

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1534

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF
CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH
RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF
CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 409 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 409

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of September 30, 2011, relating to a measure making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend, my Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time that is yielded is yielded for debate purposes only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, we are dealing with extraordinarily challenging times.

The American people have been sending a message to us which is powerful and overwhelming, and it's one that I believe that both Democrats and Republicans have heard, and that is: We need to get our economy back on track. We need to make sure that we

have a climate that will create jobs so that people—many of whom I represent, sadly, and I know the Speaker faces the same thing in the Show Me State of Missouri, and my friend in his State of Massachusetts faces this. We have friends and neighbors who have lost their jobs, who have lost their homes, who have lost their businesses, and the message that has come to us overwhelmingly is that we must put into place policies that will encourage job creation and economic growth.

We obviously have a very troubled global economy. The developments that have taken place in Europe have played a big role in leading to today's huge drop in the stock market. I haven't looked at it in the last few minutes, but earlier today it was down over 400 points, and I know we have obviously difficult decisions that lie ahead for many.

We, as an institution, the United States Congress, have a responsibility to address the fiscal needs and challenges that are before us. One of those challenges and one of the factors that has played a role in the economic downturn, I believe very strongly, has been the \$14½ trillion national debt that looms before us.

Again, as you know very well, Madam Speaker, in a bipartisan way, Democrats and Republicans alike decry the \$14½ trillion national debt that we have and the fact that we have deficits going as far as the eye can see.

Now, we know that last July, just before we adjourned for the month of August, we had to deal with the question of whether or not we were going to increase the debt ceiling. We tackled that issue, and we ended up coming to a bipartisan consensus. We all knew that it was necessary for us to increase the debt ceiling because there was a responsibility to pay the bills that have been accumulated in the past.

From this side of the aisle, we complained and fought against the 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending that we've seen over the past 4 years, but with that money having been spent, we recognized that the bills had to be paid.

That led us, Madam Speaker, to come to a bipartisan consensus that we would, in fact, increase the debt ceiling; but we had to tackle, in a bipartisan way, the deficit and debt issues that are looming before us.

So we put into place a joint select committee which, as we all know, is going to be charged with, by November 23, completing its work and, by December 23, having a vote in the House and the Senate. And if they're not successful, we will deal with sequestration, which will be across-the-board spending cuts that I don't think anyone wants to see happen because we want to be in a position where we make those decisions for \$1½ trillion. And as many have said, that group of Senators the other day said a \$4 trillion—excuse me—\$4 billion. What is the number? I was right, \$4 trillion. Excuse me. You

know the proverbial Everett Dirksen line: A billion here, a billion there; before long, you're talking about real money. And that was five decades ago that he said that, and we are where we are now.

So the plan, as proposed by some, Madam Speaker, would take us to as much as \$4 trillion in spending cuts, and I hope we can do that in a bipartisan way.

Now we are in a position where we—as I said yesterday during the debate on the rule on this issue, last year, for the first time since the 1974 Budget Act was put into place, we didn't have a budget that was proposed to us.

□ 1540

Hey, I'm not in the business of pointing the finger of blame. I'm just in the business of looking at the facts of where we are. So we know what has been inherited. We know, as we hear these very strong statements being made, that we've gone through a difficult 9 months. We had to deal with the continuing resolution to simply clean up the mess. The Acting Speaker is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and she knows very well the challenges that we had with those appropriations bills having to be done last year. That Appropriations Committee on which the Acting Speaker sits has to deal with this issue, and had to deal with it earlier this year. Today, Madam Speaker, we are in a similar position.

We, right now, know that the fiscal year comes to an end next week. We have some very important priorities that need to be addressed, and the one that everyone is talking about is the fact that we have seen disaster after disaster hit this Nation. We are determined to ensure that those who have suffered most over the past several weeks and months from disasters—flooding—and I remember seeing my colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) yesterday. He sent out photographs of the devastation of the flooding that has taken place in Vermont. In Pennsylvania, we just had a Republican Conference at which one of our new colleagues, Mr. MARINO, was up, talking about the fact that he has been walking through mud, talking to families—to parents who have their children literally sitting on automobiles because they can't get into their homes—and asking what it is that they're going to do.

We have our fellow Americans who are suffering, and we want to ensure that the dollars necessary for the Federal Emergency Management Agency are there. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee reported to us that we're seeing about \$30 million a day being expended through the FEMA funding, and there's about \$200 million left. So we are faced with the prospect of expiration—the expiration of all of the resources that FEMA needs—by this weekend, Madam Speaker. That's the reason that we are back here today.

We all know what happened yesterday. The Democratic majority and some Republicans chose to vote “no” on the continuing resolution, which would simply take us from now to November 18—a very short period of time, just a matter of a month and a half—so that during that time we can, as Speaker BOEHNER has said, deal with the overall appropriations process and establish the priorities. So we are here today, having had a meeting in the Rules Committee last night, calling for same-day consideration so that, quite possibly, with some modifications, we can bring up that bill which had enjoyed bipartisan support.

It is no secret, I’m sure the Democrats will acknowledge, that the minority whip, Mr. HOYER, and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. DICKS from Seattle, both had indicated earlier support. They acknowledge it. They’re on the record as having done that. They said that they had changed their minds, and I respect that. Members have a right to change their minds. We all have a right to change our minds. But that decision was made, and we went to the vote and the votes were not there.

Madam Speaker, I think there is clearly a bipartisan understanding that ensuring that resources get to our fellow Americans who are suffering due to these disasters that have hit—hurricanes, tornadoes, flooding—is a priority that we all share. Personally, I’d like to see the Federal Government get out of being the place of first resort for the American people to look to when there is a time of disaster.

In fact, the Acting Speaker’s late husband, with whom I was elected in 1980, led an effort, going back decades, when he served here, that was working on proposals for us to address the disaster relief issue, which was a very, very challenging one. He explored and came up with some great proposals for how we could deal with disasters beyond having the Federal Government be the place of first resort for the American people when they are faced with the aftermath of a disaster.

But, Madam Speaker, those changes that were proposed by my late colleague Bill Emerson were not made in order, were not addressed, were not implemented, and so we are where we are; and while I’d love to see those changes down the road, today we need to address the very pressing needs that our fellow Americans have for some kind of resolution to this issue.

We have this same-day rule so that we can today pass with what I hope will be strong bipartisan support a continuing resolution that will simply carry us from now to November 18, during which time we will see, Madam Speaker, you and the other members of the Appropriations Committee work to come up with some kind of resolution to this issue.

I am going to urge my colleagues to support this measure in the name of bipartisanship, in the name of our effort to try and resolve this pressing issue.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Here we go again, Madam Speaker. Republicans are, once again, going back on their promises for a more open, more transparent House of Representatives—another martial law rule designed to fix problems of their own doing, another effort to break the rules just to fix their own mess.

And it didn’t have to be this way.

For months, we’ve known that more disaster assistance was needed to address the aftermath of the tragedy in Joplin and, more recently, to address the damage caused by Irene as it made its way from North Carolina up the east coast into New England. Americans respond to natural disasters. That’s what we do. We always have. We rise to the occasion when our neighbors are in need. The problem is when politicians start playing politics with people’s lives, and that’s where we find ourselves today.

Yesterday, the Republican leadership brought a continuing resolution to the floor that not only provided less disaster assistance than that of the Senate, it also offset that funding by cutting a green jobs initiative. It’s not enough that we’ve been in session 261 days without a single jobs proposal from the Republicans. With yesterday’s continuing resolution, Republicans actually proposed cutting a jobs program just to make political points with their Tea Party base.

Yesterday, Democrats said enough—enough to the job-killing Republican agenda, enough to the notion that fiscal austerity means turning our backs on people in need, enough to the “my way or the highway” attitude that seems to make up the ideology of the Republican leadership.

Yesterday, 48 Republicans joined 182 Democrats in defeating the continuing resolution. According to Politico, it was “an embarrassing setback.”

Yesterday, Republicans and Democrats said, Don’t play games with the lives of Americans.

It’s almost as if the Republicans blame the victims of the hurricane and tornado for having the audacity to live in the paths of those natural disasters. So here we are again, forced to consider a martial law rule in an attempt to fix the problems that the Republicans, themselves, created, a martial law rule that not only waives the rules of the House but that also allows for the immediate consideration of a new continuing resolution.

No time to read the bill, even though the Republicans started out the year by promising 72 hours to look at any legislation voted on in the House. No

time to read the bill. No ability to amend the bill.

So much for the new open Congress.

It wasn’t too long ago that my colleagues on the Rules Committee were touting the new open Congress. Look how far this new Republican House has fallen.

Madam Speaker, it is disappointing that we’re here today. It’s disappointing that the Republicans are making a mockery of the legislative process. It’s disappointing that they continue to choose politics over the American people. The American people deserve better than this.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my friend that it’s very unfortunate. In my opening remarks, I made the best attempt that I could to be as bipartisan as possible. Democrats and Republicans alike recognize that we’ve had the most open House, the most transparent process, and that more amendments have been made in order.

I am very proud that the Rules Committee has repeatedly made McGovern amendments in order that have been proposed to the Rules Committee. In the measure that we have addressing the regulation issue, we made every single amendment that complied with the rules of the House in order—an amendment offered by my friend Mr. HASTINGS.

So, to talk about these sorts of crocodile tears, Madam Speaker, the House has gotten to a new low. We need to make sure that the American people who are suffering and in need have the resources that are necessary.

□ 1550

The measure that is before us has a higher level of funding for those who are in need than the President has proposed to ensure that we immediately get those dollars to the people who are suffering, and there are people all over this country who have been suffering through these disasters, and it needs to be done.

Madam Speaker, I will say that we are what we are. The legislative process is not always a pretty one, but I began by talking about our priority of job creation and economic growth; limiting the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government; trying to decrease the regulatory burden, which our TRAIN Act—which we just debated the rule on a little while ago—is designed to address these sorts of steps, designed to make sure that more Americans will have opportunities to be members of the workforce, to be able to support their families and so that people won’t see their small businesses lost because of the economic downturn. Those are the priorities that we have, and getting our fiscal house in order while meeting our priorities which, in this day and age, disaster assistance is one of, are what we’ve got to do.

So I am proud to work closely with my Democratic colleagues. I am proud of the fact that they have been supportive, Madam Speaker, of a number of the measures that we have had before us; and I am proud that we have been able to take many of their ideas, Madam Speaker, and allow them to be considered on the House floor so that we've been able to have a free-flowing debate.

That's what the American people want. I believe that since every Member of this House represents just about the same number of people, about 600,000. Under the new census, it will be, I think, 704,000 constituents, that they have a right to be heard, they have a right to have their ideas considered.

That hasn't always been the case under Republicans or Democrats in the past, but today it is. We're doing our doggone-est to make sure that more Members have their ideas considered.

I am very proud of that fact, and I will say that I regularly have Democrats come to me and say they are very appreciative of the fact that we have been able to allow their ideas to be considered on the House floor.

I am proud of the strides that we have been making under Speaker BOEHNER. We have a long way to go, but this is all inside baseball stuff. As you know very well, Madam Speaker, the priority is job creation and economic growth to ensure that our fellow Americans have the kinds of opportunities that they need.

Let us proceed. This is a procedure that I don't particularly like, but in light of the fact that there had been a bipartisan agreement yesterday that did not work out—that's about the nicest way that I can put it, it didn't work out—and so we had no choice other than to allow for a rule that would provide for same-day consideration simply of this measure to ensure that we don't go through a government shutdown.

I mean, we wouldn't be doing a same-day rule, Madam Speaker, if we weren't faced with, frankly, the threat—and I'm not going to point the finger of blame, but I will say it hasn't been Republicans who have been talking about the idea of a government shutdown. It's something that has come from some others and some on the other side of the Capitol who have talked about the prospect of that. We want to avoid it. We want to ensure it doesn't happen.

And so we're going to have an opportunity, Madam Speaker, to have a measure before us that will address the very important priorities of disaster assistance and other areas which doesn't cut as much as I would like. I would have loved to have voted "no" yesterday, Madam Speaker, because I believe that the spending level is higher than it should be.

The Republicans do, in fact, have a majority in the House of Representatives, but our Democratic colleagues

have a majority in the United States Senate. We know that President Obama is a Democrat. In light of that, we have to come to some kind of a bipartisan consensus. So we're turning ourselves inside out to make that happen, and we have done it time and time again; and this is another example of it.

I hope that we will be able to move ahead and as expeditiously as possible provide the assurance that our fellow Americans need.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I'm a little bit confused. The gentleman referred to the legislation before us that it would provide this for the American people and that for the American people.

The legislation before us is a martial law rule which says that a bill that we have yet to see will be able to be brought up on the floor for same-day consideration. So I don't know what's in the new continuing resolution.

Maybe the gentleman can enlighten us: Do we expect a vote on the continuing resolution today? When can we see this continuing resolution? Does the gentleman have any insight that he can fill us in on and when Members might actually be able to see the bill?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. First of all, let me express my apologies; 99.999 percent of the time I am always riveted to the words of my friend from Worcester when he is offering his thoughts. I have to admit I was talking to our distinguished Rules Committee colleague, Mr. WEBSTER, over here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me reclaim my time and repeat the question.

The question is that the gentleman on a number of occasions referred to that the bill provides this for the American people and that for the American people when the bill before us is a martial law rule. We haven't seen the continuing resolution. When do we expect to see it? Are we voting on it today?

Mr. DREIER. First of all, let me thank the gentleman and say that he is right on mark in raising that question. It's not only a fair question; it's an appropriate question to ask of me.

The answer is we will have a meeting in the House Rules Committee right upstairs on the third floor, at which time we will have before us a proposal that I can tell you will be very similar to the measure that was considered yesterday. As you know, there was \$1.043 trillion in that proposal.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If I can reclaim my time, will that be in the next hour? Will that be today?

Mr. DREIER. It's my hope that we'll be able to do this today. That's the reason, as my friend knows, we were going to pass this measure yesterday and it

didn't work out. I mean, that's part of the legislative process.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, the Rules Committee will consider it today, and then we would vote on it tonight? Is that the plan?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, what I would say is that I hope the Rules Committee will be able to meet in the not-too-distant future. It's now about 2½ minutes before 4 o'clock. I can't say how quickly we'll be able to meet.

We certainly, as is always the case, will give the minority ample notice for them to have a chance to look at whatever modifications are made to the continuing resolution that will be before us.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Is that 1 hour or 72 hours?

Mr. DREIER. Excuse me?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will you give me 1 hour, or 72 hours as was promised?

Mr. DREIER. I have no idea what the gentleman is talking about. What is 72 hours? What is that?

Mr. MCGOVERN. My understanding was that one of the pledges of the new Republican majority was that we were going to have a 72-hour layover to be able to read the bill.

Mr. DREIER. Well, there was never any such pledge made. If the gentleman looks at the rules of the House, he knows very well that there's nothing in there that states 72 hours.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If I could reclaim my time, I thought in the rules of the House it was 3 calendar days.

Mr. DREIER. That is true. As the gentleman knows very well, we're in a position right now where we're dealing with an emergency situation; the American people are hurting. We had the measure before us with a full 3 days. It was put online on Monday, and so we had the 3 full days. And it is true, we're looking at what would be possibly an amendment to that measure, and so we will be in compliance.

First of all, again, let me say, Madam Speaker, that there was not any 72 hours in the rules of the House, if the gentleman would look at the rules of the House. It is a 3-day layover requirement, and I believe that we will be in full compliance with the 3-day layover.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, if I understand the gentleman correctly, we may or may not meet soon. We may or may not vote on it today.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say that obviously we had a bipartisan agreement that was voted on yesterday that did not enjoy bipartisan support. I say that based on

the fact that we had agreements made in colloquies that took place—

Mr. MCGOVERN. If I can reclaim my time, the gentleman mentioned our distinguished minority whip on a number of occasions. I don't recall him ever saying that he supported the Republican bill.

□ 1600

Mr. DREIER. Let me specifically say that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, indicated before the gentleman and the other Rules Committee members and me that he would be supportive of the measure; and he had a right to change his mind.

And, second, in the colloquy that took place last week between the distinguished minority whip and the majority leader, the minority whip indicated that he was supportive of the continuing resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, I don't recall that, and I'll check with the minority whip to double-check on that.

I guess I'm just trying to provide some information to the Members of the House who are watching what's going on.

Am I correct in saying that, as of right now, we don't know when we're going to meet and we don't know when we'll see a final version of the continuing resolution?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, let me say that, first, to address the issue that was raised earlier, there was confusion. I don't know what the gentleman meant about 72 hours. There is a 3-day layover requirement. We will not, and let me underscore again, Madam Speaker, we will not be waiving the 3-day layover requirement; okay? So, I just think it's important for us to make that point. The gentleman repeatedly raises 72 hours and we're not in compliance with this and that, when, in fact, Madam Speaker, we will not be waiving. It's a 3-day layover requirement that exists, and we will not be waiving that.

Second, as far as what time, I believe that, within the next few hours, we'll be able to meet in the Rules Committee and come to the House floor. There are no guarantees. There are no guarantees, but I believe there is a very good chance that we will be able to, in the next few hours, meet in the Rules Committee and the gentleman and I will come to the floor with a rule that will allow us to make in order the continuing resolution to ensure that our fellow Americans who are suffering will have the resources they need.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, if I may ask the gentleman one additional question, does he anticipate that the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Loan Program will be cut in the new version of the con-

tinuing resolution that will be brought before us?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me say, at this juncture, I cannot tell my friend exactly what this measure is going to consist of, but we're in a position right now where that will be considered by the Committee on Rules when we meet upstairs. So we'll be meeting upstairs and we'll see whether that might be an amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, just for the record, I would like to have inserted a letter from Paul A. Yost, who's the vice president at the National Association of Manufacturers, and a letter from R. Bruce Josten, who is the executive vice president, Government Affairs of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, both strongly objecting to the offset that Republicans included in the continuing resolution that we considered yesterday that went down.

One of the reasons there was great objection over this, Madam Speaker, was because this program that was cut actually was a job-creating program putting people to work. I would say to my colleagues, if you want to reduce the debt in this country, you ought to figure out a way to put people back to work; and the way you put people back to work is not cut every single program that provides assistance to business and to people to be able to get on their feet and create jobs.

We have a crisis in this country that is not being addressed by this House of Representatives which has yet to consider a single jobs bill. And instead, we have a continuing resolution that gets brought to the floor that provides less disaster assistance than the Senate bill does to people who are in need and pays for it, offsets it, by cutting a program to create jobs. What sense does that make?

When it comes to disaster relief, we have never, ever, ever offset disaster relief because you can't predict with any accuracy whether there's going to be a tornado next year or a hurricane next year or an earthquake next year.

There are some things we don't offset we should offset; for example, the wars. We've been in Afghanistan for 10 years, and I can't figure out why we're still there, but we're still there. Ten years. I can predict pretty much—very accurately—how much it will cost to stay another year, and yet we borrow that money. We put it on the credit card. We borrow \$10 billion a month for military operations in Afghanistan that goes onto our credit card; not paid for. Not paid for.

But when it comes to helping people in this country who have been adversely impacted by a natural disaster, through no fault of their own, who have lost their homes, who've seen

their communities devastated, all of a sudden we're here saying we've got to find these offsets. And where do the offsets come from? They don't come from Donald Trump's tax cut. Where they come from is a program to put people to work.

The gentleman, the chairman of the Rules Committee, talks about this great openness that we have in the Rules Committee. I have offered, I think about half a dozen times, an amendment to go after the U.S. taxpayer-funded oil subsidies, these subsidies that we provide oil companies that are making record profits, and we can't even get that issue for a vote on this House floor.

I hope we have enough time to read what's in the bill. I hope that we have enough time to understand what's in the bill. I hope that we meet today. I hope that we meet at a decent hour. But we don't have the answers to any of those questions, and I think that that's unfortunate when it comes to a bill about the funding, the continuing funding of our government.

Again, Madam Speaker, I regret that we are here. I regret that we are debating a martial law rule. We're not debating a continuing resolution right now. It's a martial rule that basically shuts everything down and allows them to bring up a bill any time they want to bring a bill up. People won't even have time to read it. And we'll have that vote possibly today. But again, we don't have any definite commitments from the other side what time or even if it will be today.

I will close by saying, Madam Speaker, that I think it is important that this House gets back to the issue of jobs and protecting and caring for the people here in this country. Our biggest challenges, I'm going to tell my friends on the other side, are not halfway around the world; some of them are just halfway down the block. I regret very much that this Congress has yet to deal with the issue of jobs.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2011.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses and organizations of every size, sector, and region, strongly supports disaster relief funding to assist victims of natural disasters. The Chamber is also a vocal proponent of fiscal responsibility and recognizes that Congress must make difficult but necessary choices among competing priorities.

As Congress sets spending priorities, the Chamber wishes to highlight a few important facts about the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing (ATVM) loan program. First, the program was authorized in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, which was supported by both Republicans and Democrats as an important step in reducing America's dependence on oil from unstable regimes. Second, ATVM loans, which will be repaid with interest, incentivize automakers and suppliers to build more fuel-efficient advanced technology vehicles in the U.S., providing new opportunities for American workers in a sector of the economy that

is critical to the nation's recovery. Third, the fact that the Department of Energy has yet to use the funds Congress appropriated for the program is not the fault of industry; numerous loan applicants have been in the queue for years, waiting for the Administration to complete its due diligence.

Again, while the Chamber understands the importance of reducing America's unacceptable debt and believes that all programs must be on the table, the Chamber urges you to bear in mind the facts about the ATVM loan program, which promotes manufacturing in the U.S. and is an important component of America's energy security.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MANUFACTURERS,

Washington, DC, September 22, 2011.

Hon. HARRY REID,

Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,

Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS REID AND MCCONNELL: The NAM is the largest trade association in the United States, representing over 11,000 small, medium and large manufacturers in all 50 states. We are the leading voice for the manufacturing economy, which provides millions of high-wage jobs in the U.S. Two-thirds of our members are small businesses, which serve as the engine for job growth. Our mission is to enhance the competitiveness of manufacturers and improve American living standards by shaping a legislative and regulatory environment conducive to U.S. economic growth.

The NAM is writing to express our support for the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing (ATVM) program, authorized under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Bush. The ATVM program is an example of what government/industry partnerships can accomplish. It has helped create and preserve thousands of auto sector jobs and put our nation on a path towards greater energy security. The NAM believes defunding ATVM will hurt manufacturers and their employees.

Introducing any new model motor vehicle is a capital intensive process. Automobile manufacturers and suppliers must make large investments at the front end before a vehicle enters production. The ATVM program assists this process by providing low cost capital for retooling U.S. facilities. These loans, which will be repaid with interest, allow automakers to build more fuel-efficient advance technology vehicles in the U.S. and provide greater job security for the workers they employ. Furthermore, it is worth noting that many suppliers to the automobile manufacturers are small and medium manufacturers. These smaller manufacturers have the potential to create thousands of jobs but are typically some of the first businesses impacted by a struggling economy. By maintaining the ATVM program the government will also be supporting the maintenance and growth of these smaller manufacturers.

During this time of economic recovery, we urge you to preserve this successful program that is helping preserve auto sector jobs and make promote energy security.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. YOST.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me say, Madam Speaker, to my very good friend that jobs and job creation are exactly what virtually every piece of legislation that we've been ad-

ressing in this House has been designed to deal with. Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle believe that the nearly \$1 trillion—it was like \$787 billion, I think, and then if you add the interest, it came up to like \$1.1 trillion. That stimulus bill was their jobs bill. As I recall, we were told, if we saw that \$1 trillion stimulus bill implemented, that the unemployment rate would not exceed 8 percent.

Well, Madam Speaker, in part of the area that I represent, we have an unemployment rate of 14 percent. We have a national unemployment rate of over 9 percent, and it's not acceptable. So I totally concur with my friend's assessment, and I congratulate him. I congratulate him for his opening statement there when he said the best way for us to deal with the deficit is to make sure that people in this country have jobs.

Economic growth is what we've been talking about. I believe if we had 2, 3, 4 percent more GDP growth in this country, we wouldn't be here having this discussion. The question is: How is it that we get our fellow Americans back to work?

We believe that it's essential to create long-term, good jobs in the private sector. We believe in doing things like opening up new markets around the world, because 96 percent of the world's consumers are outside of our borders. Ninety-six percent of the world's consumers are outside of our borders. And yet, unfortunately, we have not been able to have, yet, the agreements that have been negotiated over the past several years sent to us in the Congress to vote on. Clearly, if we had the agreements that have been negotiated between the Koreans and the United States, the Colombians and the United States, the Panamanians and the United States, we would create many, many jobs here in the United States.

Yesterday, Madam Speaker, I met with the Ambassador from Colombia. On August 15, they implemented an agreement with Canada for a free trade agreement between Canada and Colombia. And guess what? There has been an 18.9 percent increase in wheat exports from Canada to Colombia in 1 single month.

□ 1610

Now, Madam Speaker, I have said this time and time again here. We have union and nonunion workers who are employed by companies, great American companies that are manufacturing companies like Caterpillar, John Deere, and Whirlpool, and we could get these people working, we could get these people working if we could open up new markets for those manufactured products in Latin America and in Asia. That's exactly what we've got ahead of us. And I hope very much that the President will immediately send to us those agreements so that we can enjoy, again, bipartisan support, Democrats and Republicans working together to pass these agreements.

If we do that, we will do exactly what my friend just said, Madam Speaker, we will do exactly what my friend just said in his opening statement there. What he said was we need to get Americans into jobs so that we can have the revenues that are necessary for us to deal with the deficit and debt challenges that we have.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just found out some news here in answer to a question I had earlier about offsets. Apparently, according to the National Journal, the Republican leaders are considering tacking on as much as \$100 million in additional offsets to their GOP continuing resolution they are bringing to the floor. That is a quote attributed to House Rules Committee Chairman DAVID DREIER. So I just read in the National Journal basically that there will be additional offsets.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, let me just say that I hope very much we are able to see offsets for this because, again, we have a \$14.5 trillion national debt. We have deficits as far as the eye can see. So, as we deal with the very important priorities of ensuring that our fellow Americans who are suffering because of these tragic disasters that have taken place across the country—we need to realize that there is a hell of a lot of waste in the Federal Government, a hell of a lot of waste, and there are regulations.

Again, the measure that I just mentioned, my friends said that we haven't had jobs bills before us, but the measure that Mr. HASTINGS was just managing the rule on is designed to deal with the burden of regulations which have undermined the potential for job creation and economic growth.

Again, pursuing an economic growth agenda is a priority of ours, and making sure that we get our fiscal house in order is one of those. So that is why I will say to my friend in response to his question, you bet we are going to try and find areas where the Federal Government has been expending dollars that have not been spent wisely and use those dollars to ensure that those who are suffering and those who are in need have what is necessary for them to survive.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Which brings me back to my original point of why it's important for us to see this bill. You say that you want to eliminate waste, but the U.S. Chamber of Commerce says that the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program is not waste; it creates jobs. So I don't know where else you're going to cut.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, let me say to my friend we are not going to waive the 3-day layover requirement, and whatever changes are made in this

measure will be addressed in the House Rules Committee and then fully debated on this House floor so the Members will have an opportunity to decide whether or not they are going to support the special rule that would then make in order consideration of this continuing resolution that will prevent a government shutdown, make sure that the resources for those who are suffering are made available, and take us to November 18 so that very thoughtful members of the Appropriations Committee, like the acting Speaker, will be able to deal with the appropriations priorities that we need to between now and November 18.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I just want to make sure the record is clear when it comes to Democratic support for the continuing resolution. In his pen and pad press conference, Minority Whip HOYER said he was "loath" to support yesterday's CR, and I have a copy of that press conference and the transcript of the colloquy that went on on the House floor here. So if anybody is interested in reading it in detail, I have it here.

At this point, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee and my good friend for yielding. I echo all of the sentiments that he has made previously.

Firstly, I'd like to point to the fact that the National Association of Manufacturers, in its last sentence in a letter directed to Senator REID and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, says, "During this time of economic recovery, we urge you to preserve this successful program"—meaning the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing program—"that is helping preserve auto sector jobs and promote energy security."

Bruce Josten, from the Chamber of Commerce, while citing to all Members of the House of Representatives that the chamber "understands the importance of reducing America's unacceptable debt and believes that all programs must be on the table, the chamber urges you to bear in mind the facts about the ATVM loan program, which promotes manufacturing in the United States and is an important component of America's energy security."

I only cited that for the reason that there could be no better person to know what martial law is than the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, who is my good friend. He and I, he and Mr. MCGOVERN and I, Ms. SLAUGHTER and he and I have been back and forth on martial law when Democrats were in charge and when Republicans were in charge. One thing you need to understand is this is martial law that you are bringing this rule under, and we don't even know what's in the bill.

Yesterday afternoon, the Republican leadership brought up a bill that failed

American workers, failed our Nation's economy, and failed those struggling to recover from natural disasters. It is no surprise that their rank and file then failed them.

Rather than take up language that has already passed the Senate with bipartisan support, Republicans instead chose to pit unemployed factory workers against hurricane victims. This is not the kind of behavior that will bring our Nation out of this recession.

While Republicans continue their partisan squabbles, countless Americans are fighting for their livelihoods. Six years after Hurricane Katrina, roofs are still being replaced, homes are being repaired and paperwork is still pending for funds that have yet to be allocated. And if you've been to New Orleans, you'll see a whole section of that city that is not in repair.

In my home State of Florida, FEMA has already delayed \$1.68 million for work resulting from 2004 and 2005 Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Ivan, Jeanne and Dennis.

Given my colleague's distorted priorities, I can't help but wonder how long will the people of New England have to wait since we've been waiting in Florida since 2004 and 2005.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. And some have been waiting for drought relief and flood relief for an equal number of years. But this appears to be of no consequence to my Republican colleagues as they fail to recognize that their ideological posturing has very real repercussions. Once again, their irresponsible behavior and unwillingness to compromise has put us on the brink of yet another shutdown.

H. Res. 409 unnecessarily will provide for same-day consideration of another Republican continuing resolution, violating the House Republicans' rules package passed in January which provided that all bills will be available to the public 3 days before coming to a vote. Not only did we not get the required 72 hours, we didn't get 24 hours.

The Speaker made it very clear. He said that we will dispense with the conventional wisdom that bigger bills are always better; that fast legislating is good legislating; and that allowing additional amendments and open debate makes the legislative process less efficient than our forefathers intended. Legislators and the public will have 3 days to read bills before they come to a vote.

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

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

□ 1620

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. We were told we would have 3 days to read bills before they come to a vote. We were told that they would be on the Internet

and that technology is available so that all of America could see what we're doing. And as the Speaker said—and I thoroughly agree—fast legislating is not good legislating, especially when there is no need to require a rushed, closed process. As far as we know, we're voting on a same-day rule for a bill we don't even know exists. Before we even ask to spend billions of dollars, we should have some idea of what's going on. And it's not enough for me to hear that we're going to hear about it in the Rules Committee later on. I want to know what's going on right now.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, first, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my friend from Fort Lauderdale, my Rules Committee colleague, Mr. HASTINGS, that I'd like to associate myself with a segment of the remarks that he made talking about the priority of addressing the very pressing needs of those who are suffering because of the disasters that have taken place in this country. My friend is absolutely right, and that's the reason that we are here.

Now, I would like to say that I don't know where it is that my friends get this 72 hours that's discussed regularly. Mr. MCGOVERN has raised that, Mr. HASTINGS has raised it, Madam Speaker, and I don't know where they get that. We have what is known as the 3-day layover requirement. And let me clarify this because obviously some of my colleagues don't completely understand. I'm talking about the rules of the House, not statements that may have been made. The rules of the House say that there is a 3-day layover requirement.

On Monday, Madam Speaker, this measure was put online; the bill that we voted on yesterday was put online. It calls for \$1.043 trillion in spending on an annual basis as we address keeping the government going, ensuring we don't have a government shutdown between now and November 18. That was put online on Monday.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I just wanted to respond to your statement that you don't know where we—

Mr. DREIER. Are you telling me I can't associate myself with your remarks?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. No, that you don't know where we got the 72 hours from. Well, if you go on the Speaker's Web site, you will see in the very first paragraph what he says in that regard with reference to 72 hours. Perhaps that's where we got it from.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I will tell my friend that the rules of the House are what we are complying with. The rules of the House say a 3-day layover requirement. On Monday, this was made available and put online. And now my friend says, I want to see it now, I want to see exactly what we're considering.

The reason that we will not be waiving the 3-day layover requirement is that we are going to have a bill that is very similar to the measure that we had last night, with possibly an amendment made to that.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Just one thing, Mr. Chairman: Does the Speaker's word matter or not?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, I will tell you that I don't know what he means by the "Speaker's word." The rules of the House are what we live by.

The rules of the House say that it needs to be made available online for 3 days. And guess what, Madam Speaker? We are in full compliance with the rules of the House, and we have no intention to waive that.

Okay. I'm looking now at a statement that was made on some program on Fox that says: "I will not bring a bill to the floor that hasn't been posted online for at least 72 hours." Let me say thank you. I want to express my great appreciation. And I appreciate the size of the type, too, making it very easy for me to read it across the aisle here, another indication of our bridging the gap between either side of the aisle here, which is something I greatly appreciate.

It did turn out that the Speaker did say that, but then we came forward with a rules package; and that's why what I'm saying is the rules say that we will in fact have 3 days. A 3-day layover requirement needs to be met, and that's what the rules of the House consist of.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, one thing I really would like to make clear and take out some of the hyperbole and the passion from my side or yours, we know, and you have said—and I echo your expressions with reference to the need for us to address—

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time for just one moment—and the reason I'm doing that is that I'm told that we have about 1 minute or so left, and I know my friend has 10 minutes. So could my friend yield to the gentleman and me? I know we're going to get the great poster with the Speaker's quote up there again, and I will look forward to reading it again, and I will join in reading it again with you all.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The only thing I am trying to get across is I don't want the American public to believe that whenever we get through—whether it's 72 hours, or whenever it is—that that means that the des-

perately needed money in Vermont and in New England and other places is going to be forthcoming most immediately because I'm telling you that from '04 and '05, from six hurricanes we are not being paid in the State of Florida.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just very quickly say that it was explained to us by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee today that we're spending about \$30 million a day. There's \$200 million in the account; it's scheduled to expire by this weekend. Passage of this measure tonight is something that will ensure that we will at least have those resources, and I hope we can address the needs of those Floridians who continue to suffer.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Well, not only Floridians.

Mr. DREIER. And others in this country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Exactly. That's the point. From tornadoes, from hurricanes, from fires, all over the place.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend that I'm going to close the debate over here as soon as my friend holds up that brilliant poster of the Fox News interview that Speaker BOEHNER had.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to hold this poster up because I want to make sure that it's clear to everybody. I'm going to quote this: "I will not bring a bill to the floor that hasn't been posted online for at least 72 hours." JOHN BOEHNER, Fox News, "America's News Room," 7/22/2010.

Mr. Speaker, we can have all the verbal gyrations that we can come up with here about how not to kind of get to the point, which is that we're not going to be able to have 3 days or 72 hours or 3 legislative days—or three anything—to look at this bill. And the bill that we're going to be debating later today or tomorrow—we don't really know—is going to be different. And we know it's going to be different because the chairman of the Rules Committee said in an interview that we have online to National Journal that there's probably going to be another \$100 million more in offsets. And so where are those offsets coming from?

We know that one of the offsets that was in the continuing resolution yesterday was an offset that actually was a job killer, that actually is something that not only Democrats supported, but the United States Chamber of Commerce supported. Everyone came together and agreed that this is a good program, and it was cut, and it is going to discourage job creation in this country.

So I think it is important to know where these offsets are going to be coming from. And, again, let me repeat

what I've said over and over: this has not been a bipartisan process. The only thing bipartisan about this continuing resolution was the opposition to it.

And, again, I would tell my Republican friends that the reason why this promise by Speaker BOEHNER is important is because we do need to understand what's in the bill. We're beginning to understand that your rules don't live up to what you actually promised.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing about this that I think is important for people to understand is that never, ever, ever have we ever insisted on offsets for emergency spending for disasters. We don't know whether there will be one, two, three, or no emergencies that hit our country next year or the year after or the year after that. Maybe my Republican friends have now figured out a way to predict earthquakes and tsunamis and hurricanes and tornadoes, but we don't know how to predict with any accuracy.

And this notion that we're not going to be there, that we're going to insist on offsets in order to provide people who have been thrown out of their homes, whose communities have been destroyed through no fault of their own, that we can find an offset when we don't need any offsets for nation-building in Afghanistan, that's all on your credit card. There's no offsets needed for that.

□ 1630

Why is it that no offsets are needed to do that kind of stuff, but when it comes to helping people in this country, all of a sudden we become super fiscally conservative? We need to have offsets for everything.

You want to reduce the debt? Put people back to work. That's how you do it. Cutting programs that put people back to work doesn't put people back to work. It slows down the economic recovery.

Here we are in September, and we have yet to deal with a single jobs bill on this floor. I don't know what it's like in California, but I can tell you in Massachusetts, when I go home, people want to talk about jobs and the economy. Yes, they want to reduce the debt, and they understand, by ending some of these wars, by cutting back on some of these overseas bases that we have, by asking Donald Trump to pay his fair share.

There's something wrong in this country when a billionaire hedge fund manager pays a lower tax rate than his secretary. It's like, no, we can't ask that person, that billionaire to pay his fair share. Everything is aimed at working people and those who are most vulnerable.

We should be talking about putting America back to work. We should be debating every day about ways to stimulate this economy, to provide incentives to put people back to work, to find ways to stop incentivizing corporations to send American jobs overseas.

Instead, my friends on the other side of the aisle are protecting all that status quo. I mean, they are protecting those tax breaks, those incentives that encourage jobs to go overseas. Enough. Enough.

I'll close by saying this, Mr. Speaker: When it comes to protecting subsidies for Big Oil companies, my friends are there. When it comes to rebuilding and nation building in Afghanistan, they're there. When it comes to maintaining a Tax Code that allows a billionaire hedge fund manager to pay a lower tax rate than his secretary, they're there. But when it comes to disaster assistance, when it comes to jobs, when it comes to things that matter to everyday people, it is a struggle. It is a fight.

I would urge my colleagues to rethink their priorities, to work in a bipartisan way when it comes to disaster relief and job creation.

Let's bring the President's jobs bill to the floor. If you don't like it, vote against it. But allow us to have the opportunity in this new, open House. Let us bring the President's jobs bill to the floor. Let us see whether we can pass it here. I think if this truly is an open House, we ought to have that opportunity.

I will just say, Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the balance of my time, I don't know when we're going to get this bill. I don't know where the cuts are going to be made. I don't know what other job-creating programs are going to be cut. But again, "I will not bring a bill to the floor that hasn't been posted on line for at least 72 hours." We're not even going to get 72 minutes, in all likelihood.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting and have been suffering from disasters over the past several weeks and months and, obviously, for a long period of time in the past.

We just had a meeting downstairs where one of my new colleagues, the gentleman from Williamsport, Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) stood up and talked about the fact that he, just days ago, was trudging through mud, meeting with the parents of small children, young children who were literally sitting on the hoods of automobiles in Pennsylvania where terrible flooding has taken place, and they have been asking him, since they had lost their homes, what he was going to do. And Mr. MARINO made it very clear that he would do everything possible to ensure that those families would have what they needed. And that's why we're here right now with the measure that we have before us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this measure that will come before us later this evening is a measure that has been online more than 72 hours. It was put online on Monday. Today is Thursday, so well beyond 72 hours it's been made available.

We have actually doubled, from \$500 million to \$1 billion, the FY11 request that was made by the President because we understand the imperative of getting these resources to the American people who are suffering. We can do that, Mr. Speaker, while, at the same time, reining in the size and scope and reach and control of the Federal Government, because everyone knows, Democrats and Republicans alike acknowledge, that there is waste in government, and that's the reason that we're saying we must pare the level of spending back.

And so, Mr. Speaker, this is not martial law. This is simply our step to ensure that the American people get the resources they need and that we do it in a fiscally responsible way, and it stems from what was a bipartisan agreement.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge an "aye" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. DREIER. 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 on House Resolution 409 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 409, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 406; and adoption of House Resolution 406, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 180, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 721]

YEAS—240

Adams	Canseco	Flores
Aderholt	Cantor	Forbes
Akin	Capito	Fortenberry
Alexander	Carter	Fox
Amash	Cassidy	Franks (AZ)
Amodei	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Austria	Chaffetz	Gallegly
Bachus	Coble	Gardner
Barletta	Coffman (CO)	Garrett
Bartlett	Cohen	Gerlach
Barton (TX)	Cole	Gibbs
Bass (NH)	Conaway	Gibson
Benishek	Cravaack	Gingrey (GA)
Berg	Crawford	Gohmert
Biggert	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bilbray	Culberson	Gosar
Bilirakis	Davis (KY)	Gowdy
Bishop (UT)	Denham	Granger
Black	Dent	Graves (GA)
Blackburn	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Bonner	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Bono Mack	Dold	Griffith (VA)
Boustany	Dreier	Grimm
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Guinta
Brooks	Duncan (SC)	Guthrie
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hall
Buchanan	Ellmers	Hanna
Bucshon	Emerson	Harper
Buerkle	Farenthold	Harris
Burgess	Fincher	Hartzler
Burton (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Hastings (WA)
Calvert	Flake	Hayworth
Camp	Fleischmann	Heck
Campbell	Fleming	Hensarling

Herger	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Herrera Beutler	Rodgers	Scalise
Huelskamp	Meehan	Schilling
Huizenga (MI)	Mica	Schmidt
Hultgren	Miller (FL)	Schock
Hunter	Miller (MI)	Schweikert
Hurt	Miller, Gary	Scott (SC)
Issa	Mulvaney	Scott, Austin
Jenkins	Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (IL)	Myrick	Sessions
Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Shuler
Jones	Nugent	Shuster
Jordan	Nunes	Simpson
Kelly	Nunnelee	Smith (NE)
King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NJ)
King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (TX)
Kingston	Paulsen	Southerland
Kinzinger (IL)	Pearce	Stearns
Kline	Pence	Stivers
Labrador	Petri	Stutzman
Lamborn	Pitts	Sullivan
Lance	Platts	Terry
Landry	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Lankford	Pompeo	Thornberry
Latham	Posey	Tiberi
LaTourette	Price (GA)	Tipton
Latta	Quayle	Turner (NY)
Lewis (CA)	Reed	Turner (OH)
LoBiondo	Rehberg	Upton
Long	Renacci	Walberg
Lucas	Ribble	Walden
Luetkemeyer	Rigell	Walsh (IL)
Lummis	Rivera	Webster
Lungren, Daniel	Roby	West
E.	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
Mack	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
Manzullo	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Wittman
Marino	Rohrabacher	Wolf
McCarthy (CA)	Rokita	Womack
McCaul	Rooney	Woodall
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoder
McCotter	Roskam	Young (AK)
McHenry	Ross (FL)	Young (FL)
McKeon	Royce	Young (IN)
McKinley	Runyan	

NAYS—180

Ackerman	Doggett	Lowey
Altmire	Donnelly (IN)	Lujan
Andrews	Doyle	Lynch
Baca	Edwards	Maloney
Baldwin	Ellison	Markey
Barrow	Engel	Matheson
Bass (CA)	Eshoo	Matsui
Becerra	Farr	McCarthy (NY)
Berkley	Fattah	McCollum
Berman	Filner	McDermott
Bishop (GA)	Frank (MA)	McGovern
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	McIntyre
Blumenauer	Garamendi	McNerney
Boren	Gonzalez	Meeks
Boswell	Green, Al	Michaud
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	Miller (NC)
Braley (IA)	Grijalva	Miller, George
Brown (FL)	Gutierrez	Moore
Butterfield	Hahn	Moran
Capps	Hanabusa	Murphy (CT)
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Cardoza	Heinrich	Napolitano
Carnahan	Frelinghuysen	Neal
Carney	Hinchee	Olver
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Owens
Castor (FL)	Hochul	Pallone
Chandler	Holden	Pascrell
Chu	Holt	Pastor (AZ)
Ciilline	Honda	Payne
Clarke (MI)	Hoyer	Pelosi
Clarke (NY)	Inslee	Perlmutter
Clay	Israel	Peters
Cleaver	Jackson (IL)	Peterson
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Pingree (ME)
Connolly (VA)	(TX)	Polis
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Costello	Keating	Rahall
Courtney	Kildee	Reyes
Critz	Kind	Richardson
Crowley	Kissell	Ross (AR)
Cuellar	Kucinich	Rothman (NJ)
Cummings	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeFazio	Levin	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
DeLauro	Lipinski	T.
Dicks	Loebsock	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe	Sarbanes

Schakowsky Smith (WA) Velázquez
Schiff Speier Visclosky
Schrader Stark Walz (MN)
Schwartz Sutton Wasserman
Scott (VA) Thompson (CA) Schultz
Scott, David Thompson (MS) Waters
Serrano Tierney Watt
Sewell Tonko Waxman
Sherman Towns Welch
Sires Tsongas Wilson (FL)
Slaughter Van Hollen Woolsey

NOT VOTING—13

Bachmann Hirono Reichert
Conyers Kaptur Richmond
Deutch Lee (CA) Yarmuth
Giffords Paul
Higgins Rangel

□ 1711

Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MATSUI, Messrs. MCINTYRE, CROWLEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BARTLETT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 182, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 722]

YEAS—238

Adams Cravaack Hall
Aderholt Crawford Hanna
Akin Crenshaw Harper
Alexander Culberson Harris
Amash Davis (KY) Hartzler
Amodei Denham Hastings (WA)
Austria Dent Hayworth
Bachus DesJarlais Heck
Barletta Diaz-Balart Hensarling
Bartlett Dold Herger
Barton (TX) Dreier Herrera Beutler
Bass (NH) Duffy Huelskamp
Benishek Duncan (SC) Huizenga (MI)
Berg Duncan (TN) Hultgren
Biggert Ellmers Hunter
Bilbray Emerson Hurt
Bilirakis Farenthold Issa
Bishop (UT) Fincher Jenkins
Black Fitzpatrick Johnson (IL)
Blackburn Flake Johnson (OH)
Bonner Fleischmann Johnson, Sam
Bono Mack Fleming Jones
Boustany Flores Jordan
Brady (TX) Forbes Kelly
Brooks Fortenberry King (IA)
Broun (GA) Foxx King (NY)
Buchanan Franks (AZ) Kingston
Bucshon Frelinghuysen Kinzinger (IL)
Buerkle Gallegly Kline
Burgess Gardner Labrador
Burton (IN) Garrett Lamborn
Calvert Gerlach Lance
Camp Gibbs Landry
Campbell Gibson Lankford
Canseco Gingrey (GA) Latham
Cantor Goodlatte LaTourette
Capito Gosar Latta
Carter Gowdy Lewis (CA)
Cassidy Granger LoBiondo
Chabot Graves (GA) Long
Chaffetz Graves (MO) Lucas
Coble Griffin (AR) Luetkemeyer
Coffman (CO) Griffith (VA) Lummis
Cohen Grimm Lungren, Daniel
Cole Guinta E.
Conaway Guthrie Mack

Manzullo Pompeo
Marchant Posey
Marino Price (GA)
McCarthy (CA) Quayle
McCaul Reed
McClintock Rehberg
McCotter Renacci
McHenry Ribble
McKeon Rigell
McKinley Rivera
McMorris Roby
Rodgers Roe (TN)
Meehan Rogers (AL)
Mica Rogers (KY)
Miller (FL) Rogers (MI)
Miller (MI) Rohrabacher
Miller, Gary Rokita
Mulvaney Rooney
Murphy (PA) Ros-Lehtinen
Myrick Roskam
Neugebauer Ross (FL)
Noem Royce
Nugent Runyan
Nunes Ryan (WI)
Nunnelee Scalise
Olson Schilling
Palazzo Schmidt
Paulsen Schock
Pearce Schweikert
Pence Scott (SC)
Petri Scott, Austin
Pitts Sensenbrenner
Platts Sessions
Poe (TX) Shimkus

NAYS—182

Ackerman Garamendi Owens
Altmire Gonzalez Pallone
Andrews Green, Al Pascrell
Baca Green, Gene Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin Grijalva Payne
Barrow Gutierrez Pelosi
Bass (CA) Hahn Perlmutter
Becerra Hanabusa Peters
Berkley Hastings (FL) Peterson
Berman Heinrich Pingree (ME)
Bishop (GA) Higgins Polis
Bishop (NY) Himes Price (NC)
Blumenauer Hinchey Quigley
Boren Hinojosa Rahall
Boswell Hochul Reyes
Brady (PA) Holden Richardson
Braley (IA) Holt Richmond
Brown (FL) Honda Ross (AR)
Butterfield Hoyer Rothman (NJ)
Capps Inslee Roybal-Allard
Capuano Israel Ruppertsberger
Cardoza Jackson (IL) Rush
Carnahan Jackson Lee Ryan (OH)
Carney (TX) Sanchez, Linda
Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B. T.
Castor (FL) Kaptur Sanchez, Loretta
Chandler Keating Sarbanes
Chu Kildee Schakowsky
Cicilline Kind Schiff
Clarke (MI) Kissell Schrader
Clarke (NY) Kucinich Schwartz
Clay Langevin Scott (VA)
Cleaver Larsen (WA) Scott, David
Clyburn Lee (CA) Serrano
Connolly (VA) Levin Sewell
Cooper Lewis (GA) Sherman
Costa Lipinski Shuler
Costello Loebsock Sires
Courtney Lofgren, Zoe Slaughter
Critz Lowey Smith (WA)
Crowley Lujan Speier
Cuellar Lynch Stark
Cummings Maloney Sutton
Davis (CA) Matheson Thompson (CA)
Davis (IL) Matsui Thompson (MS)
DeFazio McCarthy (NY) Tierney
DeGette McCollum Tonko
DeLauro McDermott Towns
Dicks McGovern Tsongas
Dingell McIntyre Van Hollen
Doggett McNerney Velázquez
Donnelly (IN) Meeks Visclosky
Doyle Michaud Walz (MN)
Edwards Miller (NC) Wasserman
Ellison Miller, George Schultz
Engel Moore Waters
Eshoo Moran Watt
Farr Murphy (CT) Waxman
Fattah Nadler Welch
Finer Napolitano Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA) Neal Woolsey
Fudge Oliver

NOT VOTING—13

Bachmann Hirono Rangel
Conyers Johnson (GA) Reichert
Deutch Larson (CT) Yarmuth
Giffords Markey
Gohmert Paul

□ 1718

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2401, TRANSPARENCY IN REGULATORY ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS ON THE NATION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 406) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2401) to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 184, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 723]

YEAS—237

Adams Crenshaw Harris
Aderholt Culberson Hartzler
Akin Davis (KY) Hastings (WA)
Alexander Denham Hayworth
Amash Dent Heck
Amodei DesJarlais Hensarling
Austria Diaz-Balart Herger
Bachus Bachus Dold
Barletta Barletta Dreier
Bartlett Duffy Hultgren
Barton (TX) Duncan (SC)
Bass (NH) Duncan (TN) Hunter
Benishek Ellmers Hurt
Berg Emerson Issa
Biggert Farenthold Jenkins
Bilbray Bilbray Fincher
Bilirakis Fitzpatrick Johnson (IL)
Bishop (UT) Flake Johnson (OH)
Black Fleischmann Johnson, Sam
Blackburn Fleming Jones
Bono Mack Bonner Jordan
Boustany Bono Mack Kelly
Brady (TX) Fortenberry King (IA)
Brooks Fortenberry King (NY)
Broun (GA) Foxx Kingston
Buchanan Franks (AZ) Kinzinger (IL)
Bucshon Frelinghuysen Kline
Buerkle Gallegly Labrador
Burgess Gardner Lamborn
Burton (IN) Garrett Lance
Calvert Gerlach Lankford
Camp Gibbs Latham
Campbell Gibson LaTourette
Canseco Gingrey (GA) Latta
Cantor Goodlatte Lewis (CA)
Capito Gosar LoBiondo
Carter Gowdy Long
Cassidy Granger Lucas
Chabot Graves (GA) Luetkemeyer
Chaffetz Graves (MO) Lummis
Coble Griffin (AR) Lungren, Daniel
Coffman (CO) Griffith (VA) E.
Cohen Grimm Mack
Cole Guinta
Conaway Guthrie