

the globe that are required by Federal law to have these Transportation Worker Identification Credentials not only to perform their jobs, but even to get promoted.

So as these cards come up, whether you're applying for them for the first time or trying to get them renewed, you have to not only make one, but two in-person visits. When we talk about these visits, in many cases people have to take a day off of work for the first, and then another day off of work for the second visit because this is a card that they're required to have if they're going to be able to work in the transportation industry.

The rule that was put in place by TSA really is unworkable and doesn't really make sense, especially as we're talking about safety. It has nothing to do with safety. It's just a rule that they came up with that we recognize, number one, it's not in law, but it's something that we recognize, especially as we talk to our constituents who work in the transportation industry throughout the country, that this is creating tremendous burdens on our employees who have to actually miss work and miss pay that goes along with it.

So we're talking about something that affects people's jobs and their careers and, in fact, in some cases has limited their ability to get promotions.

I want to read parts of a letter that I received from Andrew Drury, who is an assistant cargo mate aboard the USS Mount Whitney. He's in the Merchant Marines, and this has been a problem to him. He wrote in to our office as he heard we were addressing this issue.

He's a graduate of the Citadel and is employed by Military Sealift Command, a company that is tasked with supplying the U.S. Navy with anything from bombs, bullets, fuel and provisions to our Armed Forces. He works throughout Europe and Africa. He writes to say: "Due to my long tours of duty overseas,"—his TWIC card has since expired, and—"I am not allowed to advance in rank or position without the current TWIC credential."

He goes on to write: this means that anybody who currently works overseas has to take time off from work and fly back to the States twice. This is very expensive, time consuming, stressful, and "because I live on a ship that constantly moves around is logistically impossible. Sir, I am writing you in hope that there is something you could do for my fellow Merchant Mariners and me in this precarious situation.

So as we see that 2 million of our workers across the globe are facing this problem, this is a commonsense reform that actually puts some new rules in place and puts some new rules in place that says you still make that first trip; but just like a passport, you shouldn't have to be required to take time off from work to go back a second time.

Again, I appreciate over 40 cosponsors in a bipartisan way that have

signed onto this. I would urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with more than 40 bipartisan cosponsors, passage of this measure will make a strong statement of support for reform of the TWIC issuance process and American workers. I compliment the gentleman from Louisiana for introducing this legislation.

I encourage passage of H.R. 3173, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 million transportation workers have applied for and received a TWIC. The goal of this bill is to limit the red tape involved in the TWIC process so we can focus on the work of this Nation while being as secure as possible.

The Secretary needs to reform the Transportation Workers Identification Credential enrollment and renewable process so that our workers are not burdened with increased and unnecessary bureaucracy.

As with the previously considered bill, this is an attempt by those of us in the Congress to try and get rid of some unnecessary red tape. It in no way undercuts the security of our Nation. As a matter of fact, it improves it because it gets rid of a burden on people that is totally without merit.

So I ask my colleagues to support its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3173, "to reform the process for enrollment, activation, issuance, and renewal of a Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) to require not more than one in-person visit to a designated enrollment center." This legislation removes economic tensions placed on workers due to unnecessary commutes to an enrollment center. The TWIC serves as a vital security measure that ensures that individuals who pose a threat do not gain unescorted access to secure areas of the nation's maritime transportation system. Without a doubt, it is a necessary precaution for the protection of the America's assets. However, the current system for the acquirement of a TWIC is inefficient, superfluous, and costly for American transportation workers.

In addition to the \$129.75 that transportation employees must pay every 5 years to obtain the TWIC, they must also make two or more trips to an enrollment center to obtain it. In most cases, the nearest enrollment center is hundreds of miles away from the worker's home. With national gas prices averaging nearly \$4 a gallon, any mode of transportation chosen by the worker can quickly become pricey.

This bill seeks to eliminate the pointless red-tape in the attainment of a TWIC, in which millions of Americans are subject to hefty transportation costs to travel back and forth to the enrollment centers to obtain their TWIC.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, many of our fellow Americans face tough economic situa-

tions. It truly is imperative to remove this excess and unnecessary burden placed on the American workers.

As a Member of the Committee of Homeland Security, ensuring the protection of our interests from domestic threats is one of my top priorities. Although TWIC does just that, I feel that we must also endeavor to protect the interest of our own citizens. It simply just is not an economically viable option to expect our transportation workers to pay for two or more round trip journeys for the TWIC. To avoid imposing these unnecessary burdens on United States workers, it is imperative that Congress enact this legislation.

This bill passed unanimously out of the Homeland Security Committee with broad bipartisan support. I believe this is because H.R. 3173 is the text-book example of a win-win situation; there are no foreseen negative consequences to the enactment of this bill. It will simply allow our American transportation workers to breathe a little easier.

This reform of the TWIC Application system will make a huge impact on transportation workers and their families. Because of it, millions of people will not lose money and precious time with loved ones by making unnecessary trips to TWIC enrollment centers.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3173, The TWIC Application Reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3173, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5973, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5972, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 697 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 697

*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. 5973) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs 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 recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. 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. 5972) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, 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 except for section 169C. The amendment specified in section 3 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. During consideration of the bill for further 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, as amended, 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 recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 of this resolution is as follows: insert before section 418 the caption "Spending Reduction Account".

SEC. 4. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July.

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

□ 1730

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 697 provides for an open rule providing for consideration of two bills, H.R. 5973, which is a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and related agencies, and H.R. 5972, the fiscal year 2013 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are offering yet another open rule, something that our liberal Democrat colleagues gleefully denied this House when they held the gavel. Once again, House Republicans continue our commitment to an open appropriations process in which all Members from both parties have an opportunity to influence the final legislative product.

In fact, this rule represents the eleventh open rule the Rules Committee has reported to the House thus far in the 112th Congress, which is in stark contrast to the 111th, in which the House considered a grand total of zero open rules.

I want to thank my colleagues from the Appropriations Committee for their leadership and hard work in producing the two bills referenced in this rule. H.R. 5973 includes \$19.4 billion in discretionary funding, which represents a cut of \$365 million below last year's level. H.R. 5972 provides a total of \$51.6 billion in discretionary spending for the departments and agencies funded in the bill for fiscal 2013, which is a level representing \$3.9 billion below last year's level.

While my liberal colleagues would undoubtedly prefer to borrow and spend more and continue to ignore the dire fiscal realities of our country, House Republicans remain committed to reining in wasteful spending, even if it involves making difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions in order to save our country from fiscal ruin.

The simple truth is we cannot afford to fund every program at the bloated levels that, for many years, kept political promises but, in the end, hurt the fiscal stability of our country. It would be unconscionable to continue indebting future generations to creditors like China without working to reduce Federal spending, which is the real driver of our deficit.

These are important bills, Mr. Speaker, and I'm proud that House Republicans, led by our esteemed Rules Committee Chairman DREIER, have embraced an open process to consider this legislation. We welcome the support of our Democrat colleagues on final passage of the underlying legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. Foxx, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I just would like to point out to my colleagues that I don't want them to be under the misimpression that somehow this Republican leadership is somehow conducting an open and transparent process. At last count, they have given us 41 completely closed rules, and that's not even getting into the number of structured rules we've had. So I would be a little bit more humble before I would brag about the open process in this House.

I rise in opposition to this rule, which combines two unrelated appropriations bills, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and the Agriculture appropriations bills. And this rule also concedes that the House Republicans will not finish all their appropriation bills on time.

Under the House rules, the House cannot adjourn for more than 3 days in a row in July unless all the appropriation bills are finished. Section 4 in this rule is an admission that the Republican leadership hasn't met this threshold.

Mr. Speaker, I also oppose this rule because Republican budget caps have made it impossible to bring appropriations bills to the floor that meet the needs of our country. Rather than a balanced, fair approach to control our Federal deficit, Republicans have launched an all-out assault against middle-income families and those who are struggling in poverty. Rather than asking Donald Trump to pay one penny more in taxes, the Republicans are pursuing an agenda that would decimate food stamps, that turns Medicare into a voucher program, that goes after student loans. I could go on and on and on. Everything that they bring to this floor lowers the quality of life and the standard of living for the people in this country.

This Congress should be about lifting people up, not putting people down. And yet, the bills that get brought to this floor, time and time again, are all about putting the American people down.

Not only is the underlying Transportation appropriations bill underfunded, but we're considering it while the ninth—the ninth—extension of the surface transportation bill, the bill that

funds our roads and bridges, is on the verge of expiring, and the summer construction season quickly moves towards a close.

We need a transportation bill, and we would have one, Mr. Speaker, if the Republican leadership would simply accept the bipartisan Senate bill. Instead, the Republican leadership has decided to play politics by including unrelated provisions like the construction of the Keystone pipeline in a bill meant to build and repair America's roads and bridges, in a bill that would have put thousands and thousands and thousands of Americans to work on these critical projects.

I had the honor of hosting Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, a former Republican Member of this body, in my congressional district yesterday. Secretary LaHood made it clear that Congress needs to get its act together and pass a transportation bill. Rather than more recesses, I would say to my friends, we ought to stay here and not leave until we get this bill passed.

Instead, this transportation appropriations bill is, essentially, a shell full of placeholder language waiting for the authorization bill to be finished. This is not a way to legislate.

My friends on the other side of the aisle like to say, where are the jobs? Well, I'll tell you where the jobs are. They're in this transportation bill that they are holding up, that they are holding hostage. You want to put Americans back to work? Pass this bill.

I'm also deeply disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that this is the second year in a row that the appropriations bill fails to fund the Sustainable Communities initiative, which brings together the Department of Transportation, HUD, and EPA to develop effective models of integrated planning and promote economic development in metropolitan areas across the country. We should be pursuing the smart, holistic approaches to urban planning and improvement encouraged by the Sustainable Communities initiative, and this bill doesn't do that.

I also have concerns with the project-based Section 8 funding level included in the THUD legislation, and with proposals to short-fund project-based contracts. Short-funding does not reduce Federal expenditures, but instead shifts the cost to the next fiscal year. In fact, according to the National Housing Trust, short-funding can increase financing costs because of the uncertainty it creates among lenders and investors. Short-funding is a direct result of the need to conform to the Ryan budget, and I hope that the Senate's funding level is adopted during this conference, if they ever do have a conference.

The sad reality, Mr. Speaker, is that of these two appropriations bills, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations is the better one. And this Agriculture appropriations bill is, to put it nicely, not where

it needs to be. It is woefully inadequate in several places, and it continues a pattern set by this Republican leadership of trying to undermine the Wall Street reforms made under Dodd-Frank and to dismantle the antihunger safety net.

This bill decimates funding for the Commodity Futures Trading Corporation, one of the key regulators of the financial services industry. In fact, the bill cuts funding for the CFTC by 41 percent, a cut that will drastically reduce CFTC's ability to oversee an industry that continues to take risky gambles, as evidenced by J.P. Morgan's recent loss of \$2 billion. The Republican leadership, once again, would rather allow Wall Street to run amok instead of providing proper oversight so that Americans on Main Street don't get taken to the cleaners.

Also not surprising is this Republican leadership's continued assault on the hungry in America. Over the past 18 months, the Republican leadership has pushed two plans to block grant SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, dramatically cut WIC funding in last year's Agriculture appropriations bill, and brought a reconciliation bill to the floor that would cut \$36 million from SNAP, the most effective and efficient Federal antihunger program we have in this country.

□ 1740

Of course, we are still anticipating a farm bill from the Agriculture Committee that will cut at least \$14 billion from this program. Also, while this bill funds WIC at \$6.9 billion, it is still \$119 million short of President Obama's request.

In essence, this bill is gambling that food prices and participation will stabilize and not continue to rise. Yet just as concerning is the lack of set-asides for breast-feeding counselors, electronic benefit cards and infrastructure. These provisions were included in the President's request and also in the Senate bill. They should not be excluded from the House version.

The other problem with the WIC language is the provision dealing with white potatoes. For the first time, Congress is mandating that white potatoes be included in the WIC food package. This is unprecedented and is deeply troubling. Congress has never, until now, interfered with the science of the WIC food package. This food package was specifically designed by the Institute of Medicine to provide the necessary nutrients through specific foods that are often not consumed, for a variety of reasons, by low-income pregnant women and their newborns, infants and young children. Like the effort to treat pizza as a vegetable, this is clearly done on behalf of industry. It does not belong in this bill.

This bill also cuts the Commodities Supplemental Food Program below the President's request. This program provides food to seniors across the country, but the funding level in this bill is

so inadequate that it will actually result in 55,000 fewer seniors being served. That's 55,000 fewer low-income seniors on fixed incomes who will have food taken away from them simply because this committee decided that tightening our Nation's fiscal belt should mean less food for elderly in America instead of fewer profits for the wealthy.

The Agriculture appropriations bill doesn't spare international food aid from drastic cuts either. This bill cuts title II PL480 by 22 percent, or \$316 million, under FY12 levels and \$250 million below the President's FY13 request. These dramatic cuts would result in decreases in emergency services to between 6 million and 8 million vulnerable people, some of whom are already on the brink of starvation. They also weaken the funding for programs that fight long-term hunger and that build the capacity of people to withstand new emergencies. For example, it was the Food for Peace development programs in Ethiopia that helped keep communities from falling into famine and to withstand the shock of last year's drought, saving the American taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars.

Not only are these cuts unconscionable, but they are unwise because they will ultimately lead to future costs should there be widespread hunger, famine or civil unrest that requires American assistance. Mr. Speaker, we need to do better. We must do better. We need a surface transportation bill that actually puts Americans back to work.

I again ask my Republican friends to stop holding the Senate bill hostage. Bring it to the floor. Let us have an up-or-down vote on it. Let us pass it and get people back to work. We need to ensure that Wall Street doesn't, once again, run unchecked; and we need to guarantee that we don't let Americans go hungry during these difficult economic times. The Republican agenda is quite contrary to where I think the majority of Americans are, and we're seeing that agenda—that radical right-wing agenda—at work in these appropriations bills.

I will just close with this, Mr. Speaker:

My colleagues on the other side like to talk about numbers all the time while I like to talk about people. I got elected to Congress to help people. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, the agenda by this Republican majority is all about putting people down. We should be about lifting people up in this country. We can meet our budgetary challenges without lowering the standard of living for the people of this country.

With that, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding time.

I am very pleased to speak in favor of the rule on H.R. 5972, the fiscal year 2013 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Rules Committee for their assistance in moving this important bill forward. I also want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member DICKS for their commitment to moving appropriations bills through the House so that we can fund America's priorities while demonstrating the committee's proven record of cutting waste, fraud, and abuse.

In particular, I want to thank THUD Ranking Member JOHN OLVER for his assistance in crafting this legislation. This is his last THUD bill before retiring at the end of this year.

The Transportation and HUD bill represents responsible choices for our Nation's most pressing housing and transportation needs. This bill's allocation of \$51.6 billion is almost \$4 billion below fiscal year 2012 and is almost \$2 billion below the President's request. The bill also reflects the budget resolution passed by the House.

The bill is largely free of authorizations, leaving that important work to the Transportation and Infrastructure and Financial Services Committees. As the amendments to the THUD bill are rolling in, we are seeing a very familiar theme—authorizing provisions. There are a multitude of issues, especially in the transportation title and the housing title, that very desperately needed to be considered and acted upon by the authorizing committees of jurisdiction. A number of Members have good ideas for improving these programs, and the authorizers need to have the opportunity to turn these ideas into law.

The Appropriations Committee can only deal with existing law, so I would urge my colleagues with amendments that are out of order to please bring these issues to the relevant chairmen, and let's improve the underlying statutes. We can't make these authorizing changes on this appropriations bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule. I look forward to the general debate on the Transportation and HUD bill and to a very speedy amendment process.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to the \$19.405 billion allocation that our Subcommittee on Agriculture and Food and Drug Administration-related agencies received, but I rise in support of the rule for moving this process forward with a great floor debate.

The allocation given to our committee is \$1.7 billion, or 8 percent,

below what the President requested; and it is \$365 million, or 1.8 percent, below what we enacted in the House last year, in 2012.

Chairman KINGSTON, my colleague on the Republican side of the aisle and chair of our committee, does a great job. He has talked about how we have savings that have been found and that, in tough budgetary times, everybody has got to tighten his belt. We all know that, but it's about the cost of tightening those belts and about those who depend on those programs which, in many ways, are their survival. I feel several programs have been cut so deeply that people will either be unable or will have difficulty in performing the duties of those programs.

This bill slashes Food for Peace by 22 percent. Let me be crystal clear about what this cut means. Mr. MCGOVERN just spelled it out very clearly. It's the wrong thing to do. It means 6 million to 8 million people will face starvation—6 million to 8 million people. Cutting food aid only increases the need to bump up other, more costly efforts later on. It means that 44,000 Americans who produce that food could be losing their jobs. Those include farmers, the shippers of food, processors, port workers, and merchant mariners, who ship it across the seas.

In another example, 41 percent is being cut from the Commodity Futures Trading Commission—41 percent. That's misguided and shows a lack of understanding of its oversight responsibilities. A failure to fund robust oversight will only hurt American taxpayers. The CFTC is charged with the oversight of unregulated swaps at \$300 trillion a year—\$300 trillion of these swaps—and it is grossly unregulated.

This regulatory oversight protects the American taxpayer and reckless Wall Street behavior that caused the 2008 financial crisis. We all know that reckless Wall Street behavior led to the collapse of the housing market, which is still dragging down economic growth in all of our communities across America. We in Congress need to restore the people's confidence in our ability to govern and to regulate Wall Street and to benefit Main Street. We in Congress need to restore the CFTC funding.

Remember, too, that the FDA, which is the Food and Drug Administration, oversees 80 percent of our Nation's food supply, including food for more than 3,000 facilities in 200 countries around the world.

□ 1750

I appreciate the effort here to bump up food safety modernization implementation. However, the total Food and Drug Administration is funded at \$16 million under what we gave them last year, and \$31 million below what was requested for this year.

As you know, in addition to overseeing most of our food supply, it is responsible for the safety of drugs and medical devices, many of which are imported to the United States.

In closing, I do think that Chairman KINGSTON made a good effort in crafting this bill, given the allocation he had to deal with. I support this rule and continue to work with him as we move forward on this bill. Let's have a good hearty debate and adopt some amendments to correct it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, one of the bills that will seek consideration under this open rule is H.R. 5973, which primarily funds agriculture and nutrition programs. The legislation contains discretionary funding, as well as required mandatory funding for food and nutrition programs within the Department of Agriculture. This includes funding for the special Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for Women, Infants, and Children, or WIC, the food stamp, or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, and the child nutrition programs.

The bill provides \$6.9 billion in discretionary funding for WIC, which, contrary to what liberals suggest, is \$303.5 million above last year's level. This program provides supplemental nutritional foods needed by pregnant and nursing mothers, babies, and young children. Language is included for oversight and monitoring requirements to ensure the proper use of taxpayer dollars, as well as food price tracking to ensure necessary resources continue serving those eligible for program benefits.

The bill provides for \$19.7 billion in required mandatory funding outside of the discretionary funding jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee for child nutrition programs, which is \$1.5 billion above last year's level. The bill provides for \$80 billion in required mandatory spending, which is, again, outside of the discretionary funding jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, for SNAP, the food stamp program. This is \$408 million below last year's level.

Since food stamps or SNAP spending is driven by program participation, the spending is called mandatory. This legislation also includes new stringent reporting requirements to help weed out and eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in the program, such as a requirement for States to include the fraud hotline number on all EBT cards, a directive that the Secretary of Agriculture ban fraudulent vendors, and a requirement for States to share data with enforcement agencies.

The legislation includes \$996 million for food safety and inspection programs, which is equal to the President's budget request, and a decrease of \$9 million below last year's level. These mandatory inspection activities, which play a significant role in maintaining the safety and productivity of the country's \$832 billion meat and poultry industry, help maintain critical meat, poultry, and egg product inspection and testing activities and support the implementation of a poultry inspection

program to improve safety and inspection efficiency. This voluntary inspection program is expected to reduce government costs by \$85 million to \$95 million over 3 years and reduce costs to private businesses by a total of \$250 million.

The FDA receives a total of almost \$2.5 billion in discretionary funding in the bill, representing a 0.7 percent or \$16.3 million reduction below last year's level. Total funding for the FDA, including user fees, is \$3.8 billion.

These are just some of the priorities outlined in the underlying legislation. I look forward to hearing from committee leaders, who will provide further discussion of various elements of the legislation at the time the bill is debated.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, I just want to yield myself such time as I may consume just to make a point here.

I think it's important for us not to try to fool anybody by saying that we are adequately living up to the challenge of combating hunger and food insecurity in this country, because I will say to the gentlelady that there are 49 million Americans who would disagree with you. There are 49 million Americans who are hungry in our country, the richest country on the planet. Seventeen million of them are children.

Among the many things that are cut in this Agriculture appropriations bill is the Commodity Supplemental Food program. The cut in that alone would throw 55,000 seniors off of food assistance.

We can talk about that we're trying to do the best we can, but let's not say that somehow we're doing something we're not. We are not meeting the challenge of ending hunger and food insecurity in America. Not by a long shot. That's one of the frustrating things about this appropriations process—that the very programs to help people get out of poverty, to get on their feet again, are being slashed. You are balancing the budget on the backs of hungry people while you ask Donald Trump not to pay one penny more in taxes. I think that's unfair, and that's why, I think, this whole process is unfair.

At this point, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying Agriculture-FDA appropriations bill.

It does not meet our responsibilities to the American people. This bill's allocation is \$1.7 billion below the President's request. The lower allocation represents a breaking of the bipartisan agreement we made last August. It will have a dramatic impact on the fundamental American priorities embodied in this bill, especially in the critical areas of financial protection, nutrition, food safety, and antihunger programs.

I would like to submit this letter from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops for the RECORD, a letter that speaks out against the inadequate funding for nutrition and antihunger programs in this appropriations bill.

Nearly half of the babies born in the United States every year participate in the Women, Infants, and Children feeding program. It is a short-term intervention that can help provide a lifetime of good nutrition and health behaviors. And yet at a time of great need, the bill underfunds WIC by \$119 million.

The Food and Drug Administration is the cornerstone of our food and product safety system, and yet this bill rescinds \$47.7 million in previous funding and displaces the agency's vital mission: protecting the health of Americans at risk.

The bill cuts the Food for Peace program. Because of this cut, at least 6.6 million fewer hungry people around the globe will be fed. Already, 300 children perish every hour of every day because of hunger and related causes. Ronald Reagan correctly called Food for Peace "an instrument of American compassion," and we should support it.

We know for a fact that the risky behavior in derivative markets that precipitated the 2008 financial meltdown is still happening. We've seen it with MF Global and J.P. Morgan. Americans want more accountability from Wall Street and less speculation erratically driving up oil prices. And yet, this bill funds the Commodity Futures Trading Commission at \$25 million less than 2012 and the full \$128 million—41 percent. This is quite simply setting the commission up for failure.

We have a lot of work to do to fix this bill. We must ensure that the fundamental priorities of the people that we represent—like preserving fair markets, improving nutrition, ensuring food and consumer safety—are upheld.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

I might add that in the State of Connecticut, in the Third Congressional District, one out of seven individuals is food insecure. What does food insecurity mean? It means they don't know where their next meal is coming from.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. We have 49 million people in this Nation who are going to bed hungry every night in the richest country in the world. It is inconceivable that we would cut back on food and nutrition programs when the Nation is suffering from the most serious economic recession it is having, and that we would cut back on food stamps.

We have cut back on school breakfast programs, school lunch programs, The Emergency Food Assistance program, the Commodity Supplemental Food program. And while the richest people

in this Nation are having three squares a day or better, let's get our priorities straight. Let's focus on the people that we have come here to represent. Oppose this rule and oppose this bill.

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE  
OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS,  
Washington DC, June 26, 2012.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, we wish to address the moral and human dimensions of the FY 2013 Agriculture Appropriations legislation. The bishops' conference urges you to resist significant cuts to both domestic and international food aid and conservation and rural development programs. Major reductions at this time of economic turmoil and rising poverty will hurt hungry, poor and vulnerable people in our nation and around the world.

In For I Was Hungry and You Gave Me Food, the bishops wrote, "The primary goals of agricultural policies should be providing food for all people and reducing poverty among farmers and farm workers in this county and abroad." Adequate nutrition is essential to protect human life and dignity. We urge support for just and sufficient funding for agriculture policies that serve hungry, poor and vulnerable people while promoting good stewardship of the land and natural resources. In our soup kitchens and on our parish doorsteps, we see the faces of poor and hungry people every day. As a faith community, we feed those without work, pregnant women and children and seniors on a limited income. The Catholic community at home and abroad includes farmers, ranchers, farmworkers and business owners who grow food, care for the land and help rural communities prosper.

The bishops' conference acknowledges the difficult challenges that Congress, the Administration and government at all levels face to match scarce resources with growing needs. A just spending bill cannot rely on disproportionate cuts in essential services to poor and vulnerable persons; it requires shared sacrifice by all.

As pastors and teachers, we believe these are economic, political and moral choices with human consequences. Our bishops' conference has offered several moral criteria to help guide difficult budgetary decisions:

Every budget decision should be assessed by whether it protects or threatens human life and dignity.

A central moral measure of any budget proposal is how it affects "the least of these" (Matthew 25). The needs of those who are hungry and homeless, without work or in poverty should come first.

Government and other institutions have a shared responsibility to promote the common good of all, especially ordinary workers and families who struggle to live in dignity in difficult economic times.

We address the following programs as they reflect a priority for poor and hungry people and promote good stewardship:

#### DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

WIC: The Women, Infants, and Children nutrition program is fully funded at \$7.04 billion in the President's FY 2013 budget. With record high child poverty (1 in 5 children), a cut to this program would harm some of the most vulnerable people in our country.

TEFAP: The Emergency Food Assistance Program receives appropriations funding for food storage and distribution grants in local communities. Cuts to the program could force some of our parishes and other charities to turn away hungry people when they continue to need our help.

SNAP: The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (formerly food stamps), received a \$2 billion cut made to the reserve fund in the 2010 child nutrition bill. Restoration of funding is necessary as families continue to struggle with joblessness and poverty.

CSFP: The Commodity Supplemental Food Program provides food assistance to low-income seniors, pregnant and breastfeeding women and infants and children. Adequate funding is needed to help faith communities and other charities provide food packages to hungry people in their local communities. Reductions will result in a loss of food for thousands of low-income seniors.

CSP: Adequately fund the Conservation Stewardship Program to help farmers conserve and care for farm land for future generations. Strong conservation programs are necessary to promote good stewardship of creation and provide needed support to family farms.

VAPG: Maintain current funding for the Value Added Producer Grants program to help farmers and ranchers develop new farm and food-related businesses to increase rural economic opportunity and help farm and ranch families thrive. In addition, restore funding for the Rural Micro-entrepreneur Assistance Program (RMAP)—which was eliminated in the FY 2012 funding bill—to help small businesses develop and grow in rural communities.

#### INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Food for Peace: The President's Budget proposal calls for a 4.5% cut to the Title II Food Aid program from the FY 2012 appropriated levels, which is a 20% cut from the FY 2010 level. Such substantial cuts over just two years will undoubtedly lead to an unacceptable loss of life for those in dire circumstances.

Safe Box: Congress must protect Title II Food Aid funds to development programs by preserving the "safe box" provision. Programs funded through the safe box help chronically hungry communities build lasting agricultural capacity that minimizes the impact of severe weather and other catastrophes.

Local and Regional Purchase: Direct funds to the Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) of food commodities. As demonstrated in the pilot program funded by the 2008 Farm Bill, LRP can reduce the cost of food assistance, shorten delivery times, and improve overall response for both emergency and development programs.

202e Funds: Increase the amount of cash resources in the Title II program. The distribution of food alone is not enough to stimulate sustainable development. Agencies like Catholic Relief Services use these funds to operate nutrition education programs that save the lives of mothers and children and for agricultural programs that increase the quality and amount of food that poor farmers produce. Increasing cash resources would also reduce the need to sell U.S. food in developing countries to generate cash to support such programs (monetization).

#### PRIORITIES AND SUBSIDIES

The bishops' conference supports farm safety net programs such as crop insurance and disaster assistance that are targeted to the needs of small to medium sized farmers and ranchers. Savings should be used to fund hunger and nutrition programs that serve people in need.

At a time of great competition for agricultural resources and budgetary constraints, the needs of those who are hungry, poor and vulnerable should come before assistance to those who are relatively well off and powerful. With other Christian leaders, we urge the committee to draw a "circle of protec-

tion' around resources that serve those in greatest need and to put their needs first even though they do not have powerful advocates or great influence. The moral measure of the agriculture appropriations process is how it serves "the least of these." We urge you to protect and fund programs that feed hungry people, help the most vulnerable farmers, strengthen rural communities and promote good stewardship of God's creation.

Sincerely yours,

MOST REVEREND STEPHEN  
E. BLAIRE,  
*Bishop of Stockton,  
Chairman, Com-  
mittee on Domestic  
Justice and Human  
Development.*

MOST REVEREND RICHARD  
E. PATES,  
*Bishop of Des Moines,  
Chairman, Com-  
mittee on Inter-  
national Justice and  
Peace.*

□ 1800

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the other bill that will benefit from consideration under this open rule is H.R. 5972, which provides funding aimed at supporting a vibrant and safe transportation infrastructure while making the difficult decisions needed to balance the budget.

The bill includes \$17.6 billion in discretionary appropriations for the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2013. This is \$69 million below last year's level. The bill designates \$39.1 billion from the highway trust fund for the Federal highway program, which is the same level provided last year.

However, the committee recognizes that since the highway program still requires reauthorization and the funding level provided in the bill may change upon the enactment of a highway authorization bill for the next fiscal year, the Appropriations Committee is prepared to support a differing highway trust fund spending level should a new multiyear authorization bill be enacted.

Included in the legislation is \$12.6 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration, which is \$91 million above last year's level. The bill provides nearly \$1 billion for the FAA's Next Generation Air Transportation System, otherwise known as NextGen, allowing the FAA to move forward with the next step in modernizing the Nation's air control and airport system. The bill also supports operations and staffing, which will help ease congestion and reduce delays for travelers in U.S. airspace while rejecting the administration's proposals for new aviation fees.

The legislation contains funding for the various transportation safety programs and agencies within the Department of Transportation. This includes \$776 million in both mandatory and discretionary funding for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, representing a reduction of \$23.8 million below last year; \$551 million for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, representing a reduction of \$2.6 million below last year; and \$177

million for the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, which is \$4 million above last year's level.

The legislation includes a total of \$33.6 billion to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which is \$3.8 billion below last year's level. The bill wastes no funding on any new, unauthorized "sustainable," "livable," or "green" community development programs. \$26.3 billion is included in the bill for public and Indian housing, representing an increase of \$759 million above last year's level.

Within this total, the bill provides funding to renew benefits for every single individual and family currently receiving assistance and ensures that no critical benefits are eliminated or canceled. The bill also fully funds the President's request for veterans' housing at \$75 million and Native American block grants at \$650 million.

Housing programs within the bill are funded at \$9.3 billion, representing a reduction of \$361 million below last year's level and \$49 million below the request. Within this total, the bill provides sufficient funding for the most vulnerable populations, including \$165 million for housing for the disabled, an increase of \$15 million over last year, and \$425 million for housing for the elderly, again, an increase of \$50 million above last year.

These are just some of the priorities outlined in the underlying legislation. Again, I look forward to hearing from committee leaders who will provide further discussion of the various elements of the legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this rule allows Members to go home to their districts, even if we don't address the doubling of student loan interest rates that are about to hit people across the country and even if we don't hammer out a deal to fund our transportation programs and create jobs, notwithstanding the fact that our infrastructure is crumbling.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to say that the House cannot adjourn at the end of this week until we finish our business.

And to discuss this amendment, I would yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule because we are set to adjourn this week without finishing our critical work on transportation.

We need a long-term surface transportation bill that puts Americans back to work. Mr. Speaker, this House only builds roads in order to find cans to kick down those roads. We cannot have a "big league" economy with "little league" infrastructure in this country. We need a long-term investment to repair our roads, bridges, and highways, and to maintain our transit systems.

Leaders of our country have always recognized this fact. Three years after Lewis and Clark left for the West, President Jefferson secured funding for the Cumberland Road. If Jefferson recognized the importance that transportation can have in linking this country, uniting the States in a shared economy and trade, surely we can show that same recognition today by staying here to ensure that the work of job creation is done. The question before us is whether this body recognizes that transportation projects create jobs and set the stage for economic growth.

A bipartisan bill passed out of the Senate. It was forged out of compromise. It is a bipartisan solution. It means immediate job creation. It means jobs for private sector contractors, laborers, and engineers.

A conference committee is meeting right now to bring us a long-term authorization to create real jobs. We should not adjourn without a long-term, robust, and bipartisan investment in transportation and jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule so we can finish this work.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are talking about the fact that we are going to have a district work period next week. The district work period is because next week we are celebrating the signing of the Declaration of Independence, one of the most important holidays in this country.

Our colleagues across the aisle want to create more dependence in this country. They are as far away from the Founders of this country as you can be in terms of what makes this country unique and what makes it so great.

We don't need more dependence in this country, Mr. Speaker. We need to celebrate what makes this country great, what makes us unique. It's the independence of this country and the independence of citizens and their ability to take care of themselves and to personally take care of each other and not continue to look to the nanny state that our friends would create and have tried to create over the years.

These are very difficult times, Mr. Speaker. We all know that. But it's important that the American people understand that House Republicans have repeatedly worked to find common ground with the President and Senate Democrats and have passed several bipartisan bills that would improve this economy which has been so damaged by the policies of the left and this President.

Several proposals supported even by the President have passed the House and have been signed into law, including trade pacts, a bipartisan veterans hiring bill, and a repeal of the IRS withholding tax on job creators. But the President's own job council has embraced many of the job proposals advocated by Republicans but ignored by the President himself.

The simple truth is that President Obama's attempt supported by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle,

and by them only, to stimulate the economy by growing government has failed.

But you don't have to take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. Just look at the facts: The recent jobs report showed that the U.S. gained only 69,000 jobs in the month of May.

May marked the 40th consecutive month that the unemployment rate has remained above 8 percent, repudiating the administration's pledge that unemployment would remain below 8 percent if the Democrat 2009 stimulus plan became law. Lest we forget, it was the Obama administration which claimed unemployment would be below 6 percent today if the \$1.178 trillion Democrat "stimulus" was signed into law.

At the current rate of job growth, if the United States continues to struggle under the failed policies that have produced the "Obama economy" and adds only 69,000 jobs each month in the future, it would take a total of 10 years and 5 months—until June 2018—to regain all the jobs lost during the latest recession, which is longer than the 8 years it took to regain the jobs lost during the Great Depression.

□ 1810

But even these figures, Mr. Speaker, hide the fact that the rate of underemployment, or real unemployment, which counts those who want to work but have stopped searching in this economy and those who are forced to work part-time because they cannot find full employment, is 14.5 percent or higher.

Also troubling is the realization that since 2008, which is the year President Obama was elected, median family income has declined by \$1,154, falling to its lowest level since 1996. As a March 2012, the number of Americans receiving food stamps was 46.4 million, which is the third most in any month in history and up 80,000 from February. Today, 15 percent of Americans receive food stamps, representing an increase of 45 percent since President Obama took office.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to continue the failed policies they began in 2007 and instituted for 4 years and worked with President Obama for 2 years on. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are working to improve the dismal conditions imposed by the liberal regime that dominated Washington, D.C., for far too long.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me just say I hope that the gentelady wasn't implying that somehow the Federal Government doesn't have a role in investing in our national highway infrastructure. Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican, I should remind the gentelady, understood the importance of having a national highway program.

As has been pointed out by a number of our speakers on the Democratic side, our infrastructure is aging and is fall-

ing apart, and we're not going to be able to compete in this global economy unless we make the proper investments. And by making the proper investments, we are not only helping our economy; we are putting people back to work. We are putting people back to work. And yet the Republican leadership of this House is holding hostage a transportation bill that passed the Senate that would put countless people back to work, which passed overwhelmingly in the Senate by 74 votes—overwhelmingly in the Senate. We can't get that brought up on the House floor for a vote.

The Republicans, I would say, Mr. Speaker, I think are intentionally running out the clock. I think it's a cynical attempt to hold everything up, to not invest in our economy, to slow down economic growth. Hopefully, I think, in their minds, they hope that it will win them the election. I think it's a cynical way to do politics. We ought to be on this floor helping the American people.

And, yes, the 4th of July is a great time for us to celebrate our country, but a lot of Americans are not going to celebrate because they're out of work. And we have the ability to put them back to work. Yet my friends on the other side of the aisle are holding hostage the very bill that could put countless Americans back to work.

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, unless Congress acts in the next 4 days, the subsidized Stafford student loan interest rate is going double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. Despite the fact that that looming deadline which affects over 7 million college students all across American is staring us in the face, what we are debating here today is a rule which allows the House to go into recess for the 10th week since January, which is part of this rule.

The good news is that a couple of hours ago it was reported that the Senate and Republican leadership have actually agreed upon a settlement of this issue which would allow the 3.4 percent rate to be extended for 1 year. But I would note that MITCH MCCONNELL, who's the minority leader for the Republican Party, said that:

Final approval of student loan legislation, which would prevent rates on Federal Stafford loans from doubling to 6.8 percent, depends on House Republicans.

The fact of the matter is we have no idea whether or not the House Republican leadership is going to agree to this compromise which the Senate leadership reached a few hours ago, because all we're debating here today is another adjournment or recess motion before the House. The fact of the matter is it is time for us to focus on this issue which the President on January 25 challenged Congress to act on.

I started this countdown chart at day 110. We are now down to the final hours

before the interest rates double, which will cost thousands of dollars in more interest costs to college student across America, unless we act. The fact of the matter is that the House Republican bill that they rushed to the floor without a subcommittee, without a markup, was completely rejected by Republicans in the Senate. We now have the glimmer of a deal, a compromise. We should not be debating another adjournment resolution for the 10th week of recess this year until we get this work done.

There are millions of college students all across America who are waiting for us to get this issue resolved so that they can plan their budget for the next fall semester. And the fact that we're here again with another adjournment resolution with the most unproductive Congress in recent memory is ridiculous. We should reject this rule. Let's focus on getting the work done that the American people are counting on.

Ms. FOXX. I need to remind my colleague across the aisle we're not debating an adjournment resolution here today. I also need to remind my colleague across the aisle that it was the Democrats that set this student loan problem up. They made promises in 2006 to the American people they couldn't keep; and so they set up a time bomb, actually, so that the interest rates on the student loans would go back up because, again, they made promises they couldn't keep about lowering the rate of interest.

It affects a very small number of students, and it only affects them when they graduate from college, Mr. Speaker. If the Obama economy weren't so lousy and only 50 percent of the students graduating were getting jobs, it really wouldn't be that big an issue because it's a very small amount of money to the students. And if they had jobs, they wouldn't be quite so concerned about it. They only have to pay those loans back after they graduate because we're subsidizing interest while they are in school.

So I think our colleagues don't really want to go in that direction and talk about blaming Republicans for this mess with student loans, since they created it. And if the students were getting jobs, most of them wouldn't be as concerned about it as they are now.

Also, on the transportation bill that our colleagues tout so well, again, it fits right into their philosophy of borrow, borrow, borrow; spend, spend, spend. It is not a responsible bill because the Republican bill would stay within the limits of the revenue that we get from the highway trust fund. But they just want to borrow from the general fund and make our situation worse.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear to everyone except the liberal leadership that job creators are bogged down by overly burdensome Federal regulations that prevent job creation and hinder economic growth. These regulations are

particularly damaging for the real job creators in the country: small business owners. The Federal Government may create jobs, but they are not sustainable jobs, and they are a drag on the economy.

However, House Republicans recognize the need to remove onerous, redundant Federal regulations that are so harmful to small businesses and impede private sector investment and job creation. In order to ease the regulatory burden on the economy and to promote job creation, House Republicans have worked to advance legislation to rein in the unaccountable Federal regulatory apparatus and continue to pursue innovative initiatives such as my bill, H.R. 373, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, which would help improve transparency and accountability by disclosing costs to Federal mandates that would otherwise remain hidden from public scrutiny.

House Republicans appreciate that America's Tax Code has grown overly complicated and cumbersome, filled with loopholes and giveaways and is fundamentally unfair. That's why the House Republican plan for America's job creators recognizes the need to eliminate the special interest tax breaks that litter the Tax Code and reduce our overall tax rate to no more than 25 percent for business and individuals, including small business owners. This would make the Tax Code flatter, fairer, and simpler. Common-sense changes to the Tax Code would ensure that everyone pays his or her fair share, lessens the burden on families, generates economic expansion, and creates jobs by making Americans more competitive.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a "no" vote on the previous question so that an amendment to the rule can be offered.

Mr. Speaker, we just heard about what makes this country great. Well, I think what makes this country great is the education of our people.

□ 1820

We know that having a good education is key to achieving the American Dream and key to keeping our country competitive. We all know that because the folks in this Chamber know the importance of a college education. Most people here have gone to college. But there are millions of young adults who are slowly seeing that opportunity evaporate with tuition skyrocketing.

Students from across my district in San Diego are struggling, and they tell me that every day. Some are doing a delicate balancing act of providing for their families while taking on a full academic course load. And others, quite frankly, are just scraping by each semester. An additional burden of

\$1,000 in interest payments is no trifling matter for these students. And yet, we see that partisan games have led to gridlock on this issue.

College students know that if they miss deadlines, there are consequences. And for Congress, there should be consequences, too. Well, Mr. Speaker, the clock is running out, and I urge my colleagues, please, support a solution that gives students and families the relief that they desperately need.

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

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

I think most Americans would agree, irrespective of which party they are in, that it would be a good idea to put Americans back to work building our highways and our bridges and our transportation systems, and do it now.

I think most Americans would agree that doubling interest rates on student loans would be disastrous for people struggling to get a college education.

I think most Americans would agree that if the other body passed a transportation bill by three-quarters of the Members voting for it, Republican and Democrat, it would be a good idea to take that bill up here.

I think most Americans would agree that if the Republican and Democratic leadership in the other body reached an agreement on a way to keep the student loan rates low and not add to the deficit by paying for it, it would be a really good idea to bring the bill up here.

The unfortunate thing for the House and for the country is that the only people who don't seem to be a part of that consensus are the Republican Members of the House of Representatives. No matter if the Senate Republicans say it's okay, and the Senate Democrats say it's okay, and the President says it's okay, and the House Democrats say it's okay, and more importantly, if the American people say it's okay, it somehow isn't usually okay with them.

So what Mr. MCGOVERN is saying is this: until we keep the student loan rates low, and until we pass a jobs bill to put people back to work on transportation, let's not take our 10th week of paid vacation this year. I think that's a pretty reasonable thing to do. So voting "no" on the previous question says let's get our work done before we go home and take our 10th week of vacation for the year. Vote "no."

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I don't know about my colleagues across the aisle, it's not a paid vacation for me. I go home and spend time with my constituents and hear from them what's of concern. Maybe they're on vacation, but I know the people on our side of the aisle are not on vacation. They're

working hard for the American people, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentlelady how many more speakers she has on her side?

Ms. FOXX. We are prepared to close when the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm prepared to close. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, our job should be to help improve the quality of life for the citizens that we represent. We ought to be investing in our economy at this very difficult time. That's why we are urging the House Republicans to join with the Senate Republicans and the Senate Democrats and the House Democrats in bringing a highway bill to the floor so we can provide some certainty to our States, so there can be more investments in infrastructure, so there can be more jobs created. That would give the American people a little something to celebrate.

We are urging my colleagues on the Republican side here in the House to join with us in making sure that interest rates on student loans don't double for a great number of young people in this country who are trying to get an education. My colleague from North Carolina would have us believe that it is no big deal. Well, it is a big deal. It's a big deal to those students and to their families. It is a big deal to those of us on this side of the aisle. And maybe that's one of the differences between the two parties. We believe college education ought to be affordable, and no one should not go to college because they can't afford the education.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of an amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment basically says we're not going home, we're not leaving this place until we do our work because part of our job, I would say to my colleague from North Carolina, is not just going home and meeting with our constituents and marching in parades. Part of our job is to pass legislation that is important to the people we represent.

This highway bill is important to putting people back to work. My friends on the other side of the aisle have dragged their feet and dragged their feet and dragged their feet. I think it is unconscionable. We are running out of time. We need to start doing the people's business here. And if that means that we have to stay through the weekend, we should stay

through the weekend. If we have to stay through next week, we should stay through next week. But we ought to do something meaningful.

Our job should not be about lowering the quality of life for people, and that is my problem with the appropriations process that my colleagues have pursued in this House. It is all about putting all of the burden of balancing our budget on middle-income families and on those who least can afford it. Donald Trump is not asked to pay one penny more.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, again, next week is the Fourth of July. We are going to be celebrating Independence Day, and I would like to say that I don't believe the job of the Federal Government is to provide things to citizens but to preserve our liberty, and that's what next week should be reminding us of.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are aware of the clear mandate the American people gave us. Our charge is to reduce the crushing debt that our country is currently carrying. According to the Senate Budget Committee, debt grew four times faster under President Obama than Clinton or Bush, with President Obama already having amassed more debt since taking office than did President Bush during his entire two terms in office. Today, the national debt is over \$15 trillion, which amounts to nearly \$48,000 for every man, woman and child in America.

It's clear without a change in leadership in the White House and Senate, the legacy we are apt to leave our children and grandchildren will be a crushing debt burden and a weaker, less secure, and less prosperous Nation. This is simply unacceptable.

The Federal Government's current budget deficits are simply unsustainable. During these tough economic times, American families are getting by on less, and the government should do the same.

When the Democrat elites were in the majority, they pushed a job-killing agenda starting with the \$1 trillion failed stimulus package, followed by a massive job-killing tax hike in the form of cap-and-trade, then the job-killing ObamaCare, all the while leaving our country with record debts and deficits as unemployment skyrocketed. Recognizing that government has gotten too expensive, Republicans are here to stop the senseless Obama spending binge. That's why I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 697 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike section 4 and insert the following:

SEC. 4. Except as specified in section 5, it shall be in order without intervention of any

point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July.

SEC. 5. It shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment on Friday, June 29, 2012, unless the Majority Leader and Minority Leader jointly certify to the Speaker in writing that the Congress has cleared for presentment to the President measures that will:

- prevent the doubling of interest rates on student loans; and
- reauthorize Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund.

(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.

Ms. FOXX. 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 on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 697 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if requested; the motion to instruct on H.R. 4348 offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); and the motion to instruct on H.R. 4348 offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 168, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

YEAS—226

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

Lungren, Daniel	Platts	Sessions
E.	Poe (TX)	Shimkus
Mack	Pompeo	Shuler
Manzullo	Posey	Shuster
Marchant	Price (GA)	Simpson
Marino	Quayle	Smith (NE)
McCarthy (CA)	Reed	Smith (NJ)
McCaul	Rehberg	Smith (TX)
McClintock	Reichert	Southerland
McCotter	Renacci	Stearns
McHenry	Ribble	Stutzman
McKeon	Rigell	Terry
McKinley	Rivera	Thompson (PA)
McMorris	Roby	Thornberry
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Tiberi
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Turner (OH)
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Rohrabacher
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Rokita
Miller, Gary	Rokita	Rooney
Mulvaney	Rooney	Ros-Lehtinen
Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Roskam
Myrick	Roskam	Ross (FL)
Neugebauer	Ross (FL)	Royce
Noem	Royce	Runyan
Nugent	Runyan	Ryan (WI)
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Scalise
Nunnelee	Scalise	Schilling
Olson	Schilling	Schmidt
Palazzo	Schmidt	Schock
Paul	Schock	Schweikert
Paulsen	Schweikert	Scott (SC)
Pearce	Scott (SC)	Scott, Austin
Petri	Scott, Austin	Sensenbrenner
Pitts	Sensenbrenner	

NAYS—168

Andrews	Fattah	Murphy (CT)
Baca	Filner	Nadler
Baldwin	Frank (MA)	Napolitano
Barber	Fudge	Olver
Barrow	Garamendi	Owens
Bass (CA)	Gonzalez	Pallone
Becerra	Green, Al	Pascarell
Berkley	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Berman	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Peters
Bonamici	Heinrich	Peterson
Boren	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Boswell	Himes	Polis
Brady (PA)	Hinchoy	Price (NC)
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Hirono	Rahall
Butterfield	Hochul	Reyes
Capps	Holt	Richardson
Capuano	Honda	Richmond
Cardoza	Hoyer	Ross (AR)
Carnahan	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Keating	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Kissell	Schrader
Clyburn	Kucinich	Schwartz
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Costa	Levin	Sherman
Costello	Lipinski	Sires
Loebsack	Lowe	Slaughter
Lujan	Lujan	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lynch	Speier
Cummings	Maloney	Stark
Davis (CA)	Markey	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
DeLauro	McCollum	Tonko
Deutch	McDermott	Van Hollen
Dicks	McGovern	Visclosky
Dingell	McIntyre	Walz (MN)
Doggett	McNerney	Waters
Donnelly (IN)	Michaud	Watt
Doyle	Miller (NC)	Waxman
Edwards	Miller, George	Welch
Ellison	Moore	Yarmuth
Eshoo	Moran	
Farr		

NOT VOTING—38

Ackerman	Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)
Akin	Burton (IN)	Crowley
Altmire	Campbell	Diaz-Balart

Engel	Lewis (CA)	Towns
Flake	Lewis (GA)	Tsongas
Gutierrez	Loftgren, Zoe	Turner (NY)
Hastings (FL)	Meeks	Velázquez
Holden	Neal	Wasserman
Huizenga (MI)	Pence	Schultz
Jackson (IL)	Rangel	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (IL)	Sánchez, Linda	Woolsey
Jordan	T.	Young (FL)
Lamborn	Stivers	
Landry	Sullivan	

□ 1856

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

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 166, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

AYES—229

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

Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock

Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi

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

NOES—166

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

Filmer  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lipinski  
Loeback  
Lowe  
Luján  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran

Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rahall  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Ross (AR)  
Becerra  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Van Hollen  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—37

Ackerman  
Akin  
Altmire  
Blumenauer  
Burton (IN)  
Campbell  
Clarke (NY)  
Crowley  
Diaz-Balart  
Engel  
Flake  
Gutierrez  
Herger

Holden  
Huizenga (MI)  
Jackson (IL)  
Johnson (IL)  
Jordan  
Lamborn  
Landry  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Meeks  
Neal  
Pence

Rangel  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Stivers  
Sullivan  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey

□ 1903

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.

MOTIONS TO INSTRUCT CON-FEREEES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 4348 offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 172, nays 225, answered “present” 1, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

YEAS—172

Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barber  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggart  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bonamici  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lipinski  
Loeback  
Lowe  
Luján  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore

Fattah  
Filner  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gibson  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Van Hollen  
Walz (MN)  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Yarmuth

Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rahall  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Van Hollen  
Walz (MN)  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Yarmuth

NAYS—225

Adams  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amash  
Amodei

Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Bartlett

Barton (TX)  
Benishek  
Berg  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis

Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie

Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lance  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence

Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Long  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

DeFazio

NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman  
Akin  
Blumenauer  
Burton (IN)  
Campbell  
Clarke (NY)  
Crowley  
Diaz-Balart  
Engel  
Flake  
Frank (MA)  
Gutierrez

Holden  
Jackson (IL)  
Johnson (IL)  
Jordan  
Lamborn  
Landry  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Meeks  
Neal  
Rangel

Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Stivers  
Sullivan  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey

□ 1909

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.