I can assure you, I've done a lot of polling in my lifetime. They think the Federal Government is too big; they think it spends too much; and they would like to see

us take less of their money, not more. So if we get into a real debate here, I suspect the American people will say: Figure out a way to live within the highest level of income in American history as opposed to coming to us and asking us for more.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last night, the FAA announced that 173 air traffic control towers will be closed by April 7. So I would say to my colleague, tell the communities whose economies will be devastated by the fact that they will no longer have air service that this is not a cut. I mean, they will be losing an essential service that is vital for businesses to thrive all across this country. That is a cut.

At this point, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding time this morning.

Let me associate myself with the last comments made by Mr. MCGOVERN. He is absolutely correct; the American people are beginning to feel the impacts of sequestration.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are always talking about: We don't have a revenue problem; we don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem in this country. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a deficit problem in this country.

There are two ways, at least, where we can address the deficit. We can address it with more revenue, which is what I strongly recommend, and we can also address it with very important cuts. We have got to have a balanced approach to deficit reduction. So I've come to the floor today to strongly oppose this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I don't like the way H.R. 933 evolved. We read about it in the news media this weekend. We returned to Washington on Monday afternoon and there it was, posted. We were told that the rule would be taken up today and we would be voting on it tomorrow. But then a snowstorm came into this Capital City, and now we are voting on the rule and the CR today and we are leaving town. That is not the way to do it.

The Republican majority has instead elected to move with a bill that provides new funding levels and flexibility to just the Department of Defense and military construction and veterans, while keeping the antiquated funding levels for the remaining 10 appropriations bills. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we got serious about this and rolled up our sleeves, we could make it happen.

I cannot help but to remember the days when I was a trial judge back in North Carolina. From time to time, Mr. Speaker, we would have difficult cases. But we would send the jury in the room, we would lock the door, and we would make them deliberate; and more times than not, they would come

out with a verdict. That's the way we need to engage in this business.

This is too serious, Mr. Speaker, to have a political dimension to this debate. We've got to have common sense. We've got to make it happen.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, and I urge its defeat. We must get to the real work of governing in this country and stop the political theater.

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

Just, again, to get back to the big picture for a moment, as my friends know, we're going to spend about \$3.5 trillion this year in the Federal budget. These dreaded cuts, in terms of the total budget, amount to 2.4 percent of all spending—2.4 percent of \$3.5 trillion. I suspect the American people think: You could find a better way to distribute those cuts than closing our towers.

I agree, actually, with my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN. One of those towers, by the way, is in my district, so I certainly understand it. I have 20,000 Federal defense employees in my district, so I'm quite aware of the problems with the distribution of the cuts.

Now, I'll leave it to my friends on the other side of the aisle and Mr. Woodward to argue whose idea this was and what purpose and how it was constructed, but it's hardly as if the President of the United States or our friends in the Senate were innocent bystanders in all of this.

We tried twice last year to sit down and renegotiate. We moved something through. We've said repeatedly this year we're willing to sit down and renegotiate the cuts. To me, that's compromise.

The President talks a lot about a balanced approach. Two months ago, he got a lot of revenue. That's his side of the equation. This time it should be cuts. That's an appropriate balance. We'll sit down and renegotiate where they should come from—we think we've got some great ideas on that—but they are going to occur. They're the first and appropriate step toward getting our fiscal house back in order.

So when my friends want to work with us about the distribution, I know they'll find a willing negotiating partner in the Speaker. Until such time, we will follow the course that the President laid out, advocated for, and signed into law. If he wants to revisit that, we agree with him, let's revisit it and redistribute it, but the cuts are going to occur.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his words. I associate myself with Mr. MCGOVERN. But also, I do acknowledge Mr. COLE, my good friend. You have certainly joined us on bipartisan issues, as has already been stated, and I thank you

for that. But I do want to, in essence, gently correct the gentleman on whether or not the President got his, it's now time for us to get ours.

I think what we have missed is that this is an ongoing process, an ongoing process to find the right balance of revenue and the right balance of cuts. Let it also be on the record that we've cut over \$1 trillion already, and I can tell you that it has come out of the backs of poor people.

Now, let me give you some resounding, exciting breaking news: the Dow hit the highest amount yesterday, 14,253.77, the highest in history. Wall Street is celebrating while the backs of poor people are being broken.

This is not a rule that should pass today. We should remain snowed out. We shouldn't even be here. Snow us out until we can get the right kind of balance.

This is the bill that we received in less than 24 hours, and they're asking us to vote on it. And while we're asked to vote on it, let me suggest to you that the long-term unemployed will be particularly impacted:

\$130 a month will come out of their unemployment. It will be brutal to government workers and job training programs, those that we slash and burn, but these are the men and women that work and do the business of government;

For women who are caretakers, they will find that 50 percent of them are more likely to hold government jobs, they're going to be impacted;

\$725 million is going to come out of poor people's children's education;

Those of us who support community health clinics, \$120 million of Federal support for community health centers will just drop, and 900,000 patients will not be served. 540,000 doses of vaccine will not be there.

The point is that when it comes to the backs of those who will bear the brunt, it will be those who need clean energy, education, and research and development.

I introduced H.R. 900, a simple bill to get rid of the sequester. My point would be that we need to go back to work and vote "no" on the rule. It is on the backs of poor people.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of response.

First, I appreciate my good friend, whom I have worked with on a number of things, most recently the Violence Against Women Act, where she certainly ably represented the bill in the Rules Committee and on the floor, and I appreciate that very much. I'm going to gently correct in return.

When we talk about cuts that were previously agreed to, with all due respect to my friends, most of those cuts still haven't even taken place. If you look at them, they are far in the future, in the 10-year window.

These were not cuts, by the way, that the two sides found contentious. This was the easy stuff that they all agreed

to right up front. It wasn't as if there was some concession.

The real discussion was in the next round of cuts, where the supercommittee wasn't able to come to an agreement. Even there, there were \$600 or \$700 million in agreed-upon "cuts" that both sides acknowledge. There just wasn't agreement about revenue, and so the cuts didn't occur.

Well, we're here today, and just as the tax increases were written into law effectively when the Bush tax cuts sunsetted in January, these cuts are also written into law.

□ 1100

Again, since they're written into law, they're going to occur. Now, we're willing, again, to sit down with our friends and redistribute where they come from. We think that would be the prudent thing to do. We tried to do it twice last year. It didn't work out. Nobody was interested in talking to us last year. The President wasn't interested in putting a proposal on until, if anything, recent days, and I really couldn't still tell you what it truly is.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I will finish my point, and I will be happy to yield to my friend briefly.

I think that the reality is we ought to recognize—just as I urge my friends on my side of the aisle to recognize—as we approach the end of the Bush tax cuts, that they're going to end. We ought to sit down and negotiate with our friends some better and more proper distribution, whether we like it or not. That's just the case. It's going to be that way. That's what's going to happen here.

Now, we would rather renegotiate, minimize the harm and spread that 2.4 percent over the entire \$3.5 trillion budget. I suspect our friends would like to do that, too, over time, and hopefully we can arrive at that. So I look forward to continuing the dialogue, but the cuts are going to be secured. This legislation will move through the House, and then I'm sure something will move through the Senate and we'll sit down and negotiate in a bipartisan, bicameral manner.

With that, I yield to my good friend from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman's tone, and let it be known that all of us want to engage in that kind of civil discussion. I assume, if we all got locked up in a room, we'd be able to find the compromise.

Let me just indicate that the revenues and cuts that you just spoke about are over a 10-year period, but they're still cuts. This bill not only adds to that, but then the sequester adds to that, as well.

Our suggestion in my remarks is that this will have a heavy, heavy, heavy, heavy impact on vulnerable and innocent persons.

The cuts are going forward, and so my question is: Why can't we continue

the discussion on how we balance cuts and revenues? We must operate the government.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, if I may, I think the gentlelady asked a good question, and I look forward to working with my friends on the other side of the aisle. I actually think today is the beginning of a process where that will happen. It's one of the reasons I really commend Chairman ROGERS for moving early.

We're not in a last-minute crisis atmosphere here, and we're not trying to jam our friends in the Senate. We want them to move as quickly and expeditiously as they can. We would like to move toward the discussion and talks with them, and I'm sure the administration will be involved in that.

To me, that's a step back toward what I would like and what we all talk about around here, which is regular order. While that's going on, we can engage in the normal appropriations process for fiscal year 2014.

So, as difficult as this is—and we've been through a difficult time, I think, in recent months and over the last year plus, honestly—this may be the first step back in the right direction.

Again, I respect that my friends have a different point of view on this, but I'm talking what I would view as political reality to them, just as I did to my friends on my own side of the aisle a few weeks ago. This is going to occur, so let's just be reasonable and rational about how it is. We're going to have a lower deficit because of that. I think that's one of the reasons that Wall Street is doing well. But who knows? It's always hard to predict what's going on there.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

It's really a shame we've come to this point where the dysfunction of this Congress is going to inflict harm on families, on the military, and on communities throughout America.

I have great respect for my friend from Oklahoma. He has reached across the aisle, and he has tried to work with us to find common solutions, but he knows the truth. The truth is that discretionary domestic spending as a percentage of our GDP is at the lowest it's been since the Eisenhower administration. He knows that the Federal tax burden, the revenue side of the ledger, is the lowest since Harry Truman was in the White House. He knows that the gap between spending and revenue has grown since the last time we balanced the budget under Bill Clinton, when it was much closer.

We have to get our arms around spending, but not in a mindless, meat-axe way. It is going to hurt America. And to bake it into this continuing resolution, in my view, is a terrible mistake. If the Republican side of the aisle wants to embrace sequestration as its

own with this fairy tale that "it's just a haircut; it's not much, especially when you look at the overall size of Federal spending," that will come as news to communities, to travelers, to consumers, and to the American public who, in fact, will feel the brunt of the sequestration in this continuing resolution.

The other aspect of this continuing resolution, and why I oppose this rule, Mr. Speaker, is that, once again, we treat the Federal employee like a punching bag. For the 3rd year in a row, we freeze their salary. They have already contributed, and they were the only group singled out to contribute to the Federal debt reduction to the tune of \$100 billion in lost wages and benefit cutbacks. We use the freeze on Congress as a subterfuge to get at Federal employees.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and support my bill to freeze congressional salaries, H.R. 636. Seventy-three cosponsors have already decided to do so.

It is a shame that House Republicans cannot find a way to put aside ideology to work with us to avert the devastating cuts of sequestration. The Continuing Resolution presents the perfect opportunity to stop this self-inflicted wound on our economy, our military, and our families.

The consequences of Republican inaction will be particularly hard felt in my community, which is home to so many people who work for or partner with the federal government. That pain will spread across Virginia and the rest of the nation as no community will be spared from these meat-axe cuts as they ripple through the economy. Every community that receives direct federal assistance, has residents who work for the federal government or is home to an employer who does work with the federal government will be affected.

The slowdown in government spending has been a drag on local and state economies across the entire country and the unemployment rate for the past two years. GDP growth in the 4th Quarter of 2012 slowed to 0.1% after growing at 3.1% in the 3rd Quarter based largely on a 22% reduction in defense spending.

Now the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office projects economic growth for this year will be half of what it otherwise might be as a result of these new cuts. In addition, a study by George Mason University estimates sequestration will lead to loss of more than 2 million jobs.

Since last August, I have joined members of the regional delegation, as well as industry leaders and federal employee groups, in calling on Congress to find a balanced alternative to sequestration. I agree that we must take reasonable steps to address our debt. However, I cannot accept the House Republican philosophy that the only way to do this is through cuts alone.

We cannot cut our way to prosperity. We must have a balanced approach that finds strategic cuts and savings while maintaining critical investments that ensure our competitiveness in the global economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule so that we can bring up a balanced approach to replace sequestration along with my

bill to protect federal employees from yet another pay freeze.

My bill, H.R. 636, would freeze Member salaries for the duration of the 113th Congress. If anyone's salary should be frozen as a result of our nation's fiscal situation it is Members of Congress.

Our dedicated Federal employees are on the front lines protecting and serving the public every day in our communities. Yet House Republicans have routinely used them as a punching bag. The men and women who have dedicated their careers to public service are still weathering a pay freeze that will have lasted more than two years, and they have made sacrifices in pay and benefits totaling more than \$100 billion to help reduce our nation's debt.

Now, because House Republicans refuse to work with us to avert sequestration, they are facing furloughs and the loss of up to 20% of their pay in some cases on top of having their pay frozen for a third consecutive year as part of this CR.

Mr. Speaker, sequestration was put in place to force Congress to act, not to become law. I remain committed to preventing these harmful cuts, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this rule so we can bring up a balanced approach that will do just that.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with my good friend from Virginia on his point about discretionary spending. It's probably an area that he and I would find a considerable amount of common ground on. I certainly do think that far too much of this is coming out of the discretionary side of the budget, particularly in defense, but I would say across the board.

I have Indian health facilities in my district that will be hit, and I have the National Severe Storms Laboratory in my district that will be hit. I understand my friend makes those points. He's making a very important point.

Now, we've been willing to go where no man has gone before, the nondiscretionary side of the budget. The Ryan budget, which you may like or not like, or the Ryan plan on Medicare is a real attempt to deal with where we all in the room know the real problem is, and that's on the nondiscretionary side of the budget.

I hope that our friends put their ideas out there. The President has put, and sometimes withdrawn, but has put a number of interesting ideas on the table at various points. We never seem to quite get there, whether it's change CPI or raising age over time gradually on some of our programs.

Now, my friends on the other side, at least our distinguished minority leader, has refused to ever do that. Whether it's Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid, it's been: We're going to defend this ground; we're not going to make any changes. At the end of the day, that's the kind of thing that we're going to have to deal with.

As an appropriator, as somebody who, like my friend from Virginia, sees the impacts of these discretionary reductions and this squeezing down, I

think that is the solution. I think that's at least a big part of the solution.

I have no illusions we're going to settle all our deficit problems with this bill, but we are taking a step in the right direction. Hopefully our friends, and our side as well, will expand the dialogue to include the nondiscretionary side of the budget in the weeks and months ahead, and we can begin to arrive at common ground. But we can't simply allow Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, and farm programs—I'll put some of our sacred cows on the table as well—to expand by a matter of law without any effort to look at them.

We've offered to do that. We've actually written a budget that has done that. We've gone through the political fires. I can assure my friends you can do that and still survive as a majority. And we're anxious to do that going forward. If we can find willing partners in that, both on the other side of the aisle, the other side of the rotunda, and the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, I think we'll actually be on the road to doing something.

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

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. At least, over time, 750,000 people will lose their jobs as a result of the sequester.

Who are these Americans? They're Federal employees who inspect our food or who inspect toxic waste dumps or who work in the Federal court system or for the FBI. But they're also people in small businesses around the country and big businesses. It's the woman who owns a software company who has a contract with NOAA, the National Weather Service, that gets canceled or cut back. It is the caterer who serves an Air Force base or an Army base or a Coast Guard facility. It is the small businessperson who is a utility contractor on a transportation project to be funded by Federal dollars. These are real people who, over time, will be very badly affected by this.

We have a plan that would save these jobs but continue to reduce the deficit. It's Mr. VAN HOLLEN's plan. That plan says that we should save an equal amount the sequester would save by cutting back on corporate welfare to huge oil companies, by cutting back on corporate welfare for huge agribusinesses that own land and get payments from the Federal taxpayers through the Ag Department, and that anyone who makes more than \$2 million a year should have to pay at least 30 percent of their income under the Tax Code and not exploit loopholes and deductions.

□ 1110

Today would be the right day to take a vote on that plan. My friends on the

other side would probably oppose the plan. That's obviously within their right. But the House has not yet taken up any proposals to save these 750,000 jobs. That is wrong. You can disagree with our proposal, you can try to amend our proposal, you can try to do better than our proposal, but for the House not to take one vote on saving these 750,000 jobs is wrong.

We will have an opportunity on the previous question vote to remedy that wrong.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. A "no" vote on the previous question would mean that this body could take an up-or-down vote on whether or not to save these 750,000 jobs while still reducing the deficit in the ways that I just talked about.

Look, the basic job that we have around here is to make decisions and take votes. If you vote with us, that's fine; if you vote against us, that's fine. That's democracy. We should celebrate it. But to fail to take a vote is to avoid that responsibility.

Let's accept our responsibility to turn off this sequester, save those 750,000 jobs and vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, just very quickly I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my friend. I can assure you that we take this very serious, as well. I have lots of Federal employees, and the real job loss won't be theirs. They will certainly be hard-hit, they'll be furloughed, but the real job loss, as my friend suggests, really is in the private sector, and that's why we should sit down and have a serious discussion about entitlement costs.

With all due respect to my friend, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, my friends on the other side of the aisle, I don't think that proposal would pass. I certainly wouldn't vote for it. I want that very much in the RECORD.

If our friends want to do something, they do have control of the United States Senate. That's a body that can do whatever it wants to do, and we'll see what happens going forward.

Again, what I'm pleased with is, I think this is the beginning of a real discussion and the beginning of a real dialogue. We're going to do some good things in terms of giving flexibility to the Defense Department and our friends that deal with military construction and the VA. We're anxious to hear ideas on the other side. But we are going to reduce spending, and we're going to reduce it not by an extraordinary amount, but by 2.4 percent of the entire \$3.5 trillion Federal budget, and we're willing to renegotiate where those cuts come from. I think that's a pretty reasonable position to have.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for his graciousness and fairness in all respects.

I'm not sure anyone has control over the United States Senate. But I am sure of this: last week a proposal very similar to the one that I just talked about that would save those three-quarters of a million jobs got 51 votes on the floor of the United States Senate, a majority. Of course, under their peculiar rules, it required 60 votes to go forward.

So understand this: a majority of the United States Senate, in fact, adopted the plan that I talked about. We should be given the chance to do the same thing.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, I'd be happy if the United States Senate decided to operate collectively instead of individually, but I didn't write their rules and neither did my friends. I'm sure if we got to write them—although we've both sent a lot of our friends over there, neither of them seem to be willing to sit down and change the rules to make them a more functional body.

But I'm glad you've moved the discussion to where we both agree away from our adversarial discussion toward the real enemy, the United States Senate, which has a hard time acting.

In this case, honestly I think they are going to act, and I say that with a great deal of respect to Senator REID and to Senator MCCONNELL. I think that they will produce a product to make sure that something doesn't happen that we all agree shouldn't happen. The President doesn't think the government should shut down. We don't think the government should shut down. I don't believe our friends in the Senate think it should shut down.

This is actually a pretty good day. It may not be the perfect bill from my friends's standpoint. I certainly respect that. It's probably not the perfect bill from all of our Members' standpoint.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I will in a moment. Let me just finish my point.

But we will move in the right direction. We will actually move to avoid a government shutdown. We'll leave open an avenue of negotiation with our friends in the Senate. I'm sure the President will be involved in discussion at some point too. So I take some heart from that.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, my friend reflected on some criticism of the Senate, which I would generally agree with.

I would say this, though: the Senate did something we've not done. They put a Republican plan on the Senate floor to end the sequester and save those 750,000 jobs and a Democratic plan on the floor to save those 750,000 jobs. I think we owe it to our constituents, to our country to do the same thing. This is the opportunity to do that.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, we'll have an opportunity in the sense of the previous question. We'll see how the majority shakes out on that issue. I'm sure my friends will regard that as effectively a vote on their proposal.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire of the gentleman whether he has any additional requests for speakers?

Mr. COLE. I'm certainly prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. We are prepared to close as well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, that the time to act has long since passed. We are now in sequester.

Budgets across the board and in a mindless and senseless way are being slashed. Air traffic control towers are being shut down. That will result in an adverse impact on local economies. We will lose jobs. You've heard over and over that we're told that we should expect a job loss of 750,000 people.

What do they do? They lose their job, and they go on unemployment. Where is the future? Where is the savings that my friends are talking about when you throw people out of work?

My friends talk about tough choices. Well, we ought to assume tough choices. You're going to have health clinics that are going to be reduced in their funding. You're going to have transportation projects reduced in their funding. You're going to have cuts in WIC; you're going to have cuts in Head Start; you're going to have cuts in programs that benefit the most vulnerable people in our communities.

None of us in this Chamber has to absorb a tough choice. It's the people we represent. It's the people in this country who are getting shafted as a result of this sequestration.

The time to act has long since passed. Mr. VAN HOLLEN has time and time and time again—not once, not twice, not three times, but four times tried to bring an alternative to the House floor. All he's asked for is that we have an up-or-down vote on his proposal, and four times he has been rejected. By contrast, this year, my friends have brought up not a single alternative to avoid sequestration.

All we're asking for is a little democracy here on the floor of the House of Representatives, a chance for us to debate and have an up-or-down vote not on a procedural motion, but on the actual legislation, up or down. We've been denied that.

My friends, if they have an alternative they want to bring, fine. Bring that up there too. We'll have two votes, and we can debate our priorities so the American people know where we stand.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that the House votes on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's bill to replace the sequester and on Mr.

CONNOLLY's bill to freeze pay for Members of Congress for the next 2 years.

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 just want to again say to my friends that it is important for them to appreciate the devastation of these cuts.

Head Start: the CR will allow sequestration to cut \$400 million, resulting in a potential loss of 70,000 Head Start slots for comprehensive early learning and development services.

Job training programs: the CR will allow sequester to cut \$282 million, resulting in hundreds of thousands of unemployed adults, dislocated workers, veterans, young adults and students losing access to employment services.

Title I grants, education of the disadvantaged: the CR will allow sequestration to cut \$730 million, which is the equivalent of cutting the extra instructional services for more than 2,500 schools serving more than 1 million disadvantaged children who are struggling academically.

Special education grants: the CR will allow sequestration to cut more than \$580 million, which is the rough equivalent of shifting the cost of educating nearly 300,000 students with special needs to State and local education agencies. This also may result in more than 700,000 layoffs of teachers, aides and other staff serving students with disabilities.

□ 1120

Child care: the CR will allow sequestration to cut \$115 million, which would cause, roughly, 30,000 children to lose access to child care, further exacerbating the fact that only one in six children eligible for Federal child care assistance receives it.

Cancer screenings: the CR will allow sequestration to cut funding for cancer screenings, resulting in 25,000 fewer breast and cervical cancer screenings for low-income women.

I can go on and on and on, but here is the choice: the choice is either this process, which my Republican colleagues have embraced, or the one that Mr. VAN HOLLEN has outlined—one that would say we're not going to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable, on the backs of the needy, on the backs of the middle class but that—do you know what?—we're going to get rid of some of these corporate loopholes that my friends on the other side used to be in favor of closing. We're not going to continue to have taxpayer subsidies for big oil companies. We're going to have some balance in our approach to dealing with our deficit. The problem with the approach my friends have outlined—the problem with the sequestration—is that it is

not balanced. It is wrong-headed; it is mindless; it is senseless; and it is cruel.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and to defeat the previous question, and I urge a “no” vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to begin by, frankly, agreeing with my friend. The time to act has long since passed. We tried to act a long time ago. We tried to act in May, but nobody in the Senate chose to pick up our bill. They sent us back something different, which was their right, but it didn't do anything at all. We tried to act in December, but nobody did anything in the Senate then.

We offered to negotiate with the President for weeks. Instead, we saw a 6-week, an 8-week campaign all over the country. There was no time, evidently, in the President's busy schedule in city after city, at photo op after photo op to simply get on the phone, call the Speaker and say—How would you like to come down and talk?—until the very last day before the sequester, when it had become evident that this type of political bullying wouldn't work.

So we believe the time has passed to act. That's why we're acting today. We are actually going to secure the cuts that are in the legislation that the President advocated for. He originated the idea—I accept the Woodward version of that, I suppose—and he signed it into law. He had 18 months to do something about it. We offered two opportunities in that timeframe to do something, and the Speaker has always been available to sit down with the President and do something.

We are going to take a small step in the right direction. Now, let's not overestimate what we're doing. We could probably take more pride in this than is warranted. Our friends, I think, are shouting more alarm than is necessary. This is \$85 billion in a \$3.5 trillion deficit—2.4 percent. We ought to be able to do that in our sleep. Quite frankly, we are willing to sit down and renegotiate with our friends from where they come. We are not willing to renegotiate the total amount of the money involved. Over time, it does add up to \$1.2 trillion. That's a lot of money, but it's not anywhere near what it's going to take to get our budget in balance.

I look forward to the debates we're going to have on that in the budget discussions ahead; but let's right now, while we have that debate and while we go through that process, take the responsible step that the President urges us to take and that we all agree on, which is simply to make sure that the government doesn't shut down while we have our discussion and sort out our differences.

I applaud Chairman ROGERS and Chairman SESSIONS for making that possible, particularly for bringing this bill in a timely fashion, giving us enough time when we're not going to be jammed. I know our friends in the

Senate are going to try and do the same thing. They're going to produce, I have no doubt, a different product than we have. That's fine. We'll negotiate it out, and we'll avoid a government shutdown, but we will secure these savings for the taxpayers of the United States, and we will then take the next step in a longer discussion.

I believe we've had a good debate on the rule. I believe the underlying bill provides the American people with the hope that we can do the basic functions that we were sent here to accomplish—funding the government. I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to commend the Chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, Mr. ROGERS, and the Chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, for their determination and perseverance in bringing the completed Defense and Military Construction/VA bills to the floor for our consideration. Since before the end of the last fiscal year, they have been committed to completing our FY '13 bills and move them onto the President's desk for his signature.

Why? Because they understood the damage that would be done to our national security if DoD was forced to operate under the funding levels and restrictions placed on them by our FY '12 bill.

By passing this package today, we will be giving our military leadership additional flexibility to protect their mission and capabilities in this constrained fiscal environment.

I would also add that passage of these measures today reinforces Congress' authority to set policy for the Department of Defense in important areas such as Air Force force structure, the retirement of Navy ships, increasing the pace of Navy shipbuilding, etc. and not cede it to the Executive Branch solely.

I am also pleased that the package also allows additional funding for nuclear weapons modernization, to ensure the safety, security, and reliability of the nation's nuclear stockpile.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 99 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 699) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to repeal and replace the 2013 sequestration. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may

have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 699 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 636) to prohibit Members of Congress from receiving any automatic pay adjustments through the end of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bills specified in sections 2 or 3 of this resolution.

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 Democratic minority 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.”

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

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

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

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

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the 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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 188, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Bonner	Carter
Alexander	Boustany	Cassidy
Amash	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Amodel	Bridenstine	Chaffetz
Bachmann	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Bachus	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Barletta	Brown (GA)	Collins (GA)
Barr	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Barton	Bucshon	Conaway
Benishek	Burgess	Cook
Bentivolio	Calvert	Cotton
Bilirakis	Camp	Cramer
Bishop (UT)	Campbell	Crawford
Black	Cantor	Crenshaw
Blackburn	Capito	Culberson

Daines	Kelly	Ribble	Lujan, Ben Ray	Pelosi	Shea-Porter
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	Rice (SC)	(NM)	Perlmutter	Sherman
Denham	King (NY)	Rigell	Maffei	Peters (CA)	Sinema
Dent	Kingston	Roby	Maloney,	Peters (MI)	Slaughter
DeSantis	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)	Carolyn	Peterson	Smith (WA)
DesJarlais	Kline	Rogers (AL)	Maloney, Sean	Pingree (ME)	Speier
Duffy	Labrador	Rogers (KY)	Markey	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rogers (MI)	Matsui	Price (NC)	Takano
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Rohrabacher	McCarthy (NY)	Quigley	Thompson (CA)
Ellmers	Lance	Rokita	McCollum	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
Farenthold	Lankford	Roskam	McDermott	Rangel	Tierney
Fincher	Latham	Ross	McGovern	Richmond	Titus
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Rothfus	McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Tonko
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Royce	Meng	Ruiz	Tsongas
Fleming	Long	Runyan	Michaud	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Flores	Lucas	Ryan (WI)	Moore	Rush	Vargas
Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Salmon	Moran	Ryan (OH)	Veasey
Fortenberry	Lummis	Scalise	Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Vela
Fox	Marchant	Schock	Nadler	T.	Velázquez
Franks (AZ)	Marino	Schweikert	Napolitano	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Frelinghuysen	Massie	Scott, Austin	Neal	Schakowsky	Walz
Gardner	Matheson	Sensenbrenner	Negrete McLeod	Schiff	Wasserman
Garrett	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions	Nolan	Schneider	Watt
Gerlach	McCauley	Shimkus	O'Rourke	Schrader	Waters
Gibbs	McClintock	Shuster	Owens	Schwartz	Waxman
Gibson	McHenry	Simpson	Pallone	Scott (VA)	Welch
Gingrey (GA)	McKeon	Smith (NE)	Pascrell	Scott, David	Yarmuth
Gohmert	McKinley	Smith (NJ)	Pastor (AZ)	Serrano	
Goodlatte	McMorris	Smith (TX)	Payne	Sewell (AL)	
Gosar	Rodgers	Southerland			
Gowdy	Meadows	Stewart			
Granger	Meehan	Stivers	Capuano	McIntyre	Sanchez, Loretta
Graves (GA)	Messer	Stockman	Cárdenas	Meeks	Sires
Graves (MO)	Mica	Stutzman	Coble	Miller, George	Wilson (FL)
Green, Gene	Miller (FL)	Terry	Diaz-Balart	Polis	Young (AK)
Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)	Dingell	Rooney	
Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary	Thornberry	Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen	
Grimm	Mullin	Tiberi			
Guthrie	Mulvaney	Turner			
Hall	Murphy (PA)	Upton			
Hanna	Neugebauer	Valadao			
Harper	Noem	Wagner			
Harris	Nugent	Walberg			
Hartzler	Nunes	Walden			
Hastings (WA)	Nunnelee	Walorski			
Heck (NV)	Olson	Weber (TX)			
Hensarling	Palazzo	Webster (FL)			
Herrera Beutler	Paulsen	Wenstrup			
Holding	Pearce	Westmoreland			
Hudson	Perry	Whitfield			
Huelskamp	Petri	Williams			
Huizenga (MI)	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)			
Hultgren	Pitts	Wittman			
Hunter	Poe (TX)	Wolf			
Hurt	Pompeo	Womack			
Issa	Posey	Woodall			
Jenkins	Price (GA)	Yoder			
Johnson (OH)	Radel	Yoho			
Johnson, Sam	Reed	Young (FL)			
Jordan	Reichert	Young (IN)			
Joyce	Renacci				

NAYS—188

Andrews	Cuellar	Higgins
Barber	Cummings	Himes
Barrow (GA)	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Bass	Davis, Danny	Holt
Beatty	DeFazio	Honda
Becerra	DeGette	Horsford
Bera (CA)	Delaney	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Huffman
Bishop (NY)	DelBene	Israel
Blumenauer	Deutch	Jackson Lee
Bonamici	Doggett	Jeffries
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Jones
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Kaptur
Bustos	Engel	Keating
Butterfield	Enyart	Kennedy
Capps	Eshoo	Kildee
Carney	Esty	Kilmer
Carson (IN)	Farr	Kind
Cartwright	Fattah	Kirkpatrick
Castor (FL)	Foster	Kuster
Castro (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Langevin
Chu	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Cicilline	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
Clarke	Galleo	Lee (CA)
Cole	Garamendi	Levin
Collins (GA)	Garcia	Lewis
Collins (NY)	Grayson	Lipinski
Conaway	Green, Al	Loebach
Cook	Grijalva	Lofgren
Cotton	Gutierrez	Lowenthal
Cramer	Hahn	Lowe
Crawford	Hanabusa	Lujan Grisham
Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)	(NM)
Culberson	Heck (WA)	

NOT VOTING—16

Capuano	McIntyre	Sanchez, Loretta
Cárdenas	Meeks	Sires
Coble	Miller, George	Wilson (FL)
Diaz-Balart	Polis	Young (AK)
Dingell	Rooney	
Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1148

Mr. BARBER, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GINGREY of Georgia and SOUTHERLAND changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CARDENAS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 59, 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 212, noes 197, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

AYES—212

Aderholt	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Alexander	Burgess	Culberson
Amodel	Calvert	Daines
Bachmann	Camp	Davis, Rodney
Bachus	Campbell	Denham
Barber	Cantor	Dent
Barletta	Capito	DeSantis
Barr	Carter	DesJarlais
Barton	Cassidy	Diaz-Balart
Benishek	Chabot	Duffy
Bentivolio	Chaffetz	Duncan (SC)
Bilirakis	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Ellmers
Black	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Blackburn	Collins (NY)	Fincher
Bonner	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Boustany	Cook	Fleischmann
Brady (TX)	Cotton	Flores
Brooks (IN)	Cramer	Forbes
Buchanan	Crawford	Fortenberry

Foxx	Long	Rogers (MI)
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Rokita
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Roskam
Gardner	Lummis	Ross
Garrett	Marchant	Rothfus
Gerlach	Marino	Royce
Gibbs	McCarthy (CA)	Runyan
Gibson	McCaul	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	McHenry	Scalise
Gosar	McKeon	Schock
Gowdy	McKinley	Schweikert
Granger	McMorris	Scott, Austin
Graves (GA)	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner
Graves (MO)	Meadows	Sessions
Griffin (AR)	Meehan	Shimkus
Grimm	Messer	Shuster
Guthrie	Mica	Simpson
Hall	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)
Hanna	Miller (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Harper	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Harris	Mullin	Southerland
Hartzler	Mulvaney	Stewart
Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)	Stivers
Heck (NV)	Neugebauer	Stockman
Hensarling	Noem	Stutzman
Herrera Beutler	Nugent	Terry
Holding	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Hudson	Nunnelee	Thornberry
Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Tiberi
Hultgren	Owens	Tipton
Hunter	Palazzo	Turner
Hurt	Paulsen	Upton
Issa	Perry	Valadao
Jenkins	Petri	Wagner
Johnson (OH)	Pittenger	Walberg
Johnson, Sam	Pitts	Walden
Jordan	Poe (TX)	Walorski
Joyce	Pompeo	Weber (TX)
Kelly	Posey	Webster (FL)
King (IA)	Price (GA)	Wenstrup
King (NY)	Radel	Westmoreland
Kinzing (IL)	Reed	Whitfield
Kline	Reichert	Williams
Labrador	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
LaMalfa	Ribble	Wittman
Lamborn	Rice (SC)	Wolf
Lance	Rigell	Womack
Lankford	Roby	Woodall
Latham	Roe (TN)	Yoder
Latta	Rogers (AL)	Young (FL)
LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Young (IN)

NOES—197

Amash	Delaney	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	DeLauro	Jones
Barrow (GA)	DelBene	Kaptur
Bass	Deutch	Keating
Beatty	Doggett	Kennedy
Becerra	Doyle	Kildee
Bera (CA)	Duckworth	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Kind
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Kingston
Blumenauer	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Bonamici	Enyart	Kuster
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Langevin
Braley (IA)	Esty	Larson (CT)
Bridenstine	Fattah	Lee (CA)
Brooks (AL)	Fleming	Levin
Broun (GA)	Foster	Lewis
Brown (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Brownley (CA)	Fudge	Loebach
Bustos	Gabbard	Lofgren
Butterfield	Galleo	Lowenthal
Capps	Garamendi	Lowe
Cárdenas	Garcia	Luján, Ben Ray
Carney	Gingrey (GA)	(NM)
Carson (IN)	Gohmert	Maffei
Cartwright	Grayson	Maloney,
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Carolyn
Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean
Chu	Grijalva	Markey
Cicilline	Gutierrez	Massie
Clarke	Hahn	Matheson
Clay	Hanabusa	Matsui
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Clyburn	Heck (WA)	McClintock
Cohen	Higgins	McCollum
Connolly	Himes	McDermott
Conyers	Hinojosa	McGovern
Cooper	Holt	McNerney
Costa	Honda	Meng
Courtney	Horsford	Michaud
Crowley	Hoyer	Moore
Cuellar	Huelskamp	Moran
Cummings	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Davis (CA)	Israel	Nadler
Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
DeFazio	Jeffries	Neal
DeGette	Johnson (GA)	Negrete McLeod

Nolan	Rush	Takano
O'Rourke	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Pallone	Salmon	Thompson (MS)
Pascarella	Sánchez, Linda	Tierney
Pastor (AZ)	T.	Titus
Payne	Sarbanes	Tonko
Pearce	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Pelosi	Schiff	Van Hollen
Perlmuter	Schneider	Veasey
Peters (MI)	Schrader	Vela
Peterson	Schwartz	Velázquez
Pingree (ME)	Scott (VA)	Visclosky
Pocan	Scott, David	Walz
Price (NC)	Serrano	Wasserman
Quigley	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Rahall	Sherman	Waters
Richmond	Sinema	Watt
Rohrabacher	Slaughter	Waxman
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Welch
Ruiz	Speier	Yarmuth
Ruppersberger	Swailwell (CA)	Yoho

NOT VOTING—22

Capuano	Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	McIntyre	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Meeks	Shea-Porter
Farr	Miller, George	Sires
Griffith (VA)	Peters (CA)	Vargas
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Wilson (FL)
Lujan Grisham	Rangel	Young (AK)
(NM)	Rooney	

□ 1157

Ms. KUSTER changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

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 against:

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 60 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 60 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 60, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

□ 1200

PERMITTING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR A CEREMONY AS PART OF THE COMMEMORATION OF THE DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 14, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 14

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

SECTION 1. USE OF ROTUNDA FOR HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY.

The rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on April 11, 2013, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of re-

membrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR A CEREMONY TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO PROFESSOR MUHAMMAD YUNUS

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 20, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 30

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

SECTION 1. USE OF ROTUNDA FOR CEREMONY TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO PROFESSOR MUHAMMAD YUNUS.

The rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on April 17, 2013, for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Professor Muhammad Yunus in recognition of his contributions to the fight against global poverty. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the consideration of H.R. 933 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 99, I call up the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.