

and Innovation Act (H.R. 2883). This legislation shows that we can work together across the aisle to improve our child welfare system. Yet this bill is just one step in our ongoing efforts to fix the foster care system. In this time of unacceptable poverty and inequality, we must continue to support families in order to prevent kids from being neglected or abused. As we debate how to shrink our debt, we must also ensure that preserving and improving the safety net that protects our children is a higher priority than protecting special interest tax breaks.

Despite the fact that I am not on the Human Resources Subcommittee for the first time in many years, I am pleased that my colleagues still listen to some of my ideas. Last year, Congressman LANGEVIN and I introduced a bill to reduce the high number of foster youth who are victims of identity theft and are unable to secure student loans or even get a credit card. Today's legislation includes a provision from our bill that will provide youth who are about to age out of foster care with a copy of their credit report as well as resources to help clear up any credit issues. This provision is what I hope is the first movement toward ensuring that foster youth leave the system with a clean financial slate and a chance to succeed.

There are many important provisions in today's bill: maintaining a set-aside to support caseworker visits with foster children; decreasing the overuse of psychotropic drugs on foster youth, and improving education stability for children in care.

Children in foster care are our collective responsibility. The reforms made in this bill will make children safer. I thank the Chairman, the ranking Member, and all the staff involved in crafting this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2883, "The Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act," which reauthorize Title IV-B of the Social Security Act, including the Promoting Safe and Stable Families and Child Welfare Services programs, while also reinstating the authority of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to authorize States to implement innovative demonstration programs through Title IV-E waivers.

As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I have been a stalwart supporter of protecting the health and welfare of children and families. Today there are more than 463,000 children and youth that are in out-of-home care. Every day, more than a half million U.S. children are in the foster care system with over 120,000 waiting to be adopted. With no permanent legal guardians, they are our Nation's children, and we have a responsibility to ensure a bright future for those who are handed a rough start in life. Foster children like all children deserve a safe environment to grow and nourish in. This piece of legislation is a step in the right direction in addressing the needs of our Nation's children when they need our help the most. There are many silent heroes who have opened their homes and taken on the role of foster parents, social workers, mentors, caregivers and volunteers to the children in this Nation. These young kids need to know someone is looking out for them and supporting legislation like the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act provides these silent heroes with additional resources and requirements to meet the needs of children in care.

There are an estimated 12 million foster care alumni in the U.S. representing all walks of life. Each and every one of the 12 million alumni has a story of their struggles, challenges and success. The Foster care system is supposed to ensure that children are cared for by members of our communities on a full-time or temporary basis when their parents are unable to provide adequate care. Often the natural parents cannot provide for a child's care for a variety of reasons such as due to incarceration, physical or mental illness, behavioral difficulties, or problems within the family environment. These issues may include child abuse, alcoholism, extreme poverty, or crime. These children often become wards of the State and we have the responsibility to protect their interests and to ensure they are provided with the care they need.

If even a single child continues to be abused or neglected while under state supervision then that is one child too many. This legislation, although not ideal, is a valid attempt to address the needs of families in crisis. In 2001, an estimated 903,000 U.S. children were found to be victims of abuse or neglect. This number is above the estimated 879,000 child maltreatment victims in 2000 but below the annual estimated highs of more than 1 million child maltreatment victims recorded through the mid-1990s. For the year 2001, States reported 59 percent of these victims experienced neglect, compared to 63 percent in 2000 and 58 percent in 1999. The percentage of physical abuse and sexual abuse victims has declined over the past 5 years but held constant between 2000 and 2001. These children need our protection. There are over 500,000 children in foster care and with this economic downturn I hope this number does not keep on rising. But hope is not enough, we need to continue to fund programs to help these children and their families.

The size of the foster care caseload rises or falls depending upon both the number of entries to foster care—children who are removed from their homes in a given year—and the number of exits in that same year—children reunited with their families, adopted, emancipated, or placed in another permanent setting. The number of entries to foster care has outpaced the number of exits for two decades.

Accountability is key, children who received "services from Child Protective Services died as a result of abuse 16 times more often than children in the general population 16.3 percent of all fatalities were children who had received services or were 'known to the system'. These children were already in a high risk category however, we must do our best to transform these numbers and ensure their safety. Currently at least 716 thousand children received "services" (28 States reporting) or 1 percent of the general population. If CPS intervention had no effect, 1 percent of this group would have suffered a fatality; if CPS intervention had made an improvement, the percentage would be less than 1 percent. However, it is 16.3 times that amount. (18 States reporting)

At this time children are again bearing the brunt of families in crisis. When a household falls into poverty, children are exposed to increased parental distress, inadequate childcare arrangements, and poor nutrition. This will lead to an increase of families needing child welfare services. For these reasons I support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2883, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2608, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 405 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 405

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2608) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 399 is laid on the table.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 405 provides for a closed rule for the consideration of H.R. 2608. It's a temporary continuing resolution that will fund the operations of the

United States Government through November 18 of this year. It is important to note that the funding levels in this CR are the very same fiscally responsible levels that this Congress and President Barack Obama approved in the Budget Control Act just 1 month ago. This is not a departure from our path of restoring fiscal sanity, Mr. Speaker. We are committed to continuing on that path. But, unfortunately, the actions of the other body leave us no choice but to consider this continuing resolution today.

I take no pride, Mr. Speaker, in sharing with you—actually, that's not true. That's not true at all. I take great pride in sharing with you what the House has done over the last 6 months, 7 months, 8 months; but I take no pride at all in pointing out what has not happened on the other end of this Capitol to do the work that needs to be done.

Constitutionally, we are required to fund the operations of the government. June 2 of this year, the House passed the Homeland Security appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has not.

On June 14 of this year, the House passed the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs bill. This is the one bill that our friends in the Senate have passed as well.

June 16, the House passed the Agriculture appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has taken no action at all.

July 15, the House passed the Energy and Water appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has not.

July 22, the House passed the Legislative Branch appropriations bill. To date, the Senate has not.

Mr. Speaker, I did not run for Congress last November, I did not show up here as a freshman to continue business as usual, passing continuing resolution after continuing resolution after continuing resolution. And I know my friends on both sides of the aisle believe that's a process which has long since exceeded its usefulness.

I am so proud that we as a body have begun to pass those appropriations bills one by one by one. And what have we gotten because of that? We've gotten oversight. We've had the opportunity to discuss line by line by line what are our priorities as the House. Now, those priorities differ from time to time between my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle and my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, but we have an opportunity at least to discuss those priorities.

When the other body fails to pass the appropriations bills, what choices do we have left? What choices are available to me as a new freshman Member of the House? I could choose to abrogate responsibility. I could choose to say no. No, we're just going to wait, and if the Senate fails to act, then so be it. Let the government shut down and let the chips fall where they may. That's not the kind of operation I want to run. That's not why I came to the United States Congress. I came to the United States Congress because this is

the people's House. This is where thoughtful discussion of the people's priorities takes place.

What brings me to the floor today is to consider this continuing resolution that for just 1½ short months, through November 18, will extend the operations of the government so we can continue that thoughtful discussion that I know so many of the Members here came for.

With that, I urge my colleagues to thoughtfully consider this rule today, thoughtfully consider the underlying bill; and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because our colleagues in the Republican majority have failed. They failed the most basic responsibility of this institution, as my colleague has mentioned, to pass regular and routine bills to keep the government's doors open, to keep retirement checks in the mail, and vital government services available to the American people.

In a few days the fiscal year will end; and without a stopgap measure, funding for essential government services will run out. Despite 9 months of claims from the Republican majority that things have changed and despite a pledge to America that promised a different Washington, and despite endless calls for a regular appropriations process, not a single appropriations bill has been enacted for the upcoming fiscal year which begins October 1.

Throughout this failed process, the majority has blamed everyone but themselves. They have pointed fingers at President Obama, complained about our colleagues in the Senate, and blamed the Washington status quo that they say they can't control. Throughout the process, the one group of people they won't lay responsibility with is themselves.

After 9 months with not a single bill successfully making its way through Congress, finger-pointing rings hollow. Not only has no appropriations bill been enacted, but half of the necessary appropriations bills haven't even been brought to the floor for a vote. The majority controls this body and has used their powers to pursue sideshow legislation and dangerous games of default, but they can't schedule a vote for the most fundamental pieces of legislation that we consider every year.

As I stand here today to vote on a billion-dollar Band-Aid that will allow us to scrape by until November, the hope is by November the majority will be able to do the job they failed to do all year. Growing up, every child hopes for such a homework extension. By the time we are elected to Congress, however, we should know that our work must be handed in on time.

□ 1400

Sadly, today's legislation isn't even the biggest failure of leadership that

we are facing in the House. If the press reports are accurate, we may be headed for an even bigger failure in November. In recent days, reports have surfaced that the majority plans to fund the entire Federal Government with one massive, trillion-dollar omnibus bill.

This bill would explicitly break a promise that the Republican majority made to the American people. In the Pledge to America, their leadership included a goal entitled "advance legislative issues one at a time." In the document they explain, "we will end the practice of packaging unpopular bills with must-pass legislation to circumvent the will of the American people. Instead, we will pass major legislation one issue at a time."

During a speech at the American Enterprise Institute in 2010, Speaker BOEHNER affirmed the need to consider appropriations legislation one bill at a time, saying he wanted to do away with the concept of comprehensive spending bills. On the eve of assuming the majority in the House, Speaker BOEHNER elaborated, saying, "I do not believe that having 2,000-page bills serves anyone's best interest. Not the House, not for the Members and not the American people." But, if press reports are correct, a 2,000-page bill or more is what we will get.

Let's be clear. The prospect of omnibus funding is happening for two simple reasons: First, our colleagues on the other side will not work in a bipartisan manner. There are no Democrat fingerprints on any bills that come to the floor to make the compromise necessary to reach consensus. They continue to pass legislation filled with special interest favors and ideological pursuits that the American people never asked for and don't want. As a result, the legislation is built to fail, and fail it does—over and over again.

Secondly, instead of doing the tough, unglamorous, work of the House, we have spent most of the time on ideological quests and political games. Instead of fulfilling the pledge to uphold the Constitution, the majority has worked to fulfill campaign pledges to Grover Norquist and the far right. Instead of creating jobs, our colleagues on the other side have spent months on end pushing a partisan agenda that has covered everything from the trivial to the very real dangers of default.

Instead of funding the Department of Energy, the majority has tried to micromanage our lightbulbs. Instead of funding the Nation's schools, they tried to eliminate Big Bird. Instead of funding the EPA, they tried to sell the land surrounding the Grand Canyon to the state-owned mining companies of Russia and South Korea. Instead of funding cancer research conducted by the NIH, they have tried, repeatedly, to repeal health care reform. And instead of setting a responsible budget for the next fiscal year, they brought our economy to the brink of default and led to the first-ever downgrade of our Nation's credit.

Even today, our colleagues on the other side are injecting politics into a stopgap CR. Today we are considering legislation that will only provide disaster relief to hurricane victims if billions of dollars are taken from a successful alternative energy program that has created 39,000 jobs to date and is poised to create 60,000 more. We were told in the Rules Committee that this was money simply lying there.

In effect, the other side of the aisle is telling the American people that Congress will either help rebuild shattered communities or Congress will create new green jobs, but we refuse to do both. This immoral approach reflects a House of Representatives that is void of responsible leadership from those in charge.

Today I'll do the little bit that I can to provide leadership sorely lacking from those in charge. Mr. Speaker, if we can defeat the previous question at the end of this debate, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that disaster victims get the help they need. My amendment will allow Representative DINGELL to offer a motion to strike the unacceptable House language that says all disaster aid must be offset and substitute the bipartisan Senate approach.

Since 2004, American taxpayers have spent over \$3.4 billion on infrastructure in Afghanistan and even more in Iraq. Not a single one of those \$3.4 billion was held hostage or offset by any program in our budget. But now, as many Americans are struggling to rebuild and get their lives back to normal, the majority refuses to help unless they are allowed to defund a successful program they happen to dislike. Remember, what this says is that the American public is financing the reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq with taxpayer money, but taxpayer money without an offset will not be used to help the American taxpayer. That takes a lot of explaining.

Because the majority decided that pursuing a partisan agenda was more important than meeting the basic needs of the country, we face the prospect of a trillion dollar, 1,000-page bill to keep the government running because the other side will not stop playing politics and start governing as we are all expected to do. This failure is a disservice to the American people, an abdication of our responsibilities as legislators, and a shame to the expectations, responsibilities and duties of the House.

The majority rode into Washington vowing to change the ways of the past, but over the last 9 months, the American people have witnessed a case study in abandoned responsibilities and misguided priorities. Until the Republican majority begins to govern with responsibility, I fear this Congress will continue to live up to the low regard our Nation has for it, which brings shame on us all. I urge my colleagues on the other side to stop serving their political interests, start doing bipartisan bills, and start serving our country.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on today's rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 5 minutes to a gentleman who has presided over the most open Rules Committee in recent memory, not just a chairman, but my chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding and congratulate him on his stellar management of this very important rule.

Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to the remarks of my very good friend and distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and I have to say that as I listen to the remarks, I'm going to keep my hands to my side. I'm not going to point the finger of blame at anybody. I'm simply going to state a few facts that I think are important for all the Members of this House to look at.

It's true, the last 9 months under this Republican majority have been very difficult, very painful, and very challenging for us as we've been tackling the challenge of job creation and economic growth. There's a reason that we have had such a difficult time in the last 9 months here in this Congress. And the reason is very simple: Last year, for the first time in nearly three decades since the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act was established, we didn't even have a budget proposed from the then-majority.

And the fact that there was no budget proposed in the last Congress to deal with the very important spending priorities that we, as a Nation, needed to address, and the fact that we had not one single appropriations bill, not one single appropriations bill, completed in the last Congress—we inherited at the beginning of this year, and Democrats and Republicans alike will acknowledge it, we inherited a hell of a mess. It was a big mess that we inherited. And guess what? We decided that we were going to tackle that mess in a bipartisan way.

My friend who has just talked about the need for bipartisanship, we began in dealing with the appropriations process with, as Members will recall, being here for hours and hours and hours because Democrats and Republicans alike were able to put their mark—their mark—on this spending bill which we, because of the lack of action in the last Congress, inherited in this 9 months.

And so my friend is absolutely right. The last 9 months have not been easy. They've not been easy at all. And I appreciate the fact that she has worked in a bipartisan way in a number of areas, because as she knows very well, the bill that we're going to be consid-

ering this week, the regulatory relief bill, we make every amendment that complied with the rules of the House in order. So many more Democratic amendments have been made in order than Republican amendments on a number of pieces of legislation, and that's so that we can do exactly what my friend has said hasn't happened, and that is work in a bipartisan way.

Now I think that probably the single largest bipartisan achievement that we've had in this past 9 months has been the agreement that we came to at the end of July, and that was an agreement that Democrats and Republicans alike recognized had to be addressed, we needed to increase the debt ceiling.

□ 1410

We didn't like the fact that there had been so much spending that had taken place, but we recognized that it had to be done. So Democrats and Republicans came together to make that happen.

We have further opportunities for bipartisan agreement coming right down the pike. Democrats and Republicans, alike, have said we need to open up new markets around the world for us to create union and nonunion jobs so that we can export more manufactured products from the United States of America into these markets. And we have three pending trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea that will go a long way towards doing what it is Democrats and Republicans, alike, want to do.

I'm not going to accuse a single Democrat of not wanting to create jobs in this country. Everybody wants to make sure that their constituents aren't hurting, that their constituents aren't losing their homes, their jobs, their businesses. I know that everybody, Democrat and Republican, alike, wants to make that happen. We will have an opportunity, in a bipartisan way, to do just that, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to these market-opening agreements in these very, very, very important countries that will help us again create union and nonunion jobs.

And I think when it comes to the issue of job creation and income growth, we need to look at the unfortunate mischaracterization that has been made time and time again of things like the tax cuts that have enjoyed bipartisan support, what I call the Bush-Obama tax cuts.

First, the '01 tax cuts, I will acknowledge, were not real growth creators, but the '03 tax cuts generated economic growth that actually enhanced the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. And that's not my speculation. All one needs to do is simply look at the raw numbers.

In 2003, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Treasury had \$1.782 trillion in revenues from all sources. That was in '03. At the time we saw those tax cuts put into place, \$1.782 trillion in revenues. Up until the economic downturn in 2007, we saw an increase of 44 percent in the flow of revenues that came into the

Federal Treasury to \$2.567 trillion. Now, that's an increase, Mr. Speaker, of \$785 billion that came in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

That, Mr. Speaker, was a 44 percent increase, increasing by \$785 billion the flow in revenues from the '03 revenue flow of \$1.782 trillion to the '07 revenue flow of \$2.567 trillion.

The reason I use these numbers is that we all are focused on job creation and economic growth. We all know that increased gross domestic product will go a long way towards dealing with our deficit challenges and the difficulties that we face. And, Mr. Speaker, what I want us to do is recognize that, as my friend from Lawrenceville very generously said, I presided over more open rules than we had in the Republican Congress in the past and certainly than we had in the 4 years that preceded this. And I'm proud of that. I'm very proud of the fact that we've been able to make so many amendments in order that my Democratic colleagues have offered. We have a Hastings amendment that we made in order on the bill that we're going to be considering later. I'm happy that we've done that. We will have a chance to debate these issues and I hope come to a bipartisan agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I will just say in closing that we have had a difficult 9 months. My friend from Rochester is absolutely right. It's been a challenging 9 months. And as long as Americans are hurting, it's going to always be difficult for us here. But being able to establish priorities, to come together in a bipartisan way, is important.

This measure that we're considering today is being done at the request of the bipartisan leadership of our colleagues in the other body who want to be able to move this continuing resolution through as expeditiously as possible to, as my friend from Lawrenceville said, recognize that between now and November 18 we simply want to ensure that the resources are there.

I see my friend from Vermont, and I will say to my friend that I read and looked at the photographs of the flooding that has taken place in Vermont. It has been devastating. I've looked at the disasters that have taken place across this country. My State of California suffers from earthquakes, fires, flooding, lots of disasters. An earthquake was felt in this Capitol during the month of August. We know that disasters occur. We must do everything we can to address those. But calling for an \$8 billion increase in spending beyond the \$1.43 trillion that this continuing resolution calls for is not the answer.

We need to prioritize to ensure that those who are really suffering can, in

fact, have their needs addressed, and I believe that this House, in a bipartisan way, can and should and, I hope, will do that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today the Republican majority has made a mockery of both the process for and the content of this short-term continuing resolution.

Over the past several weeks, wildfires, floods, tornados, and earthquakes have brought tragedy to so many Americans, and, as it always has, the United States Government is responding with vitally needed resources and support. The Senate has already passed a disaster relief bill twice as large as the package contained in this CR and with the appropriate emergency designation. But House Republican leaders have decided to cut the Senate amount in half and tie it to an ideologically driven offset that takes modern technology off the table for U.S. car and vehicle manufacturers and which could cost thousands of current and future jobs.

And please don't tell me that it's all about balancing the budget and ending emergency spending that isn't paid for. The continuing resolution that we're debating today includes money to continue the misguided war in Afghanistan to the tune of \$10 billion each month. None of it is paid for, not a penny. It's never been paid for. It's always been borrowed money that each week adds billions to the deficit. If my Republican friends believe we don't need to offset billions of dollars for war, then why are they demanding that we offset disaster aid for families who were flooded out by a hurricane or whose homes were burnt to the ground by a wildfire?

Mr. Speaker, we've been in Afghanistan for 10 years. We know how much it costs. Its funding is as predictable as it gets, yet each and every year money for the war receives a so-called "emergency" designation, but responding to unpredictable natural disasters does not? It makes no sense. And if the Republican leadership has figured out a way to accurately predict the next tornado or earthquake, I would like to hear it.

The American people are tired of the hypocrisy and tired of the Republican priorities that make it easier to invest overseas and nearly impossible to help people here at home.

I urge my Republican friends to put the American people first. I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule and oppose the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. LEVIN. We've heard a lot of rhetoric the first 10 minutes, or whatever, on the majority side, but rhetoric cannot mask, cannot obscure reality. The reality is this is an antijobs bill.

In '07, we put forth the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program. It has worked. Tens of thousands of jobs have been created as a result of that program in Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Louisiana, and Florida. And so now the majority says they're going to pay for this bill. How? By ending a program that has created jobs. That's the reality. It cuts it off, even though there are applications pending that will create thousands of more jobs in the manufacturing base of this country, in Indiana, Missouri, Ohio, California, Michigan, and other States.

It's inexcusable. It's inexcusable.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

You may have some information that we did not have in the Rules Committee. My understanding is that this program, which has billions that were appropriated in 2008 and have not yet been spent, not only can—

Mr. LEVIN. You've been misinformed. There are millions and millions of dollars that are already in the pipeline to be spent and applications for the balance of that money. That's a fact.

□ 1420

So if you've been misinformed, I suggest that you go back to the Rules Committee and take another look at this. This is an anti-jobs bill when we need jobs in the United States of America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to speak to what's inexcusable here. And I hate that that's where we have to end up.

The truth of the matter is what we have down here today is the re-litigation of something that we already litigated in July and August, and that is that this bill today funds just until November 18 at the level that we, as a body, agreed to. You may not like it, I may not like it, but we agreed to it: a level that's 1043, \$1.043 trillion. That's a big number. That is a big number.

This resolution today, this continuing resolution to get us through November 18, does not re-litigate that decision. We spent a lot of time on that in July and August, and again, we come from different places on whether or not that's the right number. I probably say it's too high, you may say it's

too low, but this is simply a resolution that implements the will of this House.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. LEVIN. There is nothing in that decision, nothing in that action that paid for a continuing resolution that will take away jobs from the businesses and workers of the United States of America, purely and simply.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time from my friend, you're absolutely right that this bill does not define where those \$1.043 trillion go, and I take issue with that too.

I go back to what you called rhetoric, the 10 minutes that we spent at the beginning where we went through line by line to talk about, golly, the work I'm so proud of that you and I have done together, the individual appropriations bills that you and I have worked through together, doing what was supposed to be done in this House. That was the time to do these things, one by one, and, golly, we did. We did.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. LEVIN. So now you're saying we're paying for it by taking away jobs from businesses and workers. That's what this does. You can't hide that fact.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, as I'm not the chairman of the committee, I will quote the chairman of the committee, who tells us that not only can we use this offset here today, but there remains not millions, but billions of dollars in the account to be used for this purpose; dollars that were appropriated, Mr. Speaker, in 2008, 3 years ago. They remain unspent, but we leave them there just in case. Just in case.

And what I would say to my friend is, if we can just get around to doing this process right again, and I have great hope that we can, if we can get back to doing the process right, we'll have this discussion not on a \$1.043 trillion continuing resolution, and not even on a half-trillion dollar continuing resolution, but on the Energy and Water appropriations bill. We'll be able to get back to it, and I have that great wish for this House, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield myself 10 seconds to say that I said in my opening statement that this program has already yielded 39,000 jobs, on its way to 60,000, which will not be able to be met because you are using this as the offset.

I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL), who suffered great damage in the hurricane.

Mr. PASCARELL. Look, we're all Americans. We're not Democrats, Republicans.

You had 5,000 people evacuated in my district. When you see the damage in

small towns and large towns, then you can appreciate it. The President came, the Governor of the State, who is not of my persuasion, came. They saw it firsthand. Homeland Security came. Mr. Fugate from FEMA came. They saw it firsthand. The damage is deep, and it's not going to be taken away and remedied within 2 weeks, 2 months, or 2 years because the ground was so saturated that trees fell without any wind, and are still falling.

Now, we are only one of 51 districts affected in 15 States, and we're talking about over 30 million people. And for the first time since I've been a Member of Congress, the other side, your side, wants to make this conditional, the aid, so that we carve out from either this program or that program, which is immaterial at this point, the money to help these very people.

The estimates are very clear as to how much this is going to cost, beyond our wildest dreams. We don't stop and ask those folks in Joplin, who had a huge tornado, where 160 people were killed, we don't say, wait till we go and rob Peter in order to respond to your emergency.

The fires in Texas—we have never done this on an emergency. This is an absolute disgrace because we're all Americans. We're not Democrats or Republicans.

Why didn't we do this, for crying out loud, in 2001 when we went to war? We didn't say, let's take from this program or that program. That was an emergency. We came up with the money and we sure as hell didn't pay for it, did we? And now look where we are economically.

We're talking about an emergency in our own country here, in our own neighborhoods. We need both sides to come together, and that's why we formed the coalition of Democrats and Republicans. And Republicans are not going to vote for this either. I'm telling you right now. So why don't we come together. They passed a clean bill in the Senate.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman another 10 seconds.

Mr. PASCARELL. This coalition is going to stay strong because America is more important than either party, and we need to help our brothers and sisters who are hurting right now, many that will not return to their homes. They can't. Think about that.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, to correct what may be a misunderstanding about the swiftness with which this Congress is reacting to those tragedies, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has moved immediately on these issues, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As to the point, Mr. Speaker, of whether or not we offset these emergency bills, over the last 10 years, we

have used offsets in over half of the emergency spending bills and supplementals, over half, 15 of 30, actually, including war supplementals, emergency supplementals, military construction, defense supplementals, disaster relief and recovery, in 2008, for example, and on and on.

Using offsets to pay for disaster relief is the rule here. This is not an exception. And we're only offsetting \$1 billion of it. In fact, when the Homeland Security bill passed a few months ago, it included this very offset, and the bill passed by bipartisan support throughout the body. You've already voted for this, and, I might add, successfully.

Now, on that green car fund—I'm going to call it that—there's over \$4 billion this minute sitting idle in that account, and it's been sitting idle for 3 years. The \$1.5 billion rescission in subsidies we propose will not have a significant impact on the program, contrary to what some people say. All applications for those loans in late-term stages and negotiations will not be affected. Talk to the agency downtown, which we have. They will not be affected.

The factory in Michigan or Indiana will not be affected. In total, eight pending applications for loan guarantees totaling over \$6 billion will not be impacted by this offset. Michigan has the largest stake: four applications totaling \$4.7 billion in loan guarantees, which are free and clear.

□ 1430

Other States with applications in the queue that are safe from this round of cuts include Indiana and Louisiana.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains \$3.65 billion for immediate disaster relief, which our people need and deserve. As this bill works its way through the process until November 18, no doubt FEMA will have by then completed their surveys and investigations of disasters and can tell Congress, through the White House, how much more money is needed; and we'll provide it. It's covered in the debt ceiling bill that passed this body a few weeks ago.

I'm telling you the Appropriations Committee will provide whatever relief is required when we get the documentation, which is traditional, as all of the Members of this body know because they helped prepare those investigations.

So this is a clean bill. This merely extends the time for us to work with the Senate to perfect a continuing bill for the balance of 2012. It gives us 5 or 6 weeks, but only 3 or 4 of those weeks will be available because both bodies will not be here all that time. This is a clean bill. And it provides disaster relief in the appropriate way. And there's plenty of money there for the immediate needs that we've been told about by FEMA.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a

member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. HINCHEY.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and more broadly to the manner in which the House has dealt with disaster relief funding.

This year, our country has experienced some of the worst natural disasters in more than a generation. The cost of Hurricane Irene alone is estimated to be over \$1.5 billion and Tropical Storm Lee's costs are still being tallied.

Yet despite these overwhelming needs, the disaster aid included in this bill is grossly inadequate and would not sufficiently help the millions of Americans who are recent victims of floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and wildfires.

My district took a one-two punch from Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee. In the southern tier of New York, we've just seen the second 500-year flood in 5 years both in Broome and Tioga counties. Scores of homes were completely destroyed, and there are over a hundred people who are still living in an emergency center in Binghamton not knowing when they'll be able to return to their homes, if they can return ever at all.

Major companies have been shut down because their facilities are flooded. The total cost to rebuild the region will likely exceed \$250 million.

In the Hudson Valley, Hurricane Irene caused massive power outages and record flooding. In Ulster County, 60 percent of residents lost power; seven bridges were destroyed. In fact, two of those bridges were just washed away and not found.

Vegetable farmers in Ulster, Orange, and Sullivan Counties suffered devastating losses; and because the crop insurance program remains wholly inadequate for them, these farmers may get no assistance at all. Ulster and Orange Counties alone have an estimated \$62 million in agricultural losses. Yet this bill does nothing for these farmers.

And just when some of these communities began building from Irene, a second round of flooding from Lee washed away much of their hard work. Now they need to start the recovery work again.

The Senate has already passed a \$7 billion standalone disaster bill that funds the President's FEMA budget request and provides additional emergency assistance for the Department of Agriculture and other agencies that are seeing their disaster funds dwindle. This is absolutely necessary.

This bill that we are dealing with here today is a half job. It's playing politics with the lives of people who are desperate and are begging us to set aside games and get this done. Let's put an end to it now so that we can take up the Senate's bill so that we can adequately deal with this problem and solve the problems for all of these people in so many ways.

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

To get back on the topic of this continuing resolution today, that is, this number that we agreed on just a month ago, \$1.043 trillion, to fund the operations of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I go back and I look at emergency requests that this body has made. Now, I'm a freshman. I was just elected in November, began my service in January. But over the last 10 years, there have been 30 emergency and supplemental bills passed.

Now, what I would say to my friends who have been here longer than I have is perhaps if you have to do it three times a year, it's really not a surprise. Perhaps we ought to be able to budget for it.

And to his great credit, and to the committee's great credit, and candidly I would say to the House's great credit, we are trying for the first time in a long time to say you know what, we can't prevent tragedy. Tragedy is going to happen. But we can plan ahead for tragedy so that the American people have the security of knowing the money's going to be there when they need it.

And when I look, Mr. Speaker, at the way we're pouring money out of this body, I worry will the money be there when the American people need it. This budget makes sure that it does.

Mr. HINCHEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HINCHEY. Thank you very much. I deeply appreciate it.

The situation that we're dealing with here is critically important. It's harming huge numbers of people.

What the Senate has done is an adequate solution to this problem. They've provided the adequate funding that is going to deal with this. There have been at least seven Republicans over there in the Senate who supported that bill and voted for it. Why are you not dealing with an adequate solution to this problem? Why are you insisting on half ways, not dealing with the kinds of issues that need to be dealt with?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will suspend.

The gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Because I hope where my friend was going to go was an acknowledgment that this process has provided twice the amount of disaster funding that the President requested, twice that amount in FY11, plus it forward-funds FY12.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am proud that we are trying to grapple with these issues. There is not a person on the floor of this House that is saying "no" to Americans in distress. What folks are saying is "yes" to making sure that when those distresses come again, we budgeted for it.

I would now like to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the chairman of the Ap-

propriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Let me just reiterate.

The \$1 billion in the fiscal '11 portion of this bill is two times the amount the President requested. We doubled it. The amount that's in the bill for fiscal 2012, \$2.65 billion, is more than the initial request that was made to us by the White House. We're here to tell you—and I've repeated this now four times—whatever the amount is needed that we see FEMA coming to us requesting, we're going to provide. Now, we've got until November 18 by this extension, by this CR, and during that period of time we will get the documentation from the White House and from FEMA about additional funds that are requested.

I assure the gentleman from New York who spoke, your concerns will be addressed during these next few weeks, and the money will be there that's documented from the White House and from FEMA for disaster relief. We will not let our people hurt.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I'm going to give myself another second here just to say I keep hearing that we're all set for next year in the budget, but who's going to tell Mother Nature just how much we can afford and hope that we don't get more than that?

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

□ 1440

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, America has had an economic disaster and a natural disaster. The economic disaster is 15 million people unemployed, and then we had the natural disasters of August. This bill tries to help the natural disaster get solved by making the economic disaster worse. It takes a program that has produced 39,000 private sector jobs and cripples it.

Now, the ostensible purpose for this is that we want to offset the spending to help deal with the natural disasters we had around this country in August; but on multiple occasions in the last 7 years, different administrations came to the Congress and asked for infrastructure spending to help rebuild Iraq—\$3.7 billion worth of it to help rebuild Iraq and not a penny of offset.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we can vote to spend the public's money to rebuild roads and bridges in Iraq, let's not require an offset to rebuild roads and bridges in New York and Vermont and New Jersey. The right vote is "no." Rewrite this bill, and do so in a way without worsening our economic disaster.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH). We watched Route 4 in Vermont crumble like a cookie in the rain and wash away.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

This bill is not about the offset. This bill is not about whether we're going to pay for emergency spending. We must and we will. What this bill is about is whether we're going to help 427 residents of Pittsfield, Vermont, who were in the wake of the wrath of Hurricane Irene.

That flood came down and ripped their road to the north and ripped their road to the south, and the water went in the middle, taking out homes and taking out public buildings. That's the selectboard—volunteers. It was that volunteer fire department—volunteers. They didn't have time to have an argument about offsets. They had to find out how they could get an excavator in there, and if they didn't have one, they had to borrow one. They had towns that weren't leveraging some disputes they might have had about whether they would turn back an excavator or earthmoving equipment to help them out. They did it. They had their school running the next day, not because they had a school that was functional—their kids couldn't even get out. They did one thing first, and that was to set up school on the green. They set it up on the green. Two days after this hurricane, the kids were going to school, and their parents were making them feel secure. They couldn't get to a passable road for several days. What did they do? They cut a path through the woods so that, for half a mile, kids could walk and get to transportation.

Now, they're going to have a tab even if we help them, and they know they have to pay for it; but, you know, if your neighbor's house is on fire and if you've got a boundary line dispute, you can use the leverage of his urgent necessity to get that fire hose and hold off and get it on condition that he cave—or you can do the right thing.

Every time this Congress has had an opportunity to come to the aid of your district or mine, we've stepped up. No Vermonter has ever complained to me that we used his tax dollars to help out in Texas, to help out in Ohio, to help out on the gulf coast; and we didn't make it conditional in getting our way—my offset, what might be Afghanistan, and yours might be some environmental program. We knew that was not the time to do it. We are in this together.

This Congress has an obligation to the American people. I have an obligation to the folks in your district, as you do in mine, to do the right thing when an act of God requires for its remedy an act of Congress. Let us act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that we have the distinguished Appropriations chairman here on the floor, who has said, not only have we doubled the President's request here, but there is a commitment to making the dollars available to everyone who is in need in these disasters. That's the kind of commitment this Nation has always made to its citizens. That's the kind of com-

mitment that this bill continues to make to America's citizens.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the President signed the patent reform bill; but before the ink is dry on the patent reform bill, the agreement that led to the passage of it that all of the fees that are collected by the Patent and Trademark Office will be used by the Patent and Trademark Office is reneged on in this continuing resolution.

This is a job-creating bill, an innovation-creating bill, and because we have been taking the money of the Patent and Trademark Office for years and diverting it to the general fund, we have, in effect, imposed a tax on innovation in this country. The appropriators promised us that they were going to correct this problem, but there is nothing in this bill to address that promise. I don't see how I can support a continuing resolution that does not honor the commitment that was made in our patent reform bill.

Just last Friday, the President signed the America Invents Act (AIA), a bipartisan bill that promises to stimulate innovation and create jobs and add fuel to our economy. The AIA created a mechanism for USPTO, beginning in FY2012, to access all of the fees it collects by allowing USPTO to notify Congress that the Office will need the excess fees to support its operations and hire the staff required to reduce the staggering backlog of patent applications. Now, despite this hard fought deal—one which I opposed precisely because it depends upon an annual commitment to honor and implement the deal—the CR before us fails to put the USPTO on the firm, stable footing we all agreed was necessary for it to dig out of the backlog, avoid a tax on innovation, and stimulate job growth.

Under the current CR, for at least 7 weeks the USPTO will be held to a spending rate based on last year's FY11 appropriations, a rate that ignores Congress's directive and authorization that the USPTO be able to use the fees it collects in order to support implementation of the act and that those funds not be diverted to pay for wars, government waste and other Federal Government operations. I will resist the temptation to say, "I told you so," because that would not advance the debate or solve the serious problem I have identified before and identify again today. What is most compelling is that ensuring that the PTO has access to all of its funds costs nothing to the American taxpayer. It is, therefore, confusing why we are again facing such a heavy lift to simply give the PTO access to the funds it earns through its operations. But what is clear to me is that, without a provision to ensure adequate funding for the PTO, the bill the President just signed will not serve the important purposes it was designed to serve. This CR does not provide such funding, and I cannot support the CR. I urge my colleagues who say they believe in reducing the tax burden on businesses, large and small, those who fought

to ensure that the independent engines of economic growth run at full throttle, I urge them to vote no on the rule and against this CR and work to get the funding the USPTO needs and that this Congress promised it would have.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill is brought to us by people who know the cost of everything and the value of nothing. The hard fact of the matter is they've fought two wars on the credit card. This is one of the few times that we've ever found that they have required offsets for emergencies, so now we're trying to fix a bad bill.

I want to make the observation that we have a serious problem. We have a natural emergency, and we have people who have a lasting unemployment situation that is going to destroy the country and destroy families and people in this country.

Having said that, I am baffled as to why we are considering a measure that is going to cut funding for the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program. This is a loan program that has created or saved over 40,000 jobs so far, and if it's left alone and not destroyed, as would be done here, it will create another 10,000 more by year's end.

For all the talk in Washington on that side of the aisle about creating jobs, we find that they're out to kill jobs again, and killing ATVM just plain makes no sense. It is going to prevent job creation. The Economic Policy Institute just released a report that my home State of Michigan has lost nearly 80,000 jobs to China since 2001, where they sustain and support their industry and where we do not. If we cripple this loan program, Michigan and the rest of the country can expect to lose even more jobs and their ability to compete globally in the 21st century.

I understand we're living through tough economic times and have to squeeze every penny to make sure it counts, but I want to remind everybody here present that there are more applications in the pipeline than there is money to participate in this particular program. So we are essentially robbing Peter to pay Paul, but it is going to come at an enormous cost to the economic future of your constituents and mine.

Now, it comforts me that many of my colleagues have seen through this rascality and have observed it for what it is. Over 100 of them have signed on to a letter by my friends Mr. PETERS and Ms. ESHOO in opposition to gutting ATVM.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for what is right by defeating the previous question and by adopting my amendment. If we can't do that, let's vote

this rule down and let's vote this bill down, and let's go about the Nation's business in a wise and sensible fashion which will create jobs and not strangle economic opportunity for our people.

I want to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York for her leadership on this matter; but I want to denounce the behavior that I see on the other side, where they are walking into one of the most important issues that this country confronts with their eyes completely closed.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

□ 1450

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, there is a not-so-thin line between being frugal and fiscally responsible and then downright cheap and stingy, and this bill demonstrates the difference.

To say to somebody who was in a disaster, to say to somebody who might lose everything, where the waters are rising, the fires are burning, the storms are knocking things down, to say, you know what, we can only help you if we cut somewhere else, is the most stingy, shortsighted, poorest form of representative government I have ever seen. It is outrageous to tell Americans facing disaster that you don't get any help unless you can find how to squeeze it out somewhere.

Americans help Americans. Americans stand up for each other at time of crisis. This is a hallmark of who we are, and it doesn't matter whether you are Republican or Democrat, whether you are from the north, the south, the east or the west, whether you are black, white, Latino, wherever you come from, when Americans are in trouble, Americans respond. And we don't reach inside and say, well, if I can afford it, we will help you out. We just jump forward and we help out.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. No, I will not yield, and I won't cede any of my time, so you don't need to ask again.

I am also just absolutely appalled, appalled, that the Republican bill will cost at least 10,000 good-paying American manufacturing jobs and perhaps tens of thousands more by cutting the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing loan program, which is putting Americans to work at producing cleaner American cars.

This provision, perhaps more than any other, demonstrates the fraudulent nature, fraud, fraud, of claiming that the Republicans are trying to produce jobs. They are not trying to make jobs.

They run around saying that rich people are job creators, they are profit creators. And you know who is absolutely not a job creator? Anyone who votes "yes" on this bill.

Vote "no," absolutely "no" on this bad piece of bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we have been able to have a

conversation with one another and yield that time throughout the day.

In order to continue that, I yield 1 minute to the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you for yielding.

The previous speaker doesn't understand the bill. The \$2.65 billion in the 2012 portion of the bill is not offset, only the portion for fiscal 2011 is required to be offset. And I would remind the gentleman, as well as everyone else, many of whom voted for the Homeland Security bill a few months ago, it included this provision.

The disaster relief money, twice what the President requested of us, we doubled his request. That part is offset, the fiscal 2011 moneys, but the bulk of the money in this bill, the \$2.65 billion for fiscal 2012, it's not offset. So the gentleman is incorrect.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I come from the Greater Detroit area, which has been especially hard hit from this recession.

When many wanted to let the auto industry fail, I stood with President Obama, and now the Big Three auto companies are once again earning profits and creating jobs in our region.

Today, however, the House Republicans are trying to pass job-killing cuts to our auto industry by eliminating section 136 loans. We have the support of the Big Three auto manufacturers, as well as several labor unions and environmental groups but, sadly, the Tea Party can't even say "yes" to a program that has created and protected 41,000 jobs. In fact, according to experts, this program is directly responsible for bringing manufacturing of the Ford Focus automobile from Mexico to Michigan, with American workers making the Ford Focus.

We absolutely need to fund disaster relief for communities affected by the recent natural disasters, but that doesn't mean we need to cause an economic disaster for our workers.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the continuing resolution because we need to be working to create more American manufacturing jobs, not destroying them.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that we would come to the floor of the House at this time and celebrate a continuing resolution in the backdrop of Tropical Storm Lee and Hurricane Irene, the enormity of the tragedy in Vermont.

I know that my colleagues from that area are in pain and still suffering from the devastation. I noticed upstate New York, Prattsville in particular, a city that is full of pain with individuals who are at loss of why their town is no longer.

But in that instance, as my colleagues know, my Republican friends know, although we have had some moments that we have not been proud of, such as in the gulf region when we were not prepared for Hurricane Katrina, we have still risen to the occasion thereafter and said to the American people that if you are in a disaster, this Nation will come to your aid.

Unfortunately, this CR does not in any way benefit the American way, for here we have a fix that is really a broken fix.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Rather than declaring disasters what they are, emergencies, and providing the dollars that we need, we are, in essence, if I might use the old-fashioned term, nickel and diming our responsibilities. It is patently unfair to put the American people in the crosshairs of our politics about having an offset for emergency funding.

Do you want to tell that, if we look back at 2005 to the thousand-plus that died in Hurricane Katrina, you have to have an offset? Let's think about whether we're going to send you any money.

Now, I know that there is a need for this legislation to pass, but once we concede the idea that the American people will be put in the pickle of an offset, that means that disaster knocks at your door, not at your invitation, and the Federal Government, which is, in fact, the umbrella on a rainy day, it will not be there. I will not be able to tolerate that.

What we should be doing is passing a CR that declares emergency funding what it is—to be there for the American people. And this next thing we should be doing is passing the President's jobs bill, for that is how we will ensure that we are doing the job that the American people want.

This CR is a bunch of smoke and mirrors, and I will not tell the American people that they are second-class citizens. If I can find the dime to pay for your misery, I will look for the dime. That is not the American way.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding again. I'll be very brief.

The gentlewoman who just spoke mentioned Katrina and that we should not offset expenses of emergency disaster spending. In fact, in 2006 that's exactly what we did do. We required offsets for aid for Katrina and other matters, \$33.5 billion in offsets in Katrina aid in 2006. And then again in 2007, we offset \$939 million in offsets for, among other things, Hurricane Katrina recovery.

As I have said before, over the last 10 years, we have offset more than half of



the disaster emergency relief bills we have passed here. It's not unusual, and the gentelady is mistaken that we did not request offsets for Katrina. We did.

Mr. WOODALL. I say to my friend to from New York, I have no more speakers and am prepared to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order a motion to strike the unacceptable House disaster funding language and substitute the bipartisan Senate approach.

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 New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues to vote "no," defeat the previous question, and if we are successful in defeating the previous question and offering our amendment, then we will get on with the underlying House amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

I think one thing that unites us as Republicans and Democrats, and actually unites us as Americans, is when we face adversity, we say: Can we do better? Can we do better? You know, it's one thing to muddle through, but it's something else to learn from that experience and come back the next time and do better.

Now, I'm proud to be here as part of a freshman class, Mr. Speaker; 89 new Republican freshmen, 10 new Democratic freshmen. Ninety-nine Members of this House are brand new this year; 99 Members of this House. And so we look back. We look back on profligate spending where even though American families are asked to prioritize their spending each and every day, for some reason the Congress didn't. Even though small businesses are asked to prioritize their spending every day, for some reason Congress didn't.

What this new Congress has done, Mr. Speaker, this 112th Congress has done, is to say: Can we do better? And the answer is yes. Why are the American people so cynical about Congress, Mr. Speaker? Why are our approval ratings in the tank? It was less than 2 months ago, less than 2 months ago we agreed that for next year we should spend \$1.43 trillion. And we're already talking about that we've got that number wrong and we want to spend more. Folks, we have to make those priority decisions. Thirty times, Mr. Speaker, thirty times in the last 10 years we came up with emergency spending. Thirty times, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just ask you, the Defense Iraq-Afghanistan supplemental in 2004,

is anybody surprised that it took more money in those places than we had budgeted? Anybody think that's a surprise? I'm not surprised by that, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't here, but I'm not surprised. What I wish we could have done was budgeted better for that. Did we know in 2004 that it was going to take more money? Of course we did. But what did we do? We gamed that system.

What is this Appropriations Committee doing? What is this Appropriations Committee doing? They're saying that they know tragedy is going to befall Americans. They don't know what; they don't know when; but they know that it's going to happen. And so they're going to budget for it. Why? Because we tell Americans day after day that programs that they count on might not be there tomorrow. Why? Because we're broke. We tell Americans every day something that they might want to do, something they thought might be available, it might not be available. Why? Because we're broke.

But I agree with my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, when folks are facing disaster, they don't want to have to ask that question. When folks are facing personal tragedy, they don't want to have to ask that question: Will there be money there? Will there be help there?

No, in our communities, we know the help is going to be there. We know our neighbors are going to be there for us, and we know our families will be there for us. And for the first time in a long time, Mr. Speaker, we now know that the American Congress is going to be there, too, because we are changing business as usual.

We asked the question: Can we do better? And the Speaker and the committee chairmen said, Yes. Yes, we can. I encourage support for the rule, and I encourage a vote on the underlying resolution.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 405 OFFERED BY  
MRS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, after expiration of debate on the motion to concur specified in the first section of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the motion to amend printed in section 4 of this resolution. That motion may be offered only by Representative Dingell of Michigan or his designee, shall be debatable for 20 minutes 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. All points of order against that motion are waived.

SEC. 4. The motion to amend referred to in section 3 is as follows:

"(1) Strike sections 125 and 126 of the House amendment (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

"(2) At the end of the House amendment, before the short title, insert the following:

"SEC. \_\_ Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there is hereby enacted into law the provisions of division B of the

amendment adopted by the Senate on September 15, 2011, to House Joint Resolution 66 (112th Congress), relating to emergency supplemental disaster relief appropriations."

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools

for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 405, if ordered, and suspending the rules with regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 28 and S. 846.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 188, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 715]

YEAS—237

Adams	Fincher	Landry
Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Lankford
Akin	Flake	Latham
Alexander	Fleischmann	LaTourette
Amash	Fleming	Latta
Amodei	Flores	Lewis (CA)
Austria	Forbes	LoBiondo
Bachus	Fortenberry	Long
Barletta	Fox	Lucas
Bartlett	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Barton (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel
Bass (NH)	Gallely	E.
Benishek	Gardner	Mack
Berg	Garrett	Manzullo
Biggart	Gerlach	Marchant
Billray	Gibbs	Marino
Bilirakis	Gibson	McCarthy (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Gingrey (GA)	McCaul
Black	Gohmert	McClintock
Blackburn	Goodlatte	McCotter
Bonner	Gosar	McHenry
Bono Mack	Gowdy	McKeon
Boustany	Granger	McKinley
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	McMorris
Brooks	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Brown (GA)	Griffin (AR)	Meehan
Buchanan	Griffith (VA)	Mica
Bucshon	Grimm	Miller (FL)
Buerkle	Guinta	Miller (MI)
Burgess	Guthrie	Miller, Gary
Burton (IN)	Hall	Mulvaney
Calvert	Hanna	Murphy (PA)
Camp	Harper	Myrick
Campbell	Harris	Neugebauer
Canseco	Hartzler	Noem
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Nugent
Capito	Hayworth	Nunes
Carter	Heck	Nunnelee
Cassidy	Hensarling	Olson
Chabot	Herger	Palazzo
Chaffetz	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Coble	Huelskamp	Pearce
Coffman (CO)	Huizenga (MI)	Pence
Cole	Hultgren	Petri
Conaway	Hunter	Pitts
Cravaack	Hurt	Platts
Crawford	Issa	Poe (TX)
Crenshaw	Jenkins	Pompeo
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Posy
Davis (KY)	Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Quayle
Dent	Jones	Reed
DesJarlais	Jordan	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Renacci
Dold	King (IA)	Ribble
Dreier	King (NY)	Rigell
Duffy	Kingston	Rivera
Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Roby
Duncan (TN)	Kline	Roe (TN)
Ellmers	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Emerson	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Farenthold	Lance	Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher	Shimkus
Rokita	Shuster
Rooney	Simpson
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)
Roskam	Smith (NJ)
Ross (FL)	Smith (TX)
Royce	Southerland
Runyan	Stearns
Ryan (WI)	Stivers
Scalise	Stutzman
Schilling	Sullivan
Schmidt	Terry
Schock	Thompson (PA)
Schweikert	Thornberry
Scott (SC)	Tiberi
Scott, Austin	Tipton
Sensenbrenner	Turner (NY)
Sessions	Turner (OH)

NAYS—188

Ackerman	Garamendi
Altmire	Gonzalez
Andrews	Green, Al
Baldwin	Green, Gene
Barrow	Grijalva
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez
Becerra	Hahn
Berkley	Hanabusa
Berman	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich
Bishop (NY)	Higgins
Blumenauer	Himes
Boren	Hinchey
Boswell	Hinojosa
Brady (PA)	Hirono
Braley (IA)	Hochul
Brown (FL)	Holden
Butterfield	Holt
Capps	Honda
Capuano	Hoyer
Cardoza	Insee
Carmahan	Israel
Carney	Jackson (IL)
Carson (IN)	Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)	Johnson Lee
Chandler	(TX)
Chu	Johnson (GA)
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur
Clarke (NY)	Keating
Clay	Kildee
Cleaver	Kissell
Clyburn	Kucinich
Cohen	Langevin
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)
Conyers	Larson (CT)
Cooper	Lee (CA)
Costello	Costa
McKeon	Lipinski
McKinley	Shuler
McMorris	Sires
Rodgers	Slaughter
Meehan	Smith (WA)
Mica	Speier
Miller (FL)	Stark
Miller (MI)	Thompson (CA)
Miller, Gary	Thompson (MS)
Mulvaney	Tierney
Murphy (PA)	Tonko
Myrick	Towns
Neugebauer	Tsongas
Noem	Van Hollen
Nugent	Velázquez
Nunes	Visclosky
Nunnelee	Walz (MN)
Olson	Wasserman
Palazzo	Schultz
Paulsen	Miller (NC)
Pearce	Miller, George
Pence	Moore
Petri	Moran
Pitts	Murphy (CT)
Platts	Filner
Poe (TX)	Frank (MA)
Pompeo	Fudge
Posy	
Price (GA)	
Quayle	
Reed	
Rehberg	
Renacci	
Ribble	
Rigell	
Rivera	
Roby	
Roe (TN)	
Rogers (AL)	
Rogers (KY)	
Rogers (MI)	

NOT VOTING—8

Baca	Lewis (GA)	Reichert
Bachmann	Luetkemeyer	Sutton
Giffords	Paul	

□ 1530

Messrs. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. FUDGE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MYRICK changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Upton	Walberg
Walberg	Walden
Walsh (IL)	Walsh (IL)
Webster	Webster
West	West
Westmoreland	Westmoreland
Whitfield	Whitfield
Wilson (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Wittman	Wittman
Wolf	Wolf
Womack	Womack
Woodall	Woodall
Yoder	Yoder
Young (AK)	Young (AK)
Young (FL)	Young (FL)
Young (IN)	Young (IN)

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 716]

YEAS—238

Adams	Garrett	Meehan
Aderholt	Gerlach	Mica
Akin	Gibbs	Miller (FL)
Alexander	Gibson	Miller (MI)
Amash	Gohmert	Miller, Gary
Amodei	Goodlatte	Mulvaney
Austria	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Bachus	Gowdy	Myrick
Barletta	Granger	Neugebauer
Bartlett	Graves (GA)	Noem
Barton (TX)	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Bass (NH)	Griffin (AR)	Nunes
Benishek	Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee
Berg	Grimm	Olson
Biggart	Guinta	Palazzo
Billray	Guthrie	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Hall	Pearce
Bishop (UT)	Hanna	Pence
Black	Harper	Petri
Blackburn	Harris	Pitts
Bonner	Hartzler	Platts
Bono Mack	Bono Mack	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Boustany	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Brady (TX)	Posy
Brooks	Brooks	Price (GA)
Brown (GA)	Broun (GA)	Quayle
Buchanan	Buchanan	Reed
Bucshon	Bucshon	Rehberg
Buerkle	Buerkle	Renacci
Burgess	Burgess	Ribble
Burton (IN)	Burton (IN)	Rigell
Calvert	Calvert	Rivera
Camp	Camp	Roby
Campbell	Campbell	Roe (TN)
Canseco	Canseco	Rogers (AL)
Cantor	Cantor	Rogers (KY)
Capito	Capito	Rogers (MI)
Carter	Carter	Rohrabacher
Cassidy	Cassidy	Rokita
Chabot	Chabot	Rooney
Chaffetz	Chaffetz	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	Coble	Roskam
Coffman (CO)	Coffman (CO)	Ross (FL)
Cole	Cole	Royce
Conaway	Conaway	Runyan
Cravaack	Cravaack	Ryan (WI)
Crawford	Crawford	Scalise
Crenshaw	Crenshaw	Schilling
Culberson	Culberson	Schmidt
Davis (KY)	Davis (KY)	Schock
Denham	Denham	Schweikert
Dent	Dent	Scott (SC)
DesJarlais	DesJarlais	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	Diaz-Balart	Sensenbrenner
Dold	Dold	Sessions
Dreier	Dreier	Shimkus
Duffy	Duffy	Shuster
Duncan (SC)	Duncan (SC)	Simpson
Duncan (TN)	Duncan (TN)	Smith (NE)
Ellmers	Ellmers	Smith (NJ)
Emerson	Emerson	Smith (TX)
Farenthold	Farenthold	Southerland
Fincher	Fincher	Stearns
Fitzpatrick	Fitzpatrick	Stivers
Flake	Flake	Stutzman
Fleischmann	Fleischmann	Sullivan
Fleming	Fleming	Terry
Flores	Flores	Thompson (PA)
Forbes	Forbes	Thornberry
Fortenberry	Fortenberry	Tiberi
Frelinghuysen	Frelinghuysen	Tipton
Gallely	Gallely	Turner (NY)
Gardner	Gardner	Turner (OH)
		Upton
		Walberg

Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland

Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack

Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

ation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 717]

YEAS—424

**NAYS—185**

Ackerman  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)

Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslie  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kildeer  
Kind  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal

Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Townes  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth

**NOT VOTING—10**

Baca  
Bachmann  
Giffords  
Gingrey (GA)

Hastings (FL)  
Lewis (GA)  
Paul  
Reichert

□ 1537

Mr. ROKITA changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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.

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCI-PATION HALL TO AWARD CON-GRSSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) authorizing the use of Emanci-

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Austria  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline

Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly

Garamendi  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Matsui  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Inslie  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kaptur

Keating  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Kucinich  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Long  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (CT)

Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Oliver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Moran  
Scalise  
Schakowsky

Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Sotherland  
Speier  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Townes  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Webster  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

**NOT VOTING—9**

Baca  
Bachmann  
Giffords

Lewis (GA)  
Paul  
Reichert

□ 1546

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CHRISTOPHER S. BOND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the