

the backs of the middle class and America's most vulnerable: our seniors, women, and children. That means that 326,000 women will lose breast cancer screenings, 300,000 fewer children will be with health insurance, and 1.7 million seniors are going to go without Meals on Wheels.

This Tea Party budget is an embarrassment. We can all do better, and Democrats know that because we support a balanced approach that creates jobs and expands opportunities. Republicans ought to know better. Actually, Mr. Speaker, they ought to do better by honoring the American people.

□ 1220

STAFFORD LOANS IN HAWAII

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, the Senate is now debating the Stafford loan or the student loan bill—their version. And their version is better because their version pays for it by closing big tax loopholes. It requires us to now look at what the House passed. We paid for a 1-year extension by repealing the preventative health care provisions. What does that mean? It means that women and children will suffer.

For my State, Mr. Speaker, it meant that the State preventative grants will be gone, and that's what we need to prevent heart attacks, to address the concerns of, in particular, women and children and those who are in need.

But what does it mean when we let this interest rate go up? For me, it is 16,681 students, average loans of \$4,000-plus, total amount of loans in the State of \$67-plus million. This is going to be an additional \$16 million to them. Mr. Speaker, we can do better.

NATIONAL TEACHER DAY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, most of us remember a teacher who made us look at the world a little differently, introduced us to a new idea or changed the way we thought.

For me, that teacher was Betty Miles. For 2 years at Atherton High School in Louisville, my English teacher introduced me to an entire universe of thought and language, and I am forever grateful.

Across the country, millions of people like Betty Miles are introducing young Americans to new concepts that will stick with them for a lifetime. Their work is critical for our most fundamental national interest: to build and maintain a strong and vibrant economy and to remain at the forefront of global innovation and ideas. And their daily sacrifices on behalf of growing generations are nothing short of heroic.

Much in the way teachers change the lives of their students, their voices also

shape debate in Washington. As we consider the future of public education in this country, we must also continue to hear from those on the ground to better address the challenges facing our school systems.

Mr. Speaker, today on National Teacher Day, I encourage everyone to not only thank their teachers, but to ask them this essential question: How can we do better?

OBSTACLES TO HIGHER EDUCATION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if we don't act within the next 53 days, what we are going to see is the student loan interest rate double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent for more than 7.5 million students. I understand that basically that means a student would rack up an additional \$1,000 in debt each year that the student interest rate stayed at 7 percent instead of 3 percent. The fact of the matter is, we have to do something about this.

Last week during our district office week, I went to Rutgers University, Mr. Speaker, and I met with students. They were in the middle of their final exams. They reject outright this Republican idea that we should take money from women's or children's health care, from the prevention fund, to pay for this. There has got to be a better way of doing it that we must approach on a bipartisan basis. But I heard the stories at Rutgers about the students and how much debt, crushing debt, they had. Not only those who had debt from their undergraduate days, but also many students who have to go on to graduate school or law school or medical school and accumulate even more debt.

We need to address this problem immediately with regard to the student interest rate. We have got to keep it low. But we also have to address the larger issue of college affordability over the long term. There has to be more money for student loans and for grants. College affordability is something that we need to address in a major way, Mr. Speaker.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5326, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 643 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 643

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to commit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 614 is amended in section 2(a) by inserting "and the allocations of spending authority printed in Tables 11 and 12 of House Report 112-421 shall be considered for all purposes in the House to be the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974" before the period.

SEC. 3. 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 on May 10, 2012, providing for consideration or disposition of any measure reported by the Committee on the Budget relating to section 201 of House Concurrent Resolution 112.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, I always look around when I hear the Reading Clerk reading the rule because I can't tell if folks are glossing over or if they are excited about it, like I am. If you paid close attention to the Reading Clerk this morning, Mr. Speaker, you're excited about it. You're excited about it because we're here to do the first appropriations bill of the FY 2013 cycle. Now, Mr. Speaker, as you know, there is about two-thirds of the budget that is the mandatory spending—that budget that gets spent whether Congress shows up to work or not. It's just money that gets borrowed from our children and goes right out the door.

This one-third of the budget, the discretionary spending side, is the part that doesn't go out the door unless the House comes together and passes a bill, sends it to the Senate, and gets the Senate to pass a bill, and it goes to the President's desk for signature. This is the first of those bills that we're going to have a chance to do in this Congress. And as we began the year last year, we are going to begin the year this year—with an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, an open rule allows any Member of this body to bring any idea that they have and offer it as an amendment to the underlying bill. You don't have to be a high-ranking Republican to get an amendment to this bill. You don't have to be a senior Democrat to get an amendment to this bill. You just have to be a representative of constituents back home, and you can show up on this floor and have a say. This is going to be Congress at its best, Mr. Speaker. When you hear it read, it sounds like a lot of legalistic mumbo jumbo, but when you see it in action, it is this House as our Founding Fathers intended this House to be.

This is House Resolution 643, Mr. Speaker, and it is an open rule for consideration of H.R. 5326, the fiscal year 2013 Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill.

You know, last year, Mr. Speaker, we only got through 6½ of the appropriations bills in this House before it became apparent the process was going to break down, and we went to a minibus to finish the deal. But we considered 350 amendments—350 different ideas, Mr. Speaker—350 lines that came from the body right here that said we have a better way than what the committee has reported to us.

□ 1230

Now, this is a special day, as my colleague from Florida knows, because this appropriations bill passed out of subcommittee by a voice vote—a voice vote. Democrats and Republicans came together in subcommittee, passed this bill, and sent it on to the full committee where, again, Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass out of full committee this bill on a voice vote, and now we bring it to the House floor today. Goodness knows, we may be able to pass this rule on a voice vote, I say to my colleague from Florida, and perhaps the underlying legislation as well. This is the House working as the folks back home intended the House to work.

Now, this is funding for the Commerce Department, Mr. Speaker. All of those programs intended to grow jobs in this country, to promote trade in this country, Commerce Department, funded under this bill. This is the bill that funds the Justice Department, funds our U.S. Marshals, funds our FBI, funds those parts of our society that we know need special attention, Mr. Speaker, in these difficult times.

This is the bill that funds NASA, Mr. Speaker. This is the bill that funds the

National Science Foundation. This is the bill that funds the U.S. Trade Representative and the International Trade Commission. Mr. Speaker, I will quote the subcommittee chairman, FRANK WOLF, who said:

This legislation builds on significant spending reductions achieved in last year's bill while continuing to preserve core priorities. Those priorities continue to be job creation, fighting crime and terrorism—with a focus on cybersecurity—and boosting U.S. competitiveness through smart investments in science. This bill makes job creation a priority by maintaining and expanding manufacturing and job repatriation initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, these are tough times. I don't know if you've seen all the young people outside this Chamber today, Mr. Speaker, folks in town with their schools, folks in town visiting Washington, D.C. You know, 40 cents out of every dollar that this Chamber spends, Mr. Speaker, we borrow from those children. We heard lots of 1-minutes this morning about the student loan program. Of course, every penny that goes out the door is a penny that we borrowed from the next generation of Americans.

This bill, passed out of subcommittee and full committee on a voice vote, represents a 1-percent reduction from the President's request in this title. A lot of folks in this body would like it to be more than 1 percent. I suspect we'll have some amendments on this floor during this wonderful open amendment process that will in fact try to change that number to be greater than 1 percent. But what folks came together to say is these are priorities for this country. These all are important funding priorities that only the national and the Federal Government can do. So we want to fund those in a responsible way that both focuses on not borrowing from the next generation, but still maintaining important core priorities that I think we would all agree are important to this Federal Government.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. And, again, I thank my friend and colleague, Mr. WOODALL, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I also appreciated his comments about the fact that we are borrowing from the next generation. I gather that the previous generation borrowed from us. I don't know when the borrowing stops, but at least that seems to be the way of the world until we get to a point where we can be self-sustaining, as rightly we should be.

This rule provides for consideration of Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations for fiscal year 2013.

Many of my Republican colleagues have been patting themselves on the back for the open rule associated with this bill. They claim that this effort demonstrates transparency and their commitment to regular order. Putting aside for the moment whether a single open rule in 304 days makes for an open legislation process, the fact is that now

the Republicans are using this rule to correct a mistake they made in their previous effort to deem and pass the Ryan budget.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the deem and pass didn't work the first time around. It was supposed to break the spending agreement made by my friends in the Republican Party in the Budget Control Act, but they bungled that effort a couple weeks ago and now have to try to go back on their word. It seems to me that if you're going to break an agreement that you made in good faith, you ought to get it right the first time. Doing this twice just calls attention to what little regard there is for bipartisan cooperation and agreement.

I heard my colleague, Mr. WOODALL, comment about this coming out of the subcommittee and the committee by voice vote, and there is no disagreement in that regard. I guess to some that is to be a commendable effort. But he also suggested that we may very well, if we were to choose, carry this on voice vote. I would disabuse him of that notion. That is not going to happen. The deem and pass was wrong the first time around, and it's still wrong the second time around—and shouldn't have been placed in here—and it will be wrong the third, fourth, and however many more times around there are, in spite of open rules, if you put it in it, until the Republicans have repudiated every last promise they made.

If breaking the Budget Control Act agreement wasn't enough, the Republican majority is also using this rule to silence Members on the upcoming reconciliation legislation being considered by this body later this week. Rather than using regular order—and I stick a tack in that to compliment my colleague on the Rules Committee, who does believe and has made it manifestly clear that he believes in regular order—but rather than using regular order to debate the merits of breaking their promises, Republicans are imposing martial law to prevent Members from properly considering the legislation and having their say.

Forcing same-day consideration—that's what we mean when we say "martial law"—of the legislation simply reinforces the majority's intent to use this legislation for partisan gain. Instead of working with Democrats on a bipartisan process, Republicans want to jeopardize funding for essential government programs so they can both go back on their agreements and force the House to consider the legislation sight unseen.

This is an unfortunate situation because Democrats would have been pleased to support this open rule. Had the Republicans followed regular order, Democrats would support this rule; and I, for one, would argue that we should do so by voice if it had been that way. If the Budget Committee Democrats end up taking the entire 3 days that they are entitled to under the rules of the House before they finish their

views, we could consider the reconciliation bill on Monday instead of Thursday.

This is no way to run a budget process and no way to conduct the business of the House. I'd be amused at the Republicans' failed efforts here, Mr. Speaker, except that I'm dismayed to point out that millions of Americans depend on the programs considered under the appropriations process.

An agreement was made with the Budget Control Act, and under the agreement the Republicans promised certain levels of funding for essential programs. That funding is now in jeopardy because the majority wants to spend time trying to go back on what they promised. Let me remind this body that the House and Senate both passed the Budget Control Act. The Senate has not passed the Ryan budget.

□ 1240

And deeming and passing does nothing but force this body, as I say all the time, to pretend that the budget, as offered, is in effect.

As I said in the Rules Committee when the Republicans tried to do this the first time around, if we're going to pass legislation that pretends things exist, then I guess we don't need either the Senate or the President of the United States since we can just pretend that the laws have passed when, in fact, they have not.

I don't have my copy of "I'm Just a Bill," and my colleague wasn't here when I read it in committee at one point in time, but I'm pretty sure it doesn't mention that the way to pass legislation is to first pass one agreement and then try twice to pretend it never happened.

I don't know what that looks like in a cartoon version, but probably less like "Schoolhouse Rock" and more like Wile E. Coyote falling straight off a cliff, because if we're going to get out of the business of reality and into the business of pretending, let's just pretend that every American has a job, that every student can go to college, and that no child goes to bed hungry. Let's pretend that the billions we wasted on unnecessary wars were, instead, actually invested right here in the United States of America. Let's pretend that Thanksgiving is in June and Christmas is in July and the election season is over and the deficit is gone.

And since we've now pretended that everything is fine in our great country, let's go tell all of the unemployed, the middle class, the hungry and the poor that their problems aren't real. Or better yet, let's just pretend those people don't exist, because that's exactly what I believe the majority's budget does.

Rather than using the power of the Federal budget to lead this country into a new era of economic growth, Republicans want to cut taxes for those that are wealthy among us, including those of us that serve in the House of Representatives, cut services for every-

one else, and then feel like they've set the country on the right track.

Instead of spending our time debating the merits of the appropriations legislation before us, we're, again, trying to convince the majority to stick with the promises they made in the first place.

Rather than uniting in bipartisan fashion to support an open and transparent legislative process, Republicans are using partisan gimmickry to silence debate.

Rather than debating this legislation under the Budget Control Act, we have to debate whether the Republican majority should even have to keep their promises.

And rather than considering whether the inadequate levels of funding in this legislation, particularly in certain arenas—let me use one: the COPS program that I thought it was wrong when Democrats cut that program, and I think it's wrong now that Republicans are talking about less money for a program that all of us know is desperately needed in our various communities.

We have to consider doing more for struggling Americans, and we have to consider whether we ought to be cutting even more, as my colleagues would have it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you, I don't actually prepare remarks when I come down here to sit opposite my friend from Florida, because I always know his opening statement is going to be that line by line by line that reminds me of absolutely everything that I want to say. And generally speaking, it reminds me of absolutely everything I'm proud of, and sometimes things that my friend from Florida wishes had not happened.

You know, folks ask me back home, Mr. Speaker—I'm a freshman here. They say, ROB, what have you learned in your first term in Congress? And I say, What I have learned is that when you watch the House floor on C-SPAN, it looks like theater. And what I've learned is that the comments from my friends on the other side of aisle, it's not theater at all, it is heartfelt belief in absolutely every word that comes out of their mouth. And that's instructive, because if it were theater, we could go into a dark back room somewhere and try to sort it out around the edges. But when it's heartfelt belief about what direction we ought to take this country, it requires the full and open hearing that we give it here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you were here for the deem and pass of the budget several Congresses ago before I

was elected, but the gentleman's absolutely right. Deeming a budget as being passed by both Houses of Congress is a terrible way to run this institution. He is absolutely right.

Now, I'm proud that he and I did not shirk our responsibilities. We passed a budget here in this House under yet another open process. We asked any Member of this House that had an idea about what the budget ought to look like in this country to bring that budget to the floor of this House and we'd have a vote and a debate on it. And we did, and we passed a budget here in the House of Representatives.

Now, sadly, our friends on the Senate side have chosen for the 3rd year in a row not to pass a budget. And I would say again, those areas on which we agree, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's absolutely right. In the absence of actually having a budget that has passed the Senate—and not just because they haven't passed one, Mr. Speaker, but because they have said affirmatively and apparently with some pride they do not plan on passing a budget. So what's the responsible body here on the other side of the Capitol supposed to do? Well, what we said is we need to move forward with our appropriations process, and so we are going to move forward under the budget that has passed this entire U.S. House of Representatives.

Now, the truth is we did that in a rule a couple of weeks back and we got it wrong. This is not the first time we've had to make up for the Senate's mistake. You would think, as often as we've had to take up for those folks, we'd have figured out how to do it right. But sadly, we didn't get it quite right, and I hope we don't get into the habit of getting it right. I hope we get into the habit of actually passing a budget over there, bringing a budget to conference, and having a budget that controls all of Capitol Hill.

But in an effort to make up for what's not happening there, we did absolutely, in this rule that's before us today, Mr. Speaker, specify that the caps that we created, the 435 of us created in the budget that we passed, will be the caps that regulate the activity that the 435 of us engage in for the rest of the year. And I welcome the Senate to join in that debate.

You know, to be fair to my colleague from Florida, we just see the Budget Control Act differently. I think we both voted for the Budget Control Act last fall. I viewed it as budget caps. In fact, if you open up the legislation, it says budgetary caps. And when I read the word "caps," Mr. Speaker, what I see is you can't spend any more than that. I was never under any illusion that I was obligated to spend absolutely all of it.

And, candidly, I think that's one of the issues we have here in this body, Mr. Speaker. You may hear other speakers come down here today on the other side of the aisle who believe exactly that, that because we signed an

agreement with the President that we would not spend a penny more than \$1.047 trillion this year that we are, in fact, now obligated to spend every single penny of that \$1.047 trillion.

As we talked about, 40 cents out of every dollar that we spend in this town, Mr. Speaker, is borrowed, borrowed from our children, from our grandchildren. Forty cents out of every dollar is money that we do not have but we are borrowing against the next generation's prosperity to spend on our priorities today.

My friend from Florida brings up the COPS program. The COPS program is a neat program, provides dollars to local law enforcement agencies to help them succeed in their local law enforcement mission. But the clever little secret that sometimes we don't talk about, Mr. Speaker, is that my community back home takes all the tax money out of their pocket and they send it to Washington, D.C. We don't have access to any money in my part of the world, my little Seventh District there in northeast Georgia. There's no money that we get back that we didn't send in to begin with.

We can prioritize those local priorities locally. We can control those outcomes locally. Forty cents out of every dollar we're borrowing. Not one budget.

I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, that in this open process we allowed every Member of Congress to bring any budget they wanted to the House floor for debate and consideration. Not one of those budgets, not one, balanced next year. Not one. Not one budget. And some of the brightest leaders I hope that our Nation has to offer, Mr. Speaker, sit here in these chairs in this body, and not one of them had a proposal for how to right this ship next year. Not one.

So the question is: What, do we just quit trying? Do we just quit trying, Mr. Speaker? Do we just concede that the economic security of this Nation is just going to drip, drip, drip away with deficit spending year after year after year? Are we going to concede that the 50 percent increase in the public debt that's occurred over the last 4 years is just the way it's going to be; that's a pattern that is going to continue, instead of a pattern that needs to be stopped?

□ 1250

But here is the good news. I have heartfelt feelings on that issue, and my friend from Florida has heartfelt feelings on that issue. The rule that we from the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker—my colleague from Florida and I—have brought to the floor today is going to open up that debate so that absolutely all Members can have their passions and feelings heard on this issue.

One more point of pride, Mr. Speaker, because I really do like coming down here on open rule days.

What we don't talk about sometimes from that Budget Control Act is that

those caps—that \$1.047 trillion I mentioned earlier, which is the most that we could possibly spend—that's only good from October 1 to the first week of January because that very same agreement said that in the failure of the Joint Select Committee last fall to act—and I will tell you it was quite the failure—it was going to lead to 8 percent across-the-board reductions in every single account that we're talking about here on the floor today—8 percent across-the-board reductions.

What our budget does and what our caps do is recognize that failure, Mr. Speaker, that the House Representatives on that Joint Select Committee and that the Senator representatives on that Joint Select Committee did not come to an agreement on deficit reduction. Thus those caps, those 8 percent across-the-board reductions, are barreling down the road towards this institution, Mr. Speaker, and picking up speed every day.

Now, we can either tell the American people that all is well and let's go ahead and spend the maximum amount possible—but, oh, watch out; here come those across-the-board cuts that nobody planned for—or we can do the responsible thing, and the responsible thing is to plan for that contingency. I say "contingency." I dare say, Mr. Speaker, it's almost a certainty that we're not going to find a way around those across-the-board cuts but that we can find a way around them with the budget that this institution passed. With the numbers that this institution passed, we can replace those revenues—replace that spending that was going to be saved with across-the-board cuts—with targeted cuts, with targeted cuts to programs that we in this body agree on.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't come to this body to do across-the-board cuts. There is good spending and there is bad spending. I didn't come to this body to use the meat ax to go after everything. I came to this body to set the priorities that my constituents sent me here to set. Far from being an abomination of the process, this House-passed budget, this House reconciliation bill that's coming at the end of this week—and yes, this first appropriations bill, the FY 2013-cycle—is the way this process is supposed to be done.

I rise in strong support of this rule, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to make sure that we bring up the bill by Mr. TIERNEY of Massachusetts in order to prevent a doubling of student loan interest rates, which would be fully paid for by repealing tax giveaways for big oil companies.

To discuss our amendment to the rule, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, the rank-

ing member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule. This rule provides for the consideration of the Commerce-Justice appropriations, but it adds some extraneous matters, things like martial law for reconciliation. If we are going to consider other matters in this rule, we ought to be allowed, as the gentleman from Florida said, to be able to consider the question of the doubling of the interest rates of student loans.

The House Democrats, months ago, asked for this action to be taken so that interest rates would not double on students this July 1, doubling from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. Calls for bipartisanship were met with silence, silence, silence, and silence for months. All of a sudden, the Republicans in Congress started to understand this issue when President Obama took it to the parents and to the students of this country and explained to them what was at stake. Then, 2 weeks ago, the Republicans surprised us with a bill on the floor when they said they all now agree with it. Even though they had voted against it 2 weeks earlier, they agreed that there shouldn't be a doubling of the student loan rates.

But what did they decide to do?

In deciding on not doubling the student loan rates, they gave the House a choice in which they would take it out on women's health, denying women early screenings for breast cancer, for cervical cancer, denying newborn infants early screenings for birth defects. That's how they decided they would pay for it.

We tried to offer a Democratic alternative, the legislation of Mr. TIERNEY of Massachusetts, which would have taken away the unjustified, unfair tax breaks to the largest oil companies in the country at a time of record profits and use some of that money to pay for making sure that the interest rates don't double, but the Republicans wouldn't allow us to offer that.

Today, what we're trying to do is to defeat the previous question so that we will be able to offer the Democratic substitute, which would keep the interest rates from doubling. We would pay for it by taking away the unfair tax cuts to the largest oil companies and not do what the Republicans did, which is to say you can have your student loan subsidy, but you're going to have to take it out of the hides of newborn infants, of children's immunizations, and of the preventative care and early screenings for women with cervical and breast cancer.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. We know that that decision, that early screening, is a matter of life and death

for those women, but that was of no matter to the Republicans. Now we see today a recent poll out that suggested over half of the country supports the student loans not doubling, paying for it in the manner in which the Democrats did, as opposed to 30 percent of the country that think the Republicans are on the right track in going after women's health, children's health and children's immunizations.

So I would hope that we will defeat the previous question, that Mr. HASTINGS will be allowed to move to consider the legislation by Mr. TIERNEY, and that we can put this issue to rest so that families and students now sitting around trying to figure out how they're going to pay for the college educations of their children who have just been accepted to college or who are continuing in college can do that with the peace of mind of knowing that the interest rates won't double on July 1.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume to say I've just gotten the sad news that our friends on the Senate side hadn't just stuck it to us by not passing a budget last year and didn't just stick it to us by not passing a budget this year, but have just stuck it to us one more time by failing to move forward on the student loan legislation there.

I don't know what to do down here, Mr. Speaker. I mean, on the one hand, my colleagues say—rightfully so—that they don't want us just running on our own down here, doing our own thing all the time, pretending as if the Senate doesn't exist. On the other hand, we've dealt with the student loan issue—we've preserved rates at their current low levels—and the Senate can't get its work done. I don't know what more we can do.

Folks are prepared to go over for a vigil outside the Senate Chamber. I want you to put me on your invitation list. I'll go by there with you, and we'll see what we can do to shake things up over there, but those 6-year term limits are not quite as effective at motivating action as are 2-year term limits here on the House side.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us today isn't actually about student loans. You might not have believed that in listening to the last speaker. It's about the Commerce Department; it's about the Justice Department; and it's about science funding in this body. Now, the good news is we're going to be able to deal with all of these issues one by one by one.

I came to this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, in wanting to move away from the 2,000-page bills that I'd seen in past Congresses. I came to this Chamber in wanting to deal with one issue at a time, in wanting to deal with things so you didn't have to vote for all or nothing but so that you could vote for the individual items that you actually believe in and vote against those items that you don't believe in. That's the process we have today.

This is the first of a dozen different bills that are going to come down through this Chamber, and folks will be able to offer amendments line item by line item. If I didn't say it before, Mr. Speaker, I want to say it now: that that's actually what can happen here. This isn't a "take it or leave it" proposition today. This rule, again, I can't take all the credit for. I was actually tied up in the reconciliation markup yesterday. My friend from Florida was actually as responsible as anyone for bringing a rule to the floor that would allow every single line of the underlying bill to be considered by the 435 folks in this Chamber.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, you have a subcommittee, and that's a small group of folks who knows a lot about the issue on which it works. This is the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee over there. Then you have a full committee, and the full committee has a lot of really smart people who know a lot about their topic here. In this case, that's the Appropriations Committee, the full Appropriations Committee, and, of course, they both passed that out by a voice vote.

If you're like me, Mr. Speaker, if you serve on the Budget Committee and on the Rules Committee, you don't ever get a say in appropriations spending. There are a lot of really smart guys on that subcommittee and a lot of really smart men and women on that full committee. But what about my say? What about the 920,000 people I represent, Mr. Speaker? And that's the solution that the Rules Committee brought out last night.

They said you have not gotten your say yet for the Seventh District of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, but you will get it during this process—and not just you, but you and you and you and you. Every single Member of this House, by virtue of the fact that they were elected by American citizens back home, will have the opportunity to come to this floor and have their voices heard.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, this isn't a tough decision today. This is one of the proudest decisions we get to make in this House, and that is to have its membership work its will and report out the very best bill that we can, send that over to the Senate, and see what happens next.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, my good friend, Mr. COURTNEY.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to allow the Tierney amendment to move forward, which would allow a real solution to the 53-day ticking time bomb for college students and middle class families all across this country.

Today, literally, as we're standing here, high school seniors are getting notices in the mail about whether

they've been admitted to college; students are now packing up and leaving for the end of the spring term already thinking about next year; financial aid offices are trying to plan with families about how to pay for next year's tuition; and yet what they have before them is a situation where on July 1, the rates will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

On July 23, the President of the United States stood on that podium and challenged Congress to avoid that rate increase from going through. And for 3 months, we had a Republican majority which stonewalled this issue with no bill, no markup, no hearing. I filed legislation the day after that speech. We have over 150 cosponsors to permanently lock in the lower rate. Yet, as Mr. MILLER indicated, what we heard from the House Republicans was a bill 10 days ago which bypassed committees, nothing from the Education and the Workforce Committee, rammed it through the Rules Committee, and paid for in the most disgraceful, grotesque fashion.

It wipes out a fund to pay for prevention of heart disease, diabetes, cancer, and early-childhood diseases. That is not a solution. The President made it clear when that scam was presented that it would be vetoed immediately. It is a dead letter. It is time for us to, yes, debate a CJS appropriations bill, which is very important. But those kids, those families need a horizon before them as they deal with one of the most exciting opportunities and challenges before them, which is how to pay for higher education.

We should defeat this rule. We should allow a motion to go forward which will defuse this ticking time bomb for middle class families all across America, push aside that joke of a bill that passed 10 days ago, and get down to the business of addressing middle class families' needs and young people's needs to help solve the problems of this country and give them the opportunity to succeed.

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

I actually had this conversation with some schoolchildren in my district over the break, as I'm sure everybody in this body did. They call it a break, Mr. Speaker. The truth is, it's a district work period. You're working every bit as hard down in your home State as you are here and probably harder back home.

I was talking to young people and I said, Does anybody here have a parent that just let's them eat anything they want to, drink all the soda they want, eat all the candy they want? There wasn't a single hand that went up. Apparently, parents had some discipline incorporated in the lives of each one of these children. I asked, Who thinks their parents love them? The answer was every child in that room felt loved by their parents. They didn't get everything they wanted all the time, there were limits to it, but they felt loved.

Mr. Speaker, we're in the business of spending other people's money. It's not my money; it's not my colleague from Florida's money. It is other people's money in this body. Not only are we spending every penny of the money that they send us, Mr. Speaker. We are borrowing even more. If you think about it, we talk about how we borrow 40 cents out of every dollar that we spend. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is we collect every penny that America is willing to give us, and we borrow 66 percent more. Communities back home aren't operating under that kind of funny mathematics. They understand they can only spend the money that they have. Families back home aren't operating under those kinds of funny mathematics. It's only here.

So in the case of these programs—again, student loans are in absolutely no way at issue in the underlying bill, and they are absolutely in no way at issue in this rule. But just to touch on that topic for a moment—and we had the Speaker of this House come down and give a passionate plea for votes in support of the very provision that is being discussed here today. Not only did he speak on behalf of those provisions; this Chamber passed it.

We talk about the ticking time bomb. That's the ticking time bomb in action in the Senate. This body has acted. Now, what did we do? I happen to be one of those folks who took out student loans, Mr. Speaker. So I know a little bit about the student loan process. I happened to take mine out from a private institution. We were using competition to keep the marketplace regulated in those days. Now the Federal Government is the only place you can go for a student loan. That was courtesy of my friends on the other side of the aisle. Again, it was heart-felt. They believed in their heart that it was going to be a better program if only the Federal Government ran it instead of letting private financial institutions who lend money for a living manage it.

But 6.8 percent is the below-market rate that's available for folks who borrow Stafford loan money. You may have had a Stafford loan, Mr. Speaker. Other folks out here might have had a Stafford loan. But there are two kinds of Stafford loans. There is the Stafford loan that you pay interest on after you've borrowed the money. Imagine that, you borrow the money, you pay interest on it. Then there is the Stafford loan that's called the subsidized Stafford loan. That's a much smaller piece of the pie, Mr. Speaker.

We have the loans that families have to go out and get on their own to help pay for their children's education. We have savings that folks are going out and spending on their children's education. We have grant programs that are scholarship programs all that are out there to help with education. We have the PLUS program out there, which is a loan that parents and students can take out together. Then, in

addition to all those programs, we have the Stafford loans, which, again, some of them are loans you pay interest on immediately and some of them—a very small fraction of them—are loans that are subsidized while you're in school.

This conversation we're having here today is about whether or not this subsidized Stafford loan, that was over 7 percent when I borrowed it—it's 6.8 percent in normal times; but the rate was reduced to 3.4 percent by my colleagues. This conversation is about whether or not that rate should be allowed to return to normal levels.

Again I say to folks, there is no money that's coming out of anybody's pocket in this room. This is America's money, America's money that we're borrowing, that we're spending. If we want to borrow that money to cut artificially low rates in half, make them artificially lower, we absolutely can. Not only can, we did. We talk about this as if it is something that might happen one day. We did it. It was 2 weeks ago. I was down here on the House floor. In fact, I sat right over there. I remember the vote happening. It's done here.

Did we pay for it, Mr. Speaker? We did. We paid for it with a program that I would characterize as a slush fund. It is \$15 billion that exists over there in the Health and Human Services Department. It came out of the Affordable Care Act. The President looked at it and said, You know what, that really was too much of a slush fund. He cut it by almost a third. Now we said, You know what, perhaps we should go after the rest of it because accountability is an issue here, Mr. Speaker.

We hear folks talk about prevention and cancer and women and children. I wish that's where the money went. I went and got the list of where those projects are, Mr. Speaker. In my part of the world, it was a \$2.5 million grant to the county I grew up in to help with obesity training in schools. I'm in favor of that. I think we ought to absolutely work on obesity. I hope my home school district is already working on those issues. In other parts of the country, New York, for example, this is money that went to lobby in favor of soda taxes. That's right. This money that is being described by my friends on the other side of the aisle as critical to protecting the health of women so that they can get breast cancer screenings was spent in New York City to lobby in favor of job-killing taxes for my home State of Georgia.

This is not about women and children, Mr. Speaker. This is about unaccountability when you start handing out slush funds to bureaucrats. In Philadelphia, it was to lobby against cigarettes. Is that something we ought to do? Well, golly, we can go out and do that on our own every day. Does the Federal Government need to borrow from our children and our grandchildren to help Philadelphia lobby against cigarette taxes? In California, it's going to put up signs so folks can

find the local parks in the name of obesity training, Mr. Speaker. Do we need signs to help us find the local parks? We have them in our community. I thought they had them in other communities. Do I need to borrow from my children and my grandchildren to put up more signs for parks? Mr. Speaker, we don't.

□ 1310

This is not a priority that the American people stood up and voted for. This is a slush fund that is used by bureaucrats to focus on whatever their priority of the day is. And what's so disappointing is that this responsible government endorsed by a vote of this full House, is being described by my colleagues as an assault on women's health. It is offensive to me.

There are so many things that we legitimately disagree about. Go back where we began, Mr. Speaker. We disagree from the heart about so many directions in this country. There is not one person in this body—not one—that wants to put women's health at risk. Not one.

This is about responsible government and cutting out the waste, cutting out the low-priority spending, cutting out the dollars that come from taxpayers' pockets in my district to spend for job-killing legislation in New York.

Mr. Speaker, we're going to have a full debate on this, a full debate. Every Member of this body will be able to bring their voice to the floor. I look forward to that full debate. I believe in this country. I believe in this institution. I believe that full debate is going to take us exactly where we need to be.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend, Mr. TIERNEY from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentleman for acknowledging this.

Americans need to know that their family member is going to be able to afford a college degree, whether it is a 2-year degree or a 4-year degree. Too many people are afraid that their child is not going to be able to get through college. Too many students don't think they can meet the cost of it. And that's what we need to deal with.

Public dollars for schools, Pell Grants, lower interest rates, work-study, those are things that we've done together to allow people to have the opportunity of college so that everybody can try to achieve their goal, to have an equal opportunity to achieve those goals with things we have done together in the past.

We have been helping businesses find very educated and skilled people to drive our economy. It doesn't matter if you earn \$20,000, \$30,000, \$60,000 or if you are suddenly unemployed because you lost a job. It feels the same if your kids are pushed out of school if they can't afford to pay for it. Getting a degree really makes a difference for

many people, whether or not they're going to be able to get a good job. And helping them do that is something we've all decided to invest in.

Carrying a huge loan debt, it may mean that you have to delay starting a family, delay buying a house, taking a job that you otherwise wouldn't take. Pell Grants, work-study, lower interest rates, all of those things for higher education, one of the opportunities that we all helped to create so that people that have long been benefiting from special favors, from tax loopholes, corporations and people that are extremely wealthy, they need to do their part. That's simply what we're asking them to do.

We can keep this country moving forward if we can invest in our future. What we want to do is find a way and make a time that those who have benefited so extraordinarily realize that they too have to step up to the plate and join the rest of us to help pay for those opportunities to make sure that we can move forward.

This is a good time to invest in America and Americans. We have 250 tax expenditures in the Tax Code. Those are special tax rates, special favors, credits, deductions. Our friends on the other side of the aisle apparently think that's what America should borrow for, that that is what they should borrow for and pay corporations that made \$130 billion last year, to give them more money instead of helping people get through college and get a degree that they need to get a good job.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TIERNEY. I filed a bill last week that would have lowered the interest rates, back at a time when the Republican budget would have let it double, back when the Speaker and the chairman of the Education Committee and the second-ranking Member of the Republican Party all voted to keep it at 6.8 percent. I filed a bill, and I found a way to pay for it. It was paid for by taking one tax credit from Big Oil that made \$130 billion last year, one tax credit that they weren't originally intended to have even benefited from but had managed to sort of squeak their way into eventually.

So there's a way to pay for it. Now, if you didn't agree with it, the Republicans didn't agree with it, then they could have found one that wasn't noxious, one that everybody could agree on. But instead, they finally came around to deciding that they wanted to lower the interest rates because they couldn't take the political heat when the President was out there talking to American families. And American parents and American students said, What are you doing? Why are you borrowing and giving oil companies \$130 billion of profits plus tax credits when we could be having a way to make sure that our family members get the education they

need to get a job and move forward in their lives?

So the Republicans finally came along and said, Okay, we will lower the interest rates. We can't take the heat. But we are going to find a poison pill. We are going to look at what the President has planned to do with preventive funds, which are screenings for breast cancer, screenings for cervical cancer, immunizations for children; and we'll use that.

I will suggest to my friends on the other side, stop waiting for the Senate. Use some leadership. Come across the aisle and look at those 250 tax expenditures. Let's find one we can agree on, not wait for the Senate and not blame it on them. Let's move forward on that. Stop being so partisan and stop being so ideological. And let's move forward.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my friend from Massachusetts that there is only one bill in this institution that abolishes not just the oil company tax credits that he wants to go after, not just all the corporate welfare that he wants to go after, not just all the benefits and exclusions and exemptions that the wealthy in this country utilize to lower their tax bills. There is one bill in this Congress that abolishes every single special exemption, deduction, carve-out, and giveaway in the entire United States Tax Code. It's H.R. 25. I'm the sponsor of that legislation. I join you in your desire to eliminate all those special interest tax breaks and deductions. I welcome your cosponsorship of that legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would inform my colleague that I am the last speaker. I don't know whether he is, but I am prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. As am I.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the majority tried once 2 weeks ago to go back on what they agreed to. It did not work. So now here we are again, trying to "re-deem" ourselves. But this is no way to run an economy, no way to run a budget process, and no way to stick up for the millions of struggling Americans who need us to focus on improving the economy.

We can "pretend" that the Ryan budget has passed when, in fact, it has not. We can deem it or come here to re-deem it. But while we are living in legislative fantasyland, millions of other Americans will still be struggling to

find jobs, to pay off their student loans, to access affordable health care and decent housing, and, really, in the final analysis, just to survive in an economy that—not just this year or last, not just in the last decade or the decade before—but in an economy that favors those who have the most, rather than look out for those who have the least.

In the celebrated cartoon that carries Wile E. Coyote, he used to pretend that there was going to be some kind of rubberized floor mat when he landed off a cliff, only to find that soon after that, he was in a very long and painful fall to the bottom.

I've said before and I will repeat: we are better people than what's happening here. I agree with my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) that we see things differently. And in our heart of hearts, both of us and many of the Members of this body are in agreement and want things to be better.

□ 1320

As long as Republicans insist on replacing substantive debate with partisan gimmicks, broken promises, and misplaced priorities, the fall to the bottom is going to seem very long and is likely to be very painful for millions of Americans.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this rule for the reason that it is deeming something that is being pretended to be passed. I'd ask them to oppose this rule for the reason that it includes in it martial law that disallows the open discussion that my colleague rightly points to in an open rule. But this particular provision disallows that as it pertains to the reconciliation. And that is just no way for us to go about trying to come to terms with the enormous consequences and circumstances that we face by not having faced them many, many, many years ago.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for joining me here for this debate today. And there really are some things that we disagree about here in this body at large. But one thing we don't disagree about is the importance of bringing open rules to this floor to debate appropriations bills.

This appropriations bill that we're bringing under this rule, Mr. Speaker, is a 1 percent reduction from the levels the President has proposed. As we hear folks talk about the doom and the gloom and the kicking of children and the punishing of women—1 percent. There's a long, hard fall to the bottom coming all right, and it's coming in the American economy. And I'll tell you who gets hurt the most in a bad economy: it's the poorest and the weakest among us. We all know it.

We're asking for 1 percent less than what the President proposed in the name of taking a small step in the right direction. You could have gotten me for 20 or 25 percent less, just to be

clear. You could've gotten me on board if we'd gone 20 or 25 percent less. But this body is trying to move in a responsible fashion.

There's only one budget that's passed in this town, Mr. Speaker. The President's budget didn't pass. It got zero votes last year in the Senate. It got zero votes this year in the House. It didn't even get introduced last year in the House. There's only one budget in this town that has passed. That's the one that came out of the open process that we had right here.

We can take our toys and go home or we can try to do our appropriations bills under the one proposal that has garnered a majority vote in this entire Nation. I vote for the latter. And a vote for this rule is a vote for the latter.

Let's go ahead and start that process. Let's go ahead and do for the American people what we promised them we would do; and that is, operate this institution so that everybody has a voice, and at the end of the day we move our very best legislation forward.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 643 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4816) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4816.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 643, if ordered; and approval of the Journal, by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 174, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

YEAS—235

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

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

NAYS—174

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

NOT VOTING—22

Bonner	Gibson	Reichert
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Royce
Cantor	Jones	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Costa	McHenry	Slaughter
Donnelly (IN)	Moore	Tonko
Ellmers	Palazzo	
Filner	Pence	

□ 1348

Messrs. ENGEL, CROWLEY, PETERSON, CLEAVER, RICHMOND, PASCARELL and RANGEL and Ms. TSONGAS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

Stated against:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 199, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 199, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 199, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 181, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

AYES—228

Adams	Miller (MI)
Aderholt	Miller, Gary
Akin	Mulvaney
Alexander	Murphy (PA)
Amash	Neugebauer
Amodei	Noem
Austria	Nugent
Bachmann	Nunes
Bachus	Graves (GA)
Barletta	Graves (MO)
Bartlett	Griffin (AR)
Barton (TX)	Griffith (VA)
Bass (NH)	Grimm
Benishek	Guinta
Berg	Guthrie
Biggart	Hall
Bilbray	Hanna
Bilirakis	Harper
Bishop (UT)	Harris
Black	Hartzler
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)
Bono Mack	Hayworth
Boustany	Heck
Brady (TX)	Hensarling
Brooks	Herrera
Brown (GA)	Hirger Beutler
Buchanan	Huelskamp
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)
Buerkle	Hultgren
Burgess	Hunter
Burton (IN)	Hurt
Calvert	Issa
Camp	Jenkins
Campbell	Johnson (IL)
Canseco	Johnson (OH)
Capito	Johnson, Sam
Carter	Jordan
Cassidy	Kelly
Chabot	King (IA)
Coble	King (NY)
Coffman (CO)	Kingston
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)
Conaway	Kline
Cravaack	Labrador
Crawford	Lamborn
Crenshaw	Lance
Curberson	Landry
Davis (KY)	Lankford
Denham	Latham
Dent	LaTourrette
DesJarlais	Latta
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)
Dold	LoBiondo
Dreier	Long
Duffy	Lucas
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer
Duncan (TN)	Lummis
Emerson	Lungren, Daniel
Farenthold	E.
Fincher	Mack
Fitzpatrick	Manzullo
Flake	Marchant
Fleischmann	Marino
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)
Flores	McCaul
Forbes	McClintock
Fortenberry	McCotter
Foxx	McKeon
Franks (AZ)	McKinley
Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Galleghy	Rodgers
Gardner	Mica
Garrett	Miller (FL)

Westmoreland	Wolf
Whitfield	Womack
Wilson (SC)	Woodall
Wittman	Yoder

NOES—181

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

NOT VOTING—22

Bonner	Gibson	Palazzo
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Pence
Cantor	Jones	Reichert
Carson (IN)	Kucinich	Royce
Chaffetz	McHenry	Slaughter
Donnelly (IN)	Meehan	Tonko
Ellmers	Moore	
Filner	Myrick	

□ 1357

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 200, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in the following vote. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall vote 200, H. Res. 643—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce

and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and for other purposes—I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 200, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 296, nays 108, answered “present” 3, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—296

Ackerman	Cooper	Himes
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Hirono
Akin	Critz	Hochul
Alexander	Crowley	Honda
Altmire	Cuellar	Huelskamp
Amodi	Culberson	Huizenga (MI)
Austria	Cummings	Hultgren
Baca	Davis (CA)	Hurt
Bachmann	Davis (KY)	Issa
Bachus	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Barletta	DesJarlais	(TX)
Barrow	Deutch	Jenkins
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (GA)
Barton (TX)	Dicks	Johnson (IL)
Bass (NH)	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Becerra	Doggett	Johnson, Sam
Berg	Doyle	Kaptur
Berkley	Dreier	Keating
Berman	Duncan (SC)	Keating
Biggert	Duncan (TN)	Kelly
Billbray	Edwards	Kildee
Bilirakis	Ellison	King (IA)
Bishop (GA)	Emerson	King (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Engel	Kingston
Black	Eshoo	Kinzinger (IL)
Blackburn	Farenthold	Kissell
Blumenauer	Farr	Kline
Bonamici	Flake	Labrador
Bono Mack	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Boren	Fleming	Lance
Boustany	Flores	Landry
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Langevin
Braley (IA)	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Brooks	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Broun (GA)	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Buchanan	Galleghy	Latta
Bucshon	Garamendi	Levin
Buerkle	Gibbs	Lewis (CA)
Burton (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	Lipinski
Calvert	Gonzalez	Loebsack
Camp	Goodlatte	Lofgren, Zoe
Campbell	Gosar	Long
Canseco	Gowdy	Lowe
Capito	Granger	Lucas
Capps	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Carnahan	Green, Al	Lummis
Carney	Grijalva	Lungren, Daniel
Carter	Grimm	E.
Cassidy	Guthrie	Mack
Chabot	Gutierrez	Marchant
Chu	Hahn	Marino
Cicilline	Hall	Markey
Clarke (MI)	Hanabusa	Matsui
Clarke (NY)	Harper	McCarthy (CA)
Clay	Hartzler	McCarthy (NY)
Cleaver	Hastings (WA)	McCaul
Clyburn	Hayworth	McClintock
Coble	Heinrich	McCollum
Cohen	Hensarling	McIntyre
Cole	Hergert	McKeon
Connolly (VA)	Higgins	McKinley

McMorris	Reyes
Rodgers	Richardson
McNerney	Richmond
Meehan	Rigell
Meeks	Rivera
Mica	Roby
Michaud	Roe (TN)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Miller (NC)	Rogers (KY)
Miller, Gary	Rogers (MI)
Moran	Rohrabacher
Murphy (CT)	Rokita
Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Myrick	Roskam
Nadler	Ross (AR)
Napolitano	Ross (FL)
Neugebauer	Rothman (NJ)
Noem	Roybal-Allard
Nunes	Royce
Nunnelee	Runyan
Olson	Ruppersberger
Pascarell	Ryan (WI)
Paul	Scalise
Pearce	Schiff
Pelosi	Schmidt
Perlmutter	Schock
Petri	Schrader
Pingree (ME)	Schwartz
Pitts	Schweikert
Platts	Scott (SC)
Polis	Scott (VA)
Pompeo	Scott, Austin
Posey	Scott, David
Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner
Price (NC)	Serrano
Quigley	Sessions
Rangel	Sewell
Reed	Sherman
Rehberg	Shimkus

NAYS—108

Adams	Graves (MO)
Andrews	Green, Gene
Baldwin	Griffin (AR)
Bass (CA)	Griffith (VA)
Benishek	Guinta
Bishop (NY)	Hanna
Boswell	Harris
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)
Brown (FL)	Heck
Burgess	Herrera Beutler
Capuano	Hinchee
Cardoza	Holden
Castor (FL)	Holt
Chandler	Hoyer
Chaffman (CO)	Hunter
Conaway	Jackson (IL)
Conyers	Johnson (OH)
Costa	Jordan
Costello	Kind
Courtney	Latham
Cravaack	Lee (CA)
Crawford	Lewis (GA)
Davis (IL)	LoBiondo
DeFazio	Lynch
Denham	Maloney
Dent	Manzullo
Dold	Matheson
Duffy	McCotter
Fattah	McDermott
Fincher	McGovern
Fitzpatrick	Miller (FL)
Forbes	Miller, George
Foxx	Mulvaney
Fudge	Neal
Gardner	Nugent
Garrett	Olver
Gerlach	Pallone

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—3

Amash	Gohmert	Owens
Bonner	Filner	Moore
Butterfield	Gibson	Palazzo
Cantor	Hinojosa	Pence
Carson (IN)	Jones	Reichert
Chaffetz	Kucinich	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lankford	Stark
Donnelly (IN)	Lujan	Tonko
Ellmers	McHenry	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

□ 1404

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Stated against:

Shuster	Thompson (PA)
Simpson	Thornberry
Smith (NE)	Tierney
Smith (NJ)	Towns
Smith (TX)	Tsongas
Smith (WA)	Turner (NY)
Southerland	Turner (OH)
Stearns	Upton
Stutzman	Van Hollen
Sullivan	Velazquez
Sutton	Walz (MN)
Thompson (PA)	Wasserman
Thornberry	Schultz
Tierney	Watt
Towns	Waxman
Tsongas	Webster
Turner (NY)	Welch
Turner (OH)	West
Upton	Westmoreland
Van Hollen	Whitfield
Velazquez	Wilson (FL)
Walz (MN)	Wilson (SC)
Wasserman	Wittman
Schultz	Wolf
Watt	Womack
Waxman	Woolsey
Webster	Young (FL)
Welch	Young (IN)
West	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Wilson (FL)	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Wolf	
Womack	
Woolsey	
Young (FL)	
Young (IN)	

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 201, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 2012, I missed rollcall votes Nos. 199–201 because of my primary election in Indiana. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 199, “no” on rollcall No. 200, and “yes” on rollcall No. 201.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 199, 200, and 201, I was absent. I had travelled to the 21st Cong. Dist. in New York with the President for his visit. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on No. 199, “nay” on No. 200, and “yes” on No. 201.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5326, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 643 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5326.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1406

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5326) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to begin the consideration of H.R. 5326, making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies. The bill provides funding for programs whose impacts range from the safety of people in their homes and communities to the farthest reaches of space.

The bill before the House today reflects a delicate balancing of needs and