

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

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

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

□ 1220

#### SAVE MEDICARE

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

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

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

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

#### THE RYAN BUDGET

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

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

In order to pay for an enormous tax cut for millionaires and billionaires, they are ready to abolish the guarantee of Medicare. In order to protect tax cuts for the oil industry, they would cut Medicaid, resulting in seniors and the disabled being forced out of nursing homes and causing poor children to

lose health care coverage or pay more. In order to pay for tax cuts for businesses that ship American jobs overseas, they would cut investments in education and job training programs.

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

#### LEMOORE PILOTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### SAVE MEDICARE

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

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

sure they are adequate so seniors can get their care.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 218

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### POINT OF ORDER

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

It is very important, Madam Speaker, that you rule that this rule needs to be sent back and cleansed of that lan-

guage, or else we are, in effect, saying the passage of an act here shall be contingent upon the consideration of something in the Senate. That is a dangerous precedent, violates the laws, and violates the Constitution of the United States.

I ask for your ruling.

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

The Chair is prepared to rule.

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

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

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

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

The point of order is overruled.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman shall state it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has inquired about a matter that may be debated by the Members during consideration of the pending

resolution, rather than being addressed from the Chair.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The coming budget debate will be a seminal moment in which we must reject this failed, economic model. Today, with this historic spending cut,

we are paving the way to do just that. Madam Speaker, this is not the end of our work; but it is, as I said, just the beginning.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1240

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

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

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

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

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

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

ently, most of the savings are from allocations of money that wouldn't be spent anyway.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

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

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

away at their favorite targets, like education, the environment and the safety net.

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

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

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

#### SPENDING CUT HOKUM

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

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

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

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

An estimated \$17 billion comes from one-time savings in mandatory programs. The cuts are real, but the funding gets restored by law the next year, which means Republicans will have to refight the same battles. States lose some \$3.5 billion in bonus money to enroll more kids in the Children's Health Insurance Program, but many states failed

to qualify for that extra funding. These cuts don't reduce the spending baseline, so there are no compound savings over time.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

□ 1250

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now on the Defense portion of this bill, let me briefly refer to it. The provisions in this bill about the Defense budget are much like they were when all parties last December on both sides

of the aisle in this body and on both sides of the aisle in the Senate body agreed to the expenditures for the Department of Defense. We simply lifted those agreed-upon provisions for the Defense Department and dropped them into this bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I also have to say that one of the reasons we are having this debate on the rule today and voting on Thursday on the actual continuing resolution is because we put into place a very impor-

tant change in the rules at the beginning of this Congress which states that unreported measures must in fact comply with the 3-day layover requirement that exists for reported measures. We are subscribing to that and enforcing that.

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

□ 1310

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

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

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

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

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

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

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The majority proposed to close down the District government last week rather than pass my amendment to allow D.C. to spend its own local funds. Now the majority wants a closed rule

for a bill with attachments that profoundly affect only the District of Columbia.

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

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

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

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1320

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

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Just like that family, we in the United States Congress, we in this country need to come together and make hard choices about where to find additional income, where to cut expenditures, how to get this budget out of red and into the black. That's the difference between where the Democrats stand and the proposal of our friends on the other side. And another difference: A Democratic President has

actually balanced the budget. That's a claim that the other side can't make for more than a generation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge a “no” vote on the rule.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1330

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 219

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1217) to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the

question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

tions and must be spent whether we have the money or not.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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