

in southern California. My thoughts and prayers are with all those who were seriously injured and face months or years of recovery.

The miracle of Flight 214 is that 305 passengers and crew survived this horrific tragedy. That is due, in no small part, to the many heroes of that day: crew, fellow passengers, valiant first responders, SFO staff, everyone who evacuated the plane, even when fire was burning in the fuselage; the crew-member who carried a young passenger off the plane on her back because he was too frightened to escape; the firefighters and San Francisco Police Officer Jim Cunningham, who was wearing no protective gear, who entered the plane and helped four passengers escape, including one who was trapped. It was nothing short of heroic and remarkable.

Plane travel is safer than it ever has been, but this crash is a reminder that we need never stop the focus on safety. Thankfully, the National Transportation Safety Board, under the leadership of Chairman Deborah Hersman, is there to fully investigate and determine exactly what happened.

Mr. Speaker, this was a horrible tragedy, but we have much to be thankful for.

THE NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon this body to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Moments ago, I was at a mock graduation of hundreds of Dreamers. These are young, de facto Americans, Americans who are as American as you or I, grew up, played on the sports team, were cheerleaders, in some cases valedictorians in their high schools, and yet they lack the paperwork to prove that they are Americans.

They are as American in their hearts as any of us and have so much to give to the great country in which they grew up. And yet they are prevented from doing so by the failure of this body to act.

I applaud President Obama's deferred action program, at least a temporary solution to allow these young de facto Americans to have the paperwork they need to get a job or get a driver's license. But there's no certainty there.

What becomes of them in 2 years, in 4 years?

How do they know that the time that they spend investing and earning a college degree will be able to pay off with a good job down the road?

It's time for this body to take up action on the Senate bill or pass a comprehensive House bill. We have a unique window of opportunity to do something very important for our economy, creating jobs for Americans, important for our national security,

and important for the future of our country.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 9, 2013 at 10:50 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 793.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2609, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 288 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 288

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. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, 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.

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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

Mr. BURGESS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. House Resolution 288 provides for an open rule for consideration of H.R. 2609, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for fiscal year 2014.

This rule contains the tradition reinstated by the Republican majority in the last Congress that appropriations bills should come to the floor in a manner that allows every Member of the House, both Republican and Democrat, to amend those bills and to have their voices heard.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill, making appropriations for the Department of Energy and the United States Corps of Engineers. The bill provides for \$30.4 billion for these agencies, which is \$2.9 billion below fiscal year '13 enacted and \$4.1 billion below the President's request, at a time of fiscal constraint, when government, like our constituents, must make tough choices on where to smartly spend the money the American taxpayers have trusted it to oversee.

The bill provides critical funding for our energy needs, making \$450 million available for advanced coal, natural gas, oil and fossil fuel technologies. Moreover, the bill provides \$5.5 billion for environmental cleanup activities, funds to safely clean sites contaminated by nuclear weapons production.

The underlying bill before us has been carefully crafted by the Appropriations Committee under the leadership of Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, Subcommittee Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and Subcommittee Ranking Member KAPTUR.

Funding for energy programs is cut by \$1.4 billion, while simultaneously prioritizing funds to advance our goal of an all-of-the-above solution to energy independence.

Further, the House continues its commitment to achieve a long-term storage facility for nuclear waste, providing support activities in support of the opening of Yucca Mountain, a solution long overdue.

The House energy and water bill furthers this majority's commitment to spending taxpayer money wisely, cutting waste and inefficiencies wherever they may be.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill, H.R. 2609, the fiscal year 2014 Energy and Water Appropriations Act.

Having this bill on the floor this week is another example of how we, as a body, our Congress, has its priorities wrong. It's why Congress has an approval rating of 12 percent.

Rather than fixing our broken immigration system and replacing it with one that works for our country, rather than doing something about the fact that student loan rates just doubled for students that are incurring new loans, here we are sacrificing our renewable energy future while simultaneously increasing spending for new and unneeded nuclear weapons far above even the sequestration level of funding.

□ 1230

It's no wonder this institution has the disapproval rating that it does.

This legislation is fundamentally flawed. It underfunds programs that not only grow our Nation's clean energy sources but also create jobs, promote emerging technologies, and maintain critical infrastructure. Yet, while making these cuts, it increases weapons activities by \$97.7 million above the 2013 enacted levels. Here we have a bill that prioritizes unnecessary weapons and defense programs at the expense of our Nation's innovation and international competitiveness.

The underlying bill slashes program funding for a valuable program called the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, or ARPA-E. Yesterday, in our Rules Committee, both the ranking member and the subcommittee chair agreed that they were fans of this critical program; yet it cuts funding by \$215 million below last year's funding level. ARPA-E was modeled after DARPA, the Department of Defense's Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, which has led to so many great, innovative technologies that improve our security as a country. In its few short years of existence, ARPA-E has funded 285 projects in 33 States that promise to transform the energy future for our country.

ARPA-E's rigorous program design and competitive project selection process show that our taxpayer dollars are being used wisely, and the program has paid off. Since 2009, at least 17 ARPA-E programs have leveraged the government's small initial investment of approximately \$70 million into what is typically \$500,000, \$1 million, or up to \$2 million in private sector capital.

I was a founder of several startup companies before I came to Congress, and I understand the value of risk-taking and the role the government has in promoting innovation in basic technology. I represent a district with two major research universities that re-

ceive a combined Federal research investment of about \$700 million. Many of these basic technologies which we as a country invest in lead to the jobs and the companies and the consumer technologies of the future. And what could be more critical than putting our Nation on a path to sustainable energy development?

Just this last February, I met with an ARPA-E project team from my district. Within the first year of receiving ARPA-E funding, this University of Colorado project team has demonstrated important energy yield improvements and cost-reducing potential in solar photovoltaic power systems. That's an example of an ARPA-E project that will help boost our economic well-being as a country and lead to our energy independence and national security far more than a few more unneeded nuclear missiles.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that this program is essential to protecting our energy future; and that's why this program, ARPA-E, has been lauded by Democrats and Republicans alike, as it was in our Rules Committee yesterday evening.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also disproportionately cuts from science and clean energy programs while bolstering wasteful spending for fossil fuel subsidies, continuing to have our country subsidize oil and gas, to subsidizing nuclear weapons, while making cuts in our energy future. By maintaining these fossil fuel subsidies while cutting clean energy research, we're prioritizing fossil fuels over innovative technologies that actually hold the key to our clean, sustainable energy independence.

While I appreciate that this bill has some decreases to the amount of Federal subsidies going to the fossil fuel accounts compared to last year—and I think it's high time that we end these subsidies to one of America's most profitable industries—the report language from the committee seems to be searching for a reason to spend our precious taxpayer dollars at a time of sequestration and at a time of deficits. How can we spend more on fossil fuels when we should be spending less?

In addition, this bill needlessly increases the funding for weapons activities and defense programs at a time when we're winding down our involvement in two wars that have been very costly in lives and dollars in this last decade. That's why I'm offering an amendment with Representative QUIGLEY that would reduce the B61 Life Extension Program back to the agency's request level, which would save \$23.7 million in taxpayer dollars and reduce the deficit. This bill actually increases funding by over \$20 million for these ongoing missile programs in an era where Americans should expect our government to be more transparent about how this money is invested.

While some of these missiles represent a strategic commitment we have to our NATO allies, there have been

growing concerns raised by the Air Force's own Blue Ribbon Review Panel about the effectiveness and security vulnerabilities of the B61. That's why the price for this program has continued to rise dramatically and confidence in the missile program has dropped. In fact, some of our NATO allies, like Germany, have actually called for the B61s to be removed from their borders.

Again, given our fiscal constraints, it's a time of choices. It's not to have it all, but I think we need to ensure that taxpayer money is not wasted on programs that fail to sufficiently protect our national security and that in fact some of our allies don't even support.

Another unneeded increase in this funding bill, throwing more government money after more government money, is for the W76 Life Extension Program. The current bill requests \$248 million—\$13 million more than the administration requested—because of a fear of a lack of nuclear deterrence capability if we reduce our stockpile below the levels required in the New START Treaty. To put that in perspective, the START Treaty requires us to have no more than 1,550 nuclear weapons. Isn't that enough, Mr. Speaker? How many times can we completely obliterate not only our enemies but the entire world with 1,500 weapons?

Even this lower stockpile of nuclear weapons is, frankly, a relic of our foreign policy during the Cold War and can be drastically reduced. Unfortunately, this bill increased it. In fact, the Arms Control Association identified over \$39 billion in savings to the taxpayer if it reduced our nuclear weapons stockpile to 1,000 nuclear weapons—more than enough to deter any threat to the United States, more than enough to obliterate humanity from the planet. We can save \$39 billion by going down to 1,000 nuclear weapons.

These are some of the many reasons why I oppose the underlying bill. I'm very supportive of this rule coming forward from our committee that will allow for a full and open debate. I hope that many of these ideas that I have presented, as well as other ideas from Members on both sides of the aisle, will prevail so the end work product of this House is something that Democrats and Republicans can join together in supporting—something that no longer sacrifices our renewable energy future for yet more and more nuclear weapons today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I do feel obligated to point out that the object under discussion currently is the rule that will allow us to debate the energy and water appropriations bill. The rule is an open rule. If the gentleman has disagreements with the language in the underlying bill, it's an open rule. He's free to bring those amendments to the floor, have a full and fair debate, both sides, one opposed, one in support; and the will of

the House will prevail. That is the way it should be under an open rule.

Let me just state that I have, for the record, amendments that I will be placing before the House. I hope they're accepted, but I will accept the underlying bill even in the absence of those amendments. And I hope the gentleman from Colorado will approach it in a similar spirit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I was going to comment to the gentleman that the committee work product, the bill before us, is a highly flawed bill. I certainly hope that the open process and the will of the House will significantly alter and improve upon this bill. We will find that out in the days ahead.

It is my honor, Mr. Speaker, to yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California, a former colleague on the Rules Committee (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my district of Sacramento is one of the leading clean energy economies in the country. The sharp cuts to clean energy initiatives in this bill are deeply troubling. It will no doubt hurt American innovation and American jobs, particularly as other nations continue to invest in clean energy technologies. It is also not reflective of an all-of-the-above energy strategy that our Nation desperately needs.

At the same time, this bill addresses some of the important flood protection priorities for my district. Sacramento is the most at-risk metropolitan area for major flooding, as it lies at the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers. We have a great deal at risk. As the home of the State capital and half a million people, a major flood event in Sacramento would have economic damages of up to \$40 billion.

I am pleased that this bill includes nearly \$70 million in funding for Sacramento's flood protection priorities, including more than \$66 million to continue construction on the Folsom Dam Joint Federal Project. In addition, this bill includes report language, which I requested, expressing concern with the Corps' current levee vegetation policy. Sacramento is ground zero for the impact of the Corps' vegetation policy. Instead of a one-size-fits-all solution, the Corps should consider regional variances and local input, as called for under bipartisan legislation I introduced in H.R. 399, the Levee Vegetation Review Act.

The bill also includes report language that I also requested expressing concern with the Corps' decision to end its section 104 crediting policy, which has halted flood protection projects from moving forward, particularly one in west Sacramento.

Mr. Speaker, moving forward, we must also be cognizant that there are other much-needed public safety projects that remain unfunded and unbuilt due to a lack of a WRDA bill. We urgently need to improve America's

crumbling levee infrastructure. In Sacramento, my constituents have taxed themselves twice and \$350 million of construction work is well under way for the Natomas Levee Improvement Project, all while awaiting congressional authorization for over 2 years after receiving a chief's report from the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, on May 15 the Senate passed a robust WRDA bill with clear bipartisan support of 83-14. It is my sincere hope that the House will soon follow suit. We cannot wait until the next disaster takes lives and wrecks our economy. This is a bipartisan issue that must be addressed immediately in Congress.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to respond to something that was said in the initial opening by the minority. The student loan bill passed this House over a month ago. It has been sitting in the Senate for the entire month of June. The problem with student loans could have been addressed by the other body. It could have been addressed prior to the July 1 deadline, which was a deadline, after all, that the Democrats had set when they were in the majority.

So to say that the House has not done its work is in fact not correct. The House has done its work. We await the other body to act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

To further address the student loan issue, this body did pass a bill to prevent the increase in the student loan rates that just occurred. However, that bill—a very similar bill—failed in the Senate. So the Kline bill failed in the Senate. So, too, a Democratic bill to provide a 2-year extension of the student loan rates also failed in the Senate.

So at this point, the victims of all this are students in our country who are going back to school and will be forced to borrow at twice the rate—6.8 percent—if Congress can't get its act together. And that's why if we defeat the previous question, I'll offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 2574, the Keeping Student Loans Affordable Act, sponsored by Representative GEORGE MILLER, Representative RUBÉN HINOJOSA, myself, and several others, which would undue the recent doubling of student loan interest rates.

It's that simple. While we work towards a market-oriented solution along the parameters President Obama has spelled out, making sure we have the protections in place like caps for students everywhere, we need to at least make sure that students returning to school this fall are not borrowing at a rate twice the rate of last year.

To discuss this bill, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), my colleague on the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R.

2574, entitled Keeping Student Loans Affordable Act of 2013, legislation that would extend and fully pay for an additional year of the 3.4 percent interest rate on subsidized Federal direct Stafford loans.

Given that millions of students and families are struggling to afford the skyrocketing cost of a college education, it's shocking to me that this Congress allowed interest rates to double on July 1. I'm afraid that this Republican-majority Congress is making college more expensive for millions of students. With student debt surpassing \$3 trillion, another increase of \$1,000 of debt would be damaging to millions of student already struggling to afford basic expenses like rent and food.

□ 1245

The student loan debt crisis is crushing the dreams and aspirations of students and college graduates. High levels of debt are creating obstacles for young people who hope to start a family, purchase a home, and save for retirement. At this rate, they cannot accomplish those standard goals that every American should be able to achieve.

In my view, student loan debt sets our country backward, not forward. Without Congress' swift action, more than 7 million low- and moderate-income students working towards a college degree will have to pay an additional \$1,000 for each loan that they borrow.

The Keep Student Loans Affordable Act of 2013 will secure low interest rates for an additional year as Congress works on a long-term and sustainable approach for the Federal student loan program that works for both students and taxpayers.

Importantly, this bill will help ensure that college remains within reach for students who rely on Federal loans to pay for their education. In stark contrast, the GOP student loan plan is irresponsible and puts students in a yearly-adjustable student loan, which will result in great unpredictability and skyrocketing costs. What's more, the GOP bills add more debt onto students, even more than the doubling of the interest rates.

In a globally competitive economy, an education is clearly a necessity. This Congress should be helping students afford a college education, not saddling them with student loan debt.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is right and pass H.R. 2574 to reverse the student loan rate increase.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

Again, if I recall correctly, the bill that the gentleman from Texas just referenced has only Democratic sponsors. It is not a bipartisan bill.

The other body, completely controlled by Democrats in the majority, has within its power to pass a bill, conference with the Republican-passed bill

here in the House, and work out the problem. They have failed to do so.

The House has done its work. The House-passed bill was received in the Senate on the 3rd of June. It has been there for over a month. The other body certainly has within its power to act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Again, to respond to that, the bill that the House passed failed in the United States Senate. So, too, did a 2-year delay in keeping the student loan rates low; that has failed in the Senate. So we can simply say, oh, we're just not going to do anything and let student loan rates double, or we can take it upon ourselves in this body to try to find a new way. That's what the Democrats and Ranking Member MILLER have put forward, a way to say, look, we couldn't agree on 2 years, we couldn't agree on a long-term solution. Let's give us a 1-year window where the kids coming back to school in a month aren't going to be borrowing at twice the rate that they were last year.

We have the chief sponsor of the bill here to speak about it. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

As we debate this rule, it has now been a little over a week since interest rates on loans for millions of the neediest college students doubled thanks to Republican obstructionism. With that doubling, those who can afford it least will continue to be burdened under a mountain of debt with no end in sight. Because Congress has not acted in a responsible way, this rate increase will cost borrowers an additional \$1,000 per student per loan.

The doubling of interest rates did not have to happen. Rather than making it more affordable for students and families to pay for college, House Republicans decided to pass a bill that would make college more expensive.

The bill was dead on arrival in the Senate. It was dead on arrival in the Senate because it was worse for students than the doubling of the interest rates, and it left the students without an option other than the doubling of the interest rates. That's why we must act today. We must defeat the previous question so that we can deliberate this and get a solution until we can work on a long-term, bipartisan agreement on this one.

The Republican plan that passed the House was totally irresponsible. It was simply not a smart solution. It has been advertised by my friends on the other side as a long-term fix, but we all know the truth. The Republican bill adds more debt onto the students, even more than doubling the interest rates.

The Republican bill also puts students in a yearly-adjustable student loan, which will result in great unpredictability and soaring loan costs to the students and to their families. And the insistence from the GOP that the

students pay down the national debt is outrageous and offensive.

The student loan program is a program that the Federal Government makes \$50 billion off the back of the students, and the Republicans' response is that the students should pay higher interest rates so they can pay down the national deficit. The student loan program itself is paying down the national deficit because of the profit the Federal Government makes. It's time to stop that and make student loans affordable for students and for their families.

This Congress simply has not done right by students. They are forcing these students to continue to graduate with an increasing mountain of debt while, at the same time, they lament that students are graduating with increased debt.

That's what the Republicans offered. That's why, as my colleague from Colorado said, it was dead on arrival when it went to the Senate. It was dead on a bipartisan basis when it went to the Senate.

The time has come now to defeat the previous question so that we can bring the 1-year fix to make sure that students are protected from the doubling of the interest rate that is now occurring because of the inaction by the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, again, just a bit of a history lesson.

In 2007, Democratically-controlled House, Democratically-controlled Senate passed the student loan rates. They built into the law an expiration date of last July. Last July, a 1-year extension was passed. This year, the Republican House passed a responsible extension. The Senate, the other body, needs to do its work. When they do, we're here to talk.

I now wish to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the energy and water appropriation bill.

This, historically, has been one of the first appropriation bills brought to the floor. I'd like to inform the Members that, as is the practice of the Republicans in the majority, it's an open rule, and there are a number of amendments that will be made. It's my understanding that any individual who wishes to offer an amendment can come to the floor and do so.

The bill is coming in at \$30.4 billion, which is \$2.9 billion below fiscal 2013 enacted and \$4 billion below the President's request, so the Appropriations Committee is operating in compliance with the House budget that we passed several months ago.

This is a good rule. It's a good bill. I would hope that we can support the rule and obviously support the bill.

I would like to also add an editorial comment on the student loan rate issue.

Obviously, we want those interest rates to be as low as possible. But I would point out to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the House passed a bill; it's waiting to be brought up in the other body. They can bring it up tomorrow and vote it, send it to the President for his signature.

Apparently, the great sin in the House-passed bill appears to be that it moves towards an adjustable rate interest rate as opposed to a fixed rate that is below market rates. We would all like to have zero percent interest, obviously.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I'm told you have all kinds of time, so I will not yield, but I appreciate you wanting to ask me to.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I thank the gentleman. I just know that there have been less speakers on the other side, and I was hoping that we might be able to use some of the "all kinds of time" in a bipartisan way.

The gentleman from Texas was not accurate in saying that the House bill awaits action in the Senate. It had a vote in the Senate; it did not pass. So, too, a 2-year extension did not reach the cloture vote.

So, again, here we are. We can either start blaming each other—the folks on the other side of the building—or we can actually do something and get to work to keep student loan rates low for America's college students.

And of course Democrats are open to tying something into market-based rates; President Obama even proposed such. So, if that's what the gentleman wants to do, let's engage in a discussion about that. In the meantime, let's pass a 1-year extension so the rates don't double—which they already did 2 weeks ago—when the kids come back to school in the fall.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a leader on this issue and a colleague of mine on the Education and the Workforce Committee.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for the time.

A lot of American families are getting their financial aid notices for the new academic year. Much to their chagrin, they're opening these envelopes and finding out that the student loan that cost them 3.4 percent last year is going to cost them 6.8 percent starting this year. This is a huge problem for the millions of American families who borrow money to educate their children or themselves.

Now, what Congress has produced on this thus far is blame and finger-pointing. So here's what happened:

The Republican majority passed a bill on this floor that actually made the problem worse, that actually would cost more than just going up to the 6.8

percent by about \$4,000 per student over a 5-year period. They actually poured kerosine on the fire. They sent that bill over to the Senate. The Senate rejected the bill and didn't pass anything else.

Now, I regret all of that, but, ladies and gentlemen, we have two choices in front of us today. We can quit on the issue and quit on America's students, or we can try to do something about it. I think we should try to do something about it. Here's the something:

Mr. MILLER has a proposal that would keep the rates at 3.4 percent for 1 more year. It would pay for this and not add a dime to the deficit by closing a tax loophole that exists for fairly wealthy people. Our proposal is we should put that bill on the floor and take a vote on it. I hope that a majority of Members would vote "yes" to help American students in this way, but we're not even requiring that. We're simply saying that what we should do this afternoon on this floor is put that proposal up for a vote.

In a couple of minutes, we're going to take a vote on whether to take a vote on that question. Now, as is often the case around here, the rules are a little backward. Those who vote "no" on the next vote are voting in favor of bringing this up so that Congress can work its will. Those who vote "yes" are saying we should not do that.

The choice is clear: we either take a vote and try to fix this problem, or we quit on America's students and America's families. Let's do our job and take a vote on this bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from the other side as to whether or not they have additional speakers?

Mr. POLIS. We're not aware of any at this time. There might be one more coming, but if they're not here, I'm prepared to close.

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

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

Again, we wonder why this body has an approval rating of 12 percent. Instead of tackling issues that Americans want us to tackle—like finally fixing our broken immigration system, which, by the way, a bill received more than two-thirds support in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans. It's hard to get two-thirds of anybody to agree on anything, and yet 70 percent of Americans support comprehensive immigration reform, two-thirds of the United States Senate. Let's bring that bill up and pass it.

Student loans? Sure, we can cast blame on the Senate. We can cast blame on whomever we feel like. But the fact is American families are borrowing at 6.8 percent instead of 3.4 percent—now, this fall, student loans. So we can either just say, okay, it's not our fault, we passed something, let's go home, or we can actually try to reach a solution.

If we can defeat the previous question today, we can bring Representa-

tive MILLER's bill right to the floor to allow a 1-year window for Congress to work this out and keep the student loan rate at 3.4 percent and prevent our next generation of college kids from having their backs broken under the weight of high-interest student loans.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to this bill—again, not the bill that America wants us to be discussing; instead, a bill that cuts our renewable energy future, puts even more money into nuclear weapons—I can't support this committee report on the energy and water spending bill. I hope that through this process the will of the House changes this bill dramatically. If not, then we're simply making the wrong decisions for our energy future.

The bill slashes critical funding that would create jobs, grow our economy, lead to energy security, and increase our competitiveness. At the same time, the bill adds spending to increase our nuclear weapons stockpiles.

□ 1300

How can we expect to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists if we cut the nuclear nonproliferation activities by \$600 million under this bill?

While the bill increases funding for our weapons programs and continues funding for fossil fuel subsidies, it guts many of our renewable energy programs, like ARPA-E, the Department of Energy's Office of Science, and investing in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

This bill threatens to increase our reliance on foreign oil, reduce job growth, increase pollution, and damage the health of American families. If we don't act to reverse this legislation's deep cuts to science programs and energy research, the United States will have many, many missiles armed with nuclear warheads, but we will fall behind our global competitors who are investing heavily in renewable and next-generation energy technologies.

I strongly urge that we defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I cannot recall a place in the Constitution where it says the House passes a bill, the Senate can't pass it, so the House comes back and tries to find a better bill that maybe the Senate will now take up. Boy, I wish that had happened on that health care stuff back in 2009 and 2010. We would have a lot better world today.

But the fact of the matter is, the House has passed the student loan bill and the Senate has the obligation to act. The deadline of July 1 was, in fact, provided to us by a funding cliff that the Democrats enacted back in 2007 when they started this process.

The deadline was self-imposed by a Democratic majority in the House of Representatives and a Democratic majority in the Senate. Democrats in the

other body are fully aware of that deadline, we are fully aware of that deadline, and they were the ones that let it lapse. The House had done its work. They were fully capable of passing something and sending it back to us so that it could either be passed or adjusted prior to the July 4 recess.

In regards to the legislation we are currently considering, we do continue the Republican commitment to maintaining an open and transparent nature to the appropriations process. This rule balances our commitment to energy independence and national security with good stewardship of taxpayer money.

I want to, again, commend Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and Ranking Member KAPTUR for working together to craft a bill that balances our spending priorities with our concerns over the deficit and our climbing national debt.

At this point, I ask for an "aye" on the previous question and an "aye" on the underlying resolution.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 288 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2574) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2574.

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 Democratic minority 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."

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

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 288, if ordered, and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 182, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Alexander	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amash	Graves (MO)	Petri
Amodei	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Bachus	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barr	Hall	Price (GA)
Barton	Hanna	Radel
Benishek	Harper	Reed
Bentivolio	Harris	Reichert
Billrakis	Hartzler	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Black	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Hensarling	Rigell
Bonner	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Boustany	Holding	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rooney
Bucshon	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Camp	Jones	Rothfus
Cantor	Jordan	Royce
Capito	Joyce	Runyan
Carter	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	King (IA)	Sanford
Chabot	King (NY)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kingston	Schock
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Labrador	Sessions
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Shuster
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Simpson
Conaway	Lance	Smith (MO)
Cook	Lankford	Smith (NE)
Cotton	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Latta	Smith (TX)
Crawford	LoBiondo	Southerland
Crenshaw	Long	Stewart
Culberson	Lucas	Stivers
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Stockman
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Stutzman
Denham	Marchant	Terry
Dent	Marino	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	Massie	Thornberry
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	McCauley	Tipton
Duffy	McClintock	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Valadao
Ellmers	McKinley	Wagner
Farenthold	McMorris	Walberg
Fincher	Rodgers	Walden
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Walorski
Fleischmann	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fleming	Mica	Webster (FL)
Flores	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Fox	Mullin	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gerlach	Noem	Womack
Gibbs	Nugent	Woodall
Gibson	Nunes	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Yoho
Gohmert	Olson	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Paulsen	

NAYS—182

Andrews	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (NY)	Bustos
Bass	Blumenauer	Capps
Beatty	Bonamici	Capuano
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Cárdenas
Bera (CA)	Braley (IA)	Carney

Carson (IN)	Honda	Peters (MI)
Cartwright	Huffman	Peterson
Castor (FL)	Israel	Pingree (ME)
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Chu	Jeffries	Polis
Ciциlline	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Clarke	Kaptur	Quigley
Clay	Keating	Rahall
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Clyburn	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kildee	Ruiz
Connolly	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Conyers	Kind	Rush
Cooper	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Costa	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda T.
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Cummings	Levin	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Lewis	Schneider
DeFazio	Lipinski	Schrader
DeGette	Loeb	Schwartz
Delaney	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Scott, David
DelBene	Lowey	Serrano
Deutch	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sewell (AL)
Dingell	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Shea-Porter
Doggett	Lynch	Sires
Doyle	Maffei	Slaughter
Duckworth	Maloney, Carolyn	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Ellison	Markey	Swalwell (CA)
Engel	Matheson	Takano
Enyart	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Esty	McDermott	Tierney
Farr	McGovern	Titus
Fattah	McIntyre	Tonko
Foster	McNerney	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Van Hollen
Fudge	Michaud	Vargas
Gabbard	Miller, George	Veasey
Galego	Murphy (FL)	Vela
Garamendi	Nadler	Velázquez
Garcia	Napolitano	Visclosky
Grayson	Neal	Walz
Green, Al	Nolan	Wasserman
Green, Gene	O'Rourke	Schultz
Grijalva	Owens	Waters
Gutiérrez	Pascarell	Watt
Hahn	Payne	Waxman
Hanabusa	Pelosi	Welch
Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)
Heck (WA)	Peters (CA)	Yarmuth
Higgins		
Himes		
Hinojosa		

NOT VOTING—32

Barber	Hunter	Pastor (AZ)
Brown (FL)	Hurt	Posey
Buchanan	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Butterfield	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (KY)
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Salmon
Davis, Danny	Meadows	Schweikert
Franks (AZ)	Meeks	Sherman
Gosar	Moore	Shimkus
Holt	Moran	Sinema
Horsford	Negrete McLeod	Young (FL)
Hoyer	Pallone	

□ 1331

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

Stated for:

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting in my office and didn't make it to the floor before the gavel came down for the first vote (rollcall Vote 308) in this series. I did vote for the subsequent rollcall votes in this series. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 308, I was at the White House for a discussion on U.S. economy. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 178, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Perlmutter
Alexander	Graves (MO)	Perry
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Bachmann	Grimm	Pitts
Bachus	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Hall	Polis
Barr	Hanna	Pompeo
Barton	Harper	Posey
Benishkek	Harris	Price (GA)
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Radel
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Reichert
Black	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Blackburn	Holding	Ribble
Bonner	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Burgess	Jones	Rooney
Calvert	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Joyce	Roskam
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Capito	King (IA)	Rothfus
Carney	King (NY)	Royce
Carter	Kingston	Ruiz
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Runyan
Chabot	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Labrador	Sanford
Coble	LaMalfa	Scalise
Coffman	Lamborn	Schock
Cole	Lance	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Latham	Sessions
Conaway	Latta	Shuster
Connolly	LoBiondo	Simpson
Cook	Long	Smith (MO)
Cotton	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Maffei	Southerland
Culberson	Marchant	Stewart
Daines	Marino	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Massie	Stockman
Denham	Matheson	Stutzman
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
DeSantis	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	McClintock	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	McHenry	Tiberi
Duffy	McKeon	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McKinley	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McMorris	Upton
Ellmers	Rodgers	Valadao
Farenthold	Meehan	Wagner
Fincher	Messer	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Mica	Walden
Fleischmann	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Fleming	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Flores	Miller, Gary	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Moran	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Mullin	Westmoreland
Foxx	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gerlach	Noem	Wittman
Gibbs	Nugent	Wolf
Gibson	Nunes	Womack
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Woodall
Gohmert	Olson	Yoder
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Granger	Pearce	

NAYS—178

Andrews	Blumenauer	Cárdenas
Barrow (GA)	Bonamici	Carson (IN)
Bass	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Beatty	Braley (IA)	Castor (FL)
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)
Bera (CA)	Bustos	Chu
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Cicilline
Bishop (NY)	Capuano	Clarke

Clay	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Cleaver	Jeffries	Pingree (ME)
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Cohen	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Conyers	Keating	Quigley
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Rahall
Costa	Kennedy	Richmond
Courtney	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Kind	Rush
Cummings	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	T.
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Delaney	Levin	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Lewis	Schiff
DelBene	Lipinski	Schneider
Deutsch	Loebback	Schrad
Dingell	Lofgren	Schwartz
Doggett	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Doyle	Lowe	Scott, David
Duckworth	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Edwards	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Ellison	Lujan, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
Engel	(NM)	Sherman
Enyart	Sires	Sires
Eshoo	Maloney,	Slaughter
Ribble	Carolyn	Smith (WA)
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Fattah	Markey	Swalwell (CA)
Foster	Matsui	Takano
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Fudge	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Gabbard	McGovern	Tierney
Gallego	McIntyre	Titus
Garamendi	McNerney	Tonko
Garcia	Meeks	Tsongas
Grayson	Meng	Van Hollen
Green, Al	Michaud	Vargas
Green, Gene	Miller, George	Veasey
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Vela
Gutiérrez	Nadler	Velázquez
Hahn	Napolitano	Visclosky
Hanabusa	Neal	Walz
Hastings (FL)	Nolan	Wasserman
Heck (WA)	O'Rourke	Schultz
Higgins	Owens	Waters
Himes	Pascarell	Watt
Lance	Payne	Waxman
Hinojosa	Pelosi	Welch
Honda	Peters (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Huffman	Peters (MI)	Yarmuth
Israel		

NOT VOTING—30

Barber	Horsford	Pallone
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rangel
Butterfield	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Campbell	Johnson, E. B.	Salmon
Franks (AZ)	Kirkpatrick	Schweikert
Gardner	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Gosar	Meadows	Sinema
Hastings (WA)	Moore	Yoho
Holt	Negrete McLeod	Young (FL)

□ 1340

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for the following vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "yes" on adoption of the rule for Energy and Water Appropriations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote 308: on ordering the previous question to H. Res. 288—I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote 309: on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 288—I would have voted "aye."

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding my absence from the House for votes on the afternoon of July 9, 2013. I was unfortunately absent due to a medical appointment. I would like to submit how I would have voted

had I been in attendance for the following votes:

Rollcall No. 308, on the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2609, I would have voted "no."

Rollcall No. 309, on agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 288), I would have voted "no."

THE JOURNAL

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

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 262, nays 138, answered "present" 1, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—262

Aderholt	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Alexander	Ellmers	Levin
Amodei	Engel	Lipinski
Bachmann	Enyart	Loebsack
Bachus	Eshoo	Lofgren
Barletta	Esty	Long
Barr	Farenthold	Lowe
Barrow (GA)	Farr	Lucas
Barton	Fattah	Luetkemeyer
Beatty	Fincher	Lujan Grisham
Becerra	Fleischmann	(NM)
Bentivolio	Forbes	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bera (CA)	Fortenberry	(NM)
Bilirakis	Foster	Lummis
Bishop (UT)	Frankel (FL)	Marino
Black	Frelinghuysen	Massie
Blackburn	Gallego	McCarthy (CA)
Blumenauer	Garrett	McCaul
Bonamici	Gibbs	McClintock
Bonner	Gingrey (GA)	McCollum
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McHenry
Bridenstine	Gowdy	McKeon
Brooks (AL)	Granger	McKinley
Brooks (IN)	Graves (GA)	McMorris
Brown (FL)	Grayson	Rodgers
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	McNerney
Bustos	Grimm	Meadows
Calvert	Guthrie	Meehan
Camp	Hahn	Meeks
Cantor	Hall	Meng
Capito	Hanabusa	Mica
Capps	Harper	Michaud
Cárdenas	Harris	Miller (MI)
Carney	Hartzler	Miller, Gary
Carter	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Cartwright	Hastings (WA)	Mullin
Cassidy	Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Castro (TX)	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Chabot	Higgins	Nadler
Chaffetz	Himes	Neugebauer
Cicilline	Hinojosa	Noem
Clay	Huelskamp	Nunes
Coble	Huffman	O'Rourke
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Collins (NY)	Hultgren	Palazzo
Connolly	Issa	Pascarell
Cook	Jackson Lee	Payne
Cooper	Jeffries	Pelosi
Cramer	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Peters (CA)
Crenshaw	Jones	Petri
Culberson	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Daines	Kelly (PA)	Pocan
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Polis
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Pompeo
DeGette	King (IA)	Posey
Delaney	King (NY)	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Kingston	Quigley
DelBene	Kline	Ribble
Dent	Kuster	Rice (SC)
DesJarlais	Labrador	Richmond
Deuth	LaMalfa	Roby
Doggett	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Doyle	Langevin	Rogers (MI)
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Rokita