

are taking here can play a role in continuing to encourage the positive reforms that we are seeing take place in Burma. We're not there yet—that's why we need to take this action—but we are moving in the right direction.

My fellow Californian Mr. ROYCE mentioned South Sudan—the newest country in the world. Last month, I was there when they marked their first anniversary of existence. This is a country that is seeking to get its sea legs. I was pleased to be there with my colleague Mr. PRICE, who cochairs our House Democracy Partnership. We are looking at the idea of possibly putting together a partnership between this new parliament, with a very impressive speaker, in South Sudan and the United States House of Representatives. The idea of incorporating South Sudan as part of the African Growth and Opportunity Act is again an indication that we very much want to strengthen ties with new and re-emerging democracies around the world, not just politically but commercially as well.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this effort, and I congratulate my friends on both sides of the aisle who are making it happen. I especially express appreciation to my very, very good friend Mr. CAMP, who has championed this and so many other important issues. He and I will be together again this afternoon when we get to, I hope, put together a strong bipartisan effort to implement the notion of bringing about real meaningful tax reform.

Mr. McDERMOTT. May I inquire as to how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The gentleman from Washington has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Does the gentleman from Michigan have any more speakers?

Mr. CAMP. I have no further requests for time.

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

Mr. Speaker, many people played a part in all of this. Nothing in Congress ever gets done by one person. Nothing ever gets done by one side or the other, and the good things that happen here always happen on a bipartisan basis. I'm sorry ED ROYCE left, because ED ROYCE and I worked together.

One day, he called me. He said, JIM, I'm going out to Africa to look at some of the places in which the AGOA Act is working. Will you go with me?

I said, Why?

Well, he said, I need a Democrat on the trip.

That kind of relationship is rare around here, unfortunately, and I think that people need to recognize that it is still going on—that this place runs on trust.

Very early on in this session, I said to DAVE CAMP, When are you going to bring up the AGOA Act?

He said, It's going to come up.

I've asked him many times since, and he has said it's going to come up. So I told all of my African friends, It's going to come up because DAVE CAMP said it's going to come up.

I'm really pleased to acknowledge that he kept his word, because what this place runs on is trust. If you don't trust somebody in here, then you don't do business with him. If you trust him, even if it takes him a long time and you have to poke him a bunch of times, you know that ultimately he's going to do what he said he was going to do. I want to acknowledge Chairman CAMP for that because I think it is reflective of what can make it possible for us to do tax reform in this House.

It is something that took a long time the last time they did it, but it was built on the trust between Reagan and Rostenkowski and Tip O'Neill. It took a bit of time, but it will happen again if we learn to act on the behalf of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee for his kind comments and for his leadership as well over the years. This really was a team effort. A lot of people on both sides of the aisle came together to make this a reality.

I'll just briefly say that this is bipartisan legislation that does deepen our trade and investment ties with Africa and with the CAFTA-DR countries. It also supports well-paying jobs here in the United States as well as in other countries, as Mr. DREIER stated. This is not a zero sum game. This will help both of our nations as well as Africa. Also, this legislation reauthorizes the import ban on Burmese products.

I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5986.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6233, AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2012

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 752 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 752

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6233) to make supplemental agricultural disaster assistance available for fiscal year 2012 with the costs of such assistance offset by changes to certain conservation programs, and for other pur-

poses. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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 gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 752 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 6233, the Agricultural Disaster Assistance Act of 2012.

As a lifelong farmer myself, including operating a nursery and being a beekeeper, I can certainly empathize with being vulnerable to Mother Nature and the plight caused by unpredictable weather.

Without a doubt, the good Lord has blessed this country with an abundance of natural gifts, and I am very thankful for America's farmers, who work to utilize and protect these blessings to help feed our country and others throughout the world. Unfortunately, the drought devastating so much of the United States this year has yielded a tremendous amount of financial hardships not only for these farmers but also for those throughout the rest of the economy that depend on their products.

Mr. Speaker, it's important to remember that it is not just farmers affected by this drought. The consequences of this disaster impact all Americans, from those living in the biggest cities to those living in the most remote areas of this country. Not only does drought aggravate the risk of wildfires that have raged throughout the West, but it compromises our crops, which are used to feed our livestock and even fuel our cars.

□ 1040

The effects will last long after rain brings much-needed relief. With the price of corn jumping 50 percent since June, grocery costs continue to climb. The Department of Agriculture now estimates food prices could climb between 2.5 percent and 3.5 percent this year, and between 3 percent and 4 percent next year.

Also of consequence to price conscious energy consumers is how the

drought impacts the price of gasoline. Federal law provides that 10 percent of gasoline to be composed of ethanol. The increasing price has led some ethanol refineries to cut production, which, in turn, increases what drivers pay at the pump.

While many will suffer from inflated costs of staples they use every day, there are millions of Americans who live in communities throughout this country that are economically dependent on agriculture activity. Many of those living in sparsely populated regions work in businesses that thrive on the income associated with agricultural sales.

If anything positive is to come from this drought, my hope is that Americans gain a renewed appreciation for all the different ways agricultural productivity touches everyone's lives every day.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 6233, the supplemental agriculture disaster assistance.

Look, weather impacts our lives. I'm going to talk a little bit about climate change and some of the driving factors that are causing more severe weather conditions, be they droughts or floods. Yes, they affect businesses, but the solution is not another Republican Big Government government bailout of yet another industry. The Republicans have bailed out Wall Street. The Republicans have bailed out the banks. Now the Republicans are seeking to bail out cows. Yes, Mr. Speaker, another Big Government solution to another problem, in part, of their own creation by refusing to take up action and reducing our carbon emissions for climate change.

Where does this all end, when it's too cloudy? The solar industry might suffer. Are we going to bail them out? When it's not windy enough, the wind industry might suffer. Are we going to bail them out? We have restaurants on Pearl Street Mall in Boulder that have rooftop lounges. When it's too hot, less people go up to the rooftop lounges. We've had a drought in May and June and not enough people went to rooftop lounges. I would like to ask my colleague, Ms. FOXX, if there could be government bailout money for those rooftop lounges.

I yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. I'm sorry. I don't understand the analogy that you're making.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, there's just a particular sector. Maybe they have a lot of lobbyists. Maybe they're a big special interest, they own cows. We're going to bail them out because the price of hay has gone up. That's what we're talking about here today.

We're talking about a closed rule. We're talking about a closed process. This is nothing new, this lack of transparency, this limited debate, pushing through a Big Government Republican bailout on short notice without even giving Members enough time to offer improvements to the bill, to change the bill. The first time that Republicans and Democrats even saw this bill was late Tuesday night, and here we are on the floor of the House without a single hearing, without a single markup, pushing through this bill, shutting out opportunities for Democrats or Republicans to offer improvements to this bill.

This is one of the worst and widest droughts we've seen in decades. I see that firsthand in Colorado. We have had devastating fires this summer coupled with extreme heat in the West. This is indicative of a need to address the true culprit: climate change. The evidence that recent droughts and heat waves are linked to climate change is growing suddenly and represents the strong scientific consensus.

We need the very conservation programs in the farm bill that are being gutted for this Big Government bailout of cows. The very programs cut by this bill are needed to help farmers and ranchers conserve soil, conserve water to make their farms and ranches more resilient to the devastating impacts we see from climate change and to mitigate that impact.

Look, American farmers, ranchers, and environmentalists have all been waiting for months to see a farm bill come to the floor. To the disappointment of many, instead of a farm bill, which I understand for at least 5 weeks we're not going to see in the House of Representatives, we're presented with a cow bailout, which is yet another Republican Big Government bailout of an American industry.

When the Senate passed their farm bill over a month ago, the House majority couldn't even manage to bring a package to the floor for Members to debate. Earlier this week, the Republicans were looking at a 1-year extension of the farm bill and have now decided to pull that 1-year extension in favor of a cow bailout.

Let me once again stress that our severe concerns around droughts in the West and across the country are critical, but we mustn't gut programs that are some of the very programs that can help prevent the impact of droughts in seeking to bail out a particular industry. When we look at drought assistance funding, we need to have a bipartisan discussion about how we're going to structure it and where it's going to come from and why certain industries are going to be favored over others.

Why is there going to be a cow bailout instead of a rooftop terrace bailout? When it's too hot, businesses suffer. If you're going to have a big Republican bailout, why don't you discuss who it goes to and not just give it to who has the most lobbyists here or who gives the most campaign contributions.

Furthermore, the conservation provisions that are cut by this bill do have strong bipartisan support in both Chambers. Both the Senate and the House Agriculture Committees understand the importance of the farm bill's conservation title. Both farm bills retain funding for the conservation title because many folks on both sides of the aisle agree that conservation practices are critical to protect our soil, the future production of our agriculture, water, and wildlife resources. That's yet another reason to consider a comprehensive bill, to help ensure the strength of agriculture and protect American jobs, rather than another Republican bailout.

Instead of voting on the underlying bill, instead of even talking about a 5-year extension of the agriculture bill, here we are today gutting critical programs with bipartisan support to bail out yet another industry with a centrally planned Big Government solution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, again, we all grieve for the people in this country who are willing to farm, who are willing to deal with the vicissitudes of mother nature and do their best to provide food and other products for the American people and people all around the world.

We obviously don't have a lot of control over the weather. We have no control over the weather. We have no control over the climate, basically, but we need to respond to our fellow human beings, our fellow Americans when there is a need to do that.

The drought would not be as exacerbated and the effects would not be so exacerbated were it not for the overall job climate in this country. We are really suffering from the effects of our colleagues having been in charge of the Congress for 4 years and an administration that is totally out of touch with what is happening, not only in this country, but around the world, in terms of our economic situation. We have record unemployment in this country, Mr. Speaker. We have record deficits. We have record debts. It seems like everybody recognizes that except for our liberal colleagues across the aisle.

We know there's something wrong with the American job climate in this country. Whereas most people recognize the government should not wall off entrepreneurship with oppressive taxes, a costly, overcomplicated, and unnecessarily burdensome regulatory apparatus, we have a liberal President who is so out of touch that he said:

If you've got a business, you didn't build that. Somebody else made that happen.

It would be bad enough if that were the first Freudian slip from liberal leaders here in Washington, but this comes on the heels of both President Obama and Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID decreeing on separate occasions that the private sector is doing

just fine. Apparently, the two highest ranking Democrats in the country are trying to convince themselves of an alternative reality where unemployment would no longer be a problem if only more Americans worked for the government. Fortunately, we still have a lot of Americans working out there trying to produce food for all of us.

□ 1050

I recognize there are many government workers, teachers, police officers, firefighters, who provide critical services to this country. But to suggest that the unemployment problem in this country can be solved by continuing an unending, demonstrably failed liberal spending spree ignores the reality that it's the private sector that generates the wealth which provides revenue for government to work through an increasing seizure of personal earnings, as was displayed on the floor yesterday.

Liberal elites would have us all believe that the only way to promote job growth is through a perpetual expansion of special handouts and concessions to government employee unions and politically favored industries.

Less we forget that a centrally planned government-sponsored green jobs revolution was the only solution for unemployment worries during the height of the recent recession, I want to remind my colleague of the Solyndra loans and the many loans in that area that were made that have created crony capitalism in our country. The liberal Democrats promised to solve these problems by ramming through a \$1 trillion stimulus bill, financed exclusively by our posterity through deficit spending and quickly shifted their focus on other crises vulnerable to exploitation, such as a new \$800 billion energy tax that sought to crush millions of jobs while sending hundreds of billions overseas as well as the now-infamous government takeover of health care, otherwise known as ObamaCare.

We're actually fortunate for these striking statements which reveal a peek into the mystifying mindset of liberal elites who apparently believe that government dependence is a necessary condition for economic health.

Well, here's a news flash for the liberals who remain stubbornly unaware of the hardships that continue to grip Americans: the results are in, and everyone else knows that Big Government cannot simply prescribe economic prosperity and have it be so.

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

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

I listened very carefully to the gentelady from North Carolina. I didn't hear her defend this bovine bailout that the Republicans are proposing here today. Now, I'm going to take a few minutes and address some of the mischaracterizations of the President of the United States that were in some

of those comments, but then I do want to bring it back to this Big Government bovine bailout that the Republicans are proposing here before us today.

Look, the President understands and I understand, as somebody who started several businesses before I got here—I created several hundred jobs—that of course I didn't do it alone. If we didn't have roads so that employees could get to work, I wouldn't have been able to start a company. I wouldn't have been able to have any employees to get to work. If we didn't have schools that help prepare programmers and technicians to work technology companies—tech companies that I started that hired programmers, that were good-paying jobs—I wouldn't have been able to start a company. If we didn't have investors and shareholders and the right level of securities regulation to prevent fraud and to give them the confidence to invest in the companies that I started, we wouldn't have capital formation and venture capital flowing to the companies that needed it.

If we didn't have the rule of law, if we didn't fund our courts, if we didn't invest in basic research, if the government hadn't provided the funding to start the Internet, I wouldn't have been able to start a single company.

And most of my friends who are entrepreneurs, who have started companies, who are corporate executives agree. Yes, the entrepreneur is critical. And the President's Jobs Council recognizes that, and this President has been more friendly to entrepreneurship and to business than any President in my lifetime, working to ensure that small businesses have the opportunity to succeed and grow and create jobs in the private sector.

But without that basic infrastructure, we have to ask ourselves what separates the United States of America from a country like Somalia or even a centrally planned country like North Korea. A lot separates us. But a big part of that is this collaboration of a public sector role that enables entrepreneurship, enables success in the private sector, enables people to create fortunes, enables people to create jobs. That's the proper role of government.

Government doesn't stand in the way of job creation. The government's policy framework, courts people can trust, roads for people to get to work, good public schools, good health care—that's what enables success. As somebody who reached some degree of success in the private sector before I got here, I agree completely with President Obama that I couldn't have achieved that degree of success without the public infrastructure that played a role in allowing me and so many other entrepreneurs to succeed.

Now, moving back to the topic, the topic of the bovine bailout that the Republicans have proposed here today. The gentelady from North Carolina said, We have no control over climate,

basically. That was the quote that she just said. Well, the vast majority of scientific consensus and agreement would indicate otherwise.

We don't control weather. But climate is different than weather. And, yes, humans are contributing to climate change through carbon emissions and emissions of other greenhouse gases. The global climate has warmed. The average climate in Colorado now is two to three degrees warmer than it was a century ago, and it continues to accelerate. Now, that doesn't cause a drought or a flood in any one particular year, but it causes an increased incidence of severe weather patterns that cost us all money, which is why we're even talking about a bovine bailout here today.

Now, look, I wish this had come to the floor under an open process. I would have offered an amendment just to talk about it to say, why don't you bail out rooftop restaurants, rooftop terraces?

Look, we're talking about the role of the government, the role of the private sector. I find it ironic and to the point of being bizarre—almost like I'm in an alternative universe—that in the very same remarks that the gentelady from North Carolina railed against a President who dares to say that the public sector has a role in creating the landscape for private businesses to succeed, at the same time, she is advocating for a bovine bailout of a particular industry.

Now why this particular industry? Why not rooftop terraces? Why not solar, if it's too cloudy? Why not wind, if it's not windy enough? Many, many, many businesses are affected by weather. Retail stores are affected when it snows too much. Should they be coming to Washington, clamoring for a bailout?

Look, both sides respect the role of the private sector. And when you have government preempting the private sector by picking out a particular industry and elevating it above all others, by giving it government subsidies and a big bailout, you are upsetting the very market forces that the gentelady from North Carolina espoused support of in another context.

This bill today gives us a terrible choice between drought assistance and conservation. Now, both might be worthy; but disproportionate cuts to conservation programs that are used to fund this bill undermine the continued success of conservation programs that have bipartisan support and are helping farmers mitigate the impact of climate change in their businesses.

There are so many other issues of relevance for farmers that this House could be taking up. Why aren't we talking about the estate tax, which affects small farmers across this country? If we don't act by December 31, the estate tax will go to a 55 percent tax above \$1 million in assets, forcing many small farmers out of business and preventing them from being passed down from one generation to the next.

Are we going to leave it until the last minute? Is that a plan for the lame duck session? Are the Republicans scared to take on the estate tax before the election?

I would advocate that we get down to work and start addressing issues that actually affect farmers. We should be voting to provide for the success of American agriculture, opening new markets, investing in basic research, helping to ensure that families have access to healthy food and nutrition.

We need to make sure that farmers' and ranchers' needs are addressed. And if we don't address the fundamental drivers of climate change, we're only going to be faced with more and more difficulties, more and more requests for bailouts. It may be cows this time. It may be chickens next time. It may be corn the next time. There are always going to be folks here in Washington, hat in hand, coming to Republicans, saying, Give us a Big Government solution.

And the question will come to this Congress, Are we going to do something about the underlying problem? And whether that approach is through a cap-and-trade system or a carbon tax or incentives for renewables, what are we going to do to prevent farmers in this country from being driven out of business? This bill does nothing.

Sure, you can hand them government money. You can hand them taxpayer money, if that's the lack of regard that you have for taxpayer money, you want to hand it out to whoever comes to town and begs for it. Go right ahead. And I have some rooftop terrace restaurant owners in my district. Give them some while you are at it.

□ 1100

That's not a solution. That's what got us into this budget deficit. That's what got us into this hole. Let's address the underlying issue of climate change in a scientific manner, have the real political discussions that are necessary to negotiate a bipartisan solution that reduces our carbon emissions, reduces the impact of climate change on American farmers, reduces the incidence and severity of droughts across the United States of America, and also be the global leaders that we need to be on this critical issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of my colleague if he has any more speakers or if he is ready to close.

Mr. POLIS. I am the only remaining speaker, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I will close after the gentleman closes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order an amendment which proposes that Congress will not adjourn until the President signs middle class tax cuts into law.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD along with ex-

traneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. This will give us the opportunity to renew middle class tax cuts. When we talk about job creation, when we talk about growing our economy, the need to make sure that we don't increase taxes on the middle class during a recess is something economists from both sides of the aisle agree on, something Democrats agree on. I hope Republicans agree, too, that we shouldn't raise taxes on at least 98 percent of Americans.

Then let's have the discussion about the other 2 percent. But let's agree on what we agree on. Let's not raise taxes on 98 percent of American families before Congress goes on break. Before the Republicans send us all home to enjoy our summers, let's do something about jobs. Let's do something about the economy, and let's demand that we give middle class families across America the surety and the security to know that they're not going to need to pay an additional \$1,000 a year in taxes, an additional \$2,000 a year in taxes.

I think it is critical, and I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so that we can bring forward this critical amendment to provide the certainty that America needs to grow our economy and create jobs.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleague across the aisle, I don't understand why our friends can't take yes for an answer. We want to extend the tax cuts that were begun over 10 years ago to everyone in this country. We agree with that, and that's what we're doing. We don't want to raise taxes on anyone.

I would also like to commend to my colleague across the aisle, who represents a group of people who only ask for bipartisan cooperation when they're in the minority, a book by Australian geologist Ian Plimer who wrote a book called "Heaven and Earth," which I think really does do a scientific presentation of what is happening in terms of climate change.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that my colleague is trying to deal with a chicken and egg issue relative to infrastructure and how does infrastructure get funded. He wants to say that this all comes from the benevolent government, but he conveniently leaves out the fact that the government doesn't create wealth. All our government does is spend wealth, and in many cases waste the fruits of hardworking Americans by doing things often very inefficiently. Public infrastructure is funded by the taxes that we take away from hardworking Americans.

Entrepreneurs predated the government in our country. And we all know that the Constitution was written to try to establish a limited government in our country so that the entrepreneurial spirit could thrive, as it has in most cases. My colleague talks about the government enabling entrepreneurs. Excuse me, I don't believe the government does a lot to enable the private sector. What most people in the private sector will tell you is just get the government out of my way. Get the foot of the government off my neck, and I will do just fine.

I know my colleague has been in the private sector and created a lot of wealth for himself, and I applaud him for doing that. But most of the people that I know, Mr. Speaker, who are in the private sector would simply say the government isn't enabling me at all. Leave me alone, and I'll do just fine.

Mr. Speaker, talk about taking the President's words out of context, as I think my colleague knows, when you put the President's words in context, they are even more disturbing than outside of context. I do believe that our President does believe that the government is the solution, and most of us think the government is the problem. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 752 OFFERED BY  
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 746) prohibiting the consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment or adjournment sine die unless a law is enacted to provide for the extension of certain expired or expiring tax provisions that apply to middle-income taxpayers if called up by Representative Slaughter of New York or her designee. All points of order against the resolution and against its consideration are waived. (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. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 182, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

YEAS—236

Adams	Amodei	Barletta
Aderholt	Austria	Bartlett
Alexander	Bachmann	Barton (TX)
Amash	Bachus	Bass (NH)

Benishek	Hanna
Berg	Harper
Biggert	Harris
Bilbray	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Hayworth
Blackburn	Heck
Bonner	Hensarling
Bono Mack	Herger
Boustany	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp
Brooks	Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren
Buchanan	Hunter
Bucshon	Hurt
Buerkle	Issa
Burgess	Jenkins
Calvert	Johnson (IL)
Camp	Johnson (OH)
Campbell	Johnson, Sam
Canseco	Jones
Cantor	Jordan
Capito	Kelly
Carter	King (IA)
Cassidy	King (NY)
Chabot	Kingston
Chaffetz	Kinzinger (IL)
Coble	Kline
Coffman (CO)	Labrador
Cole	Lamborn
Conaway	Lance
Cravaack	Landry
Crawford	Lankford
Crenshaw	Latham
Culberson	LaTourrette
Denham	Latta
Dent	Lewis (CA)
DesJarlais	LoBiondo
Diaz-Balart	Long
Dold	Lucas
Dreier	Luetkemeyer
Duffy	Lummis
Duncan (SC)	Lungren, Daniel
Duncan (TN)	E.
Ellmers	Mack
Emerson	Manzullo
Farenthold	Marchant
Fincher	Marino
Fitzpatrick	Matheson
Flake	McCarthy (CA)
Fleming	McCaul
Flores	McClintock
Forbes	McHenry
Fortenberry	McIntyre
Fox	McKeon
Franks (AZ)	McKinley
Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Gallely	Rodgers
Gardner	Meehan
Garrett	Mica
Gerlach	Miller (FL)
Gibbs	Miller (MI)
Gibson	Miller, Gary
Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)
Goodlatte	Myrick
Gosar	Neugebauer
Gowdy	Noem
Granger	Nugent
Graves (GA)	Nunes
Griffin (AR)	Nunnelee
Griffith (VA)	Olson
Grimm	Palazzo
Guinta	Paul
Guthrie	Paulsen
Hall	Pearce

NAYS—182

Ackerman	Capps
Altmire	Capuano
Andrews	Carnahan
Baca	Carney
Baldwin	Carson (IN)
Barber	Castor (FL)
Barrow	Chandler
Bass (CA)	Chu
Becerra	Cicilline
Berkley	Clarke (MI)
Berman	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Clay
Bishop (NY)	Cleaver
Blumenauer	Clyburn
Bonamici	Connolly (VA)
Boren	Conyers
Boswell	Cooper
Brady (PA)	Costa
Braley (IA)	Courtney
Brown (FL)	Critz
Butterfield	Crowley

Pence	Fudge
Petri	Garamendi
Pitts	Gonzalez
Platts	Green, Al
Poe (TX)	Green, Gene
Pompeo	Grijalva
Posey	Gutierrez
Price (GA)	Hahn
Quayle	Hanabusa
Reed	Hastings (FL)
Rehberg	Heinrich
Reichert	Higgins
Renacci	Himes
Ribble	Hinchee
Rigell	Hinojosa
Rivera	Hirono
Roby	Hochul
Roe (TN)	Holden
Rogers (AL)	Holt
Rogers (KY)	Honda
Rogers (MI)	Hoyer
Rohrabacher	Israel
Rokita	Johnson, E. B.
Rooney	Kaptur
Ros-Lehtinen	Keating
Roskam	Kildee
Ross (FL)	Kind
Royce	Kissell
Runyan	Kucinich
Ryan (WI)	Langevin
Scalise	Larsen (WA)
Schilling	Larson (CT)
Schmidt	Lee (CA)
Schock	Levin
Schweikert	Lewis (GA)
Scott (SC)	Lipinski
Scott, Austin	Loeb sack
Sensenbrenner	Lofgren, Zoe
Sessions	Lowe y
Shimkus	Lujan
Shuler	Lynch
Shuster	
Simpson	
Smith (NE)	
Smith (NJ)	
Smith (TX)	
Southerland	
Stearns	
Stivers	
Stutzman	
Sullivan	
Terry	
Thompson (PA)	
Thornberry	
Tiberi	
Tipton	
Turner (NY)	
Turner (OH)	
Upton	
Walberg	
Walden	
Walsh (IL)	
Webster	
West	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Wolf	
Womack	
Woodall	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	
Young (IN)	

Maloney	Ryan (OH)
Markey	Sánchez, Linda
Matsui	T.
McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
McCollum	Sarbanes
McDermott	Schakowsky
McGovern	Schiff
McNerney	Schrader
Meeks	Schwartz
Michaud	Scott (VA)
Miller (NC)	Scott, David
Miller, George	Serrano
Moore	Sewell
Moran	Sherman
Murphy (CT)	Sires
Nadler	Slaughter
Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Neal	Speier
Oliver	Stark
Owens	Sutton
Pallone	Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)	Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi	Pelosi
Perlmutter	Perlmutter
Tonko	Kildee
Towns	Peters
Tsongas	Peterson
Van Hollen	Pingree (ME)
Velázquez	Polis
Visclosky	Price (NC)
Walz (MN)	Quigley
Wasserman	Larsen (WA)
Schultz	Rahall
Waters	Rangel
Watt	Reyes
Waxman	Richardson
Welch	Richmond
Wilson (FL)	Ross (AR)
Yarmuth	Rothman (NJ)
	Roybal-Allard
	Ruppersberger
	Rush

NOT VOTING—12

Akin	Costello	Jackson Lee
Black	Fleischmann	(TX)
Burton (IN)	Graves (MO)	Johnson (GA)
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Yoder
Cohen		

□ 1132

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, noes 181, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—235

Adams	Bilirakis	Canseco
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Cantor
Alexander	Blackburn	Capito
Amash	Bonner	Carter
Amodei	Bono Mack	Cassidy
Austria	Boustany	Chabot
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Chaffetz
Bachus	Brooks	Coble
Bartlett	Broun (GA)	Coffman (CO)
Barton (TX)	Buchanan	Cole
Bass (NH)	Bucshon	Conaway
Benishek	Buerkle	Cravaack
Berg	Burgess	Crawford
Biggert	Calvert	Crenshaw
Bilbray	Camp	Culberson
	Campbell	Denham

Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
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 (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan

NOES—181

Ackerman  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barber  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Bralley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn

Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
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

Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez  
Loggren, Zoe  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez

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  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters

NOT VOTING—14

Akin  
Black  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Cardoza

Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richardson  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano

Sewell  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth

Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Kissell  
Yoder

□ 1140

Mr. MCINTYRE changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AUTHORIZING THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL TO ESTABLISH BATTERY RECHARGING STATIONS UNDER JURISDICTION OF SENATE**

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (S. 739) to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to establish battery recharging stations for privately owned vehicles in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Senate at no net cost to the Federal Government, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 739

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. BATTERY RECHARGING STATIONS FOR PRIVATELY OWNED VEHICLES IN PARKING AREAS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE SENATE AT NO NET COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**

(a) DEFINITION.—In this Act, the term “covered employee” means—

(1) an employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate; or

(2) any other individual who is authorized to park in any parking area under the jurisdiction of the Senate on Capitol Grounds.

(b) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), funds appropriated to the Architect of the

Capitol under the heading “CAPITOL POWER PLANT” under the heading “ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL” in any fiscal year are available to construct, operate, and maintain on a reimbursable basis battery recharging stations in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Senate on Capitol Grounds for use by privately owned vehicles used by Senators or covered employees.

(2) VENDORS AUTHORIZED.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Architect of the Capitol may use 1 or more vendors on a commission basis.

(3) APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION.—The Architect of the Capitol may construct or direct the construction of battery recharging stations described under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the numbers and locations of the battery recharging stations to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(c) FEES AND CHARGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Architect of the Capitol shall charge fees or charges for electricity provided to Senators and covered employees sufficient to cover the costs to the Architect of the Capitol to carry out this section, including costs to any vendors or other costs associated with maintaining the battery recharging stations.

(2) APPROVAL OF FEES OR CHARGES.—The Architect of the Capitol may establish and adjust fees or charges under paragraph (1) after—

(A) submission of written notice detailing the amount of the fee or charge to be established or adjusted to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate; and

(B) approval by that Committee.

(d) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES, CHARGES, AND COMMISSIONS.—Any fees, charges, or commissions collected by the Architect of the Capitol under this section shall be—

(1) deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriations account described under subsection (b); and

(2) available for obligation without further appropriation during—

(A) the fiscal year collected; and

(B) the fiscal year following the fiscal year collected.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report on the financial administration and cost recovery of activities under this section with respect to that fiscal year to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(2) AVOIDING SUBSIDY.—

(A) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a report to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate determining whether Senators and covered employees using battery charging stations as authorized by this Act are receiving a subsidy from the taxpayers.

(B) MODIFICATION OF RATES AND FEES.—If a determination is made under subparagraph (A) that a subsidy is being received, the Architect of the Capitol shall submit a plan to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate on how to update the program to ensure no subsidy is being received. If the committee does not act on the plan within 60 days, the Architect of the Capitol shall take appropriate steps to increase rates or fees to ensure reimbursement for the cost of the program consistent with an appropriate schedule for amortization, to be charged to those using the charging stations.