

There are many issues in this particular bill which help us move forward, not only in defense of our military, but in our foreign policy opportunities. There are a few amendments out there that actually do harm to that. I hope we look at it very carefully. It is a well-crafted rule with a whole lot of amendments—perhaps far too many amendments made in order—and it will provide for a logical debate. I hope when we come out of it, we realize the significance of this, not just funding our military, but also funding our diplomatic future.

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

I want to build on something that Mr. WELCH of Vermont said here on the House floor about the lack of debate on Syria. As somebody who was here when the Afghanistan war began and when the Iraq war began, I believe that both of those wars were unnecessary. We ended up getting Osama bin Laden not in Afghanistan with 100,000 troops, but with a small well-trained group of Navy SEALs in Pakistan.

This notion that somehow our strength can only be measured by the number of troops we have overseas or the number of weapons that we send overseas I think is just crazy. I think the amount that we have spent on these wars that have been added to our debt have weakened our security. I think the fact that we have lost so many incredibly brave men and women to these conflicts is a tragedy.

What the gentleman from Vermont raised was the issue that I think is on a lot of our constituents' minds, and that is what is going to happen in Syria. The real problem with this rule, Mr. Speaker, can be seen in the debate surrounding Syria. There is a real split when it comes to Syria. There are some who don't believe we should get involved at all; and there are others, like Senator MCCAIN, leading the Republicans over in the Senate, saying we ought to do more, we ought to get more involved in Syria.

□ 1300

Yet this rule denies any real substantive debate on one of the most important issues facing our military. The Republicans, despite making 100 amendments in order, ducked this issue entirely. The rule makes in order one amendment on Syria, and that amendment simply reiterates current law. Despite the sheer number of amendments made in order, the Republican leadership has ducked a real important debate when it comes to Syria, and I hope that a few years down the road we don't look back on the fact that we avoided a debate on Syria and express regret that somehow we got sucked into this war without a real debate. I mean, that's what we're here for.

So, when people say, "Oh, these are tough issues," I'm sorry. We can't duck every tough issue. Maybe that has been the problem with a lot of our overseas

policies—that we haven't talked about what needs to be done, that we haven't debated these issues. Sometimes we've gotten involved in wars that we've found are more complicated than originally thought. There is nothing wrong with debate, and it is incredibly important. In the people's House of Representatives, we ought to have a debate on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding to me.

I want to also thank our ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), as well as to thank our mutual friend and colleague from Florida, Chairman BILL YOUNG, for their hard work on this bill, which will benefit our Nation, our men and women in uniform, our Armed Forces, and all of those who are touched by what is contained in this legislation.

Within the limits provided and despite severe cuts, this bill has been written in a bipartisan way by our subcommittee. I thank the members for working so collaboratively together. It is a model for this House and our committee on how to do the work necessary to meet the needs of the American people.

The bill includes \$125 million above the President's request for funding health research for traumatic brain injuries and posttraumatic stress conditions—the signature wounds of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The bill also includes \$544 million for cancer research, including breast cancer, prostate cancer, ovarian cancer, and lung cancer research, which are endured at a much higher percentage among our troops than among the population at large.

The bill also contains continuing support for our NATO responsibilities, including continuing joint operations related to the Newly Independent States. The bill includes the requested amount in the budget for the Iron Dome missile defense partnership with Israel.

The bill also includes \$1.5 billion above the request for the National Guard and Reserve Equipment account to fund equipment requirements of the National Guard and Reserve components. During the last decade of war, our National Guard and Reserve units have proven themselves as the strategic partners for our Nation. Our subcommittee continues to provide the funding necessary for our Guard and Reserve units to continue their missions, which they do extremely well and much more cost-effectively than in the active forces.

This legislation also continues the military's commitment to lead our Na-

tion toward energy independence. The Pentagon, which is the largest petroleum user in the world, must lead our Nation forward toward energy independence. No challenge could be more vital to our national security and economic security than energy independence.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Congressman MCGOVERN.

High fuel costs are an enormous burden on America's families and our military. It is also a burden on every branch of the service in which it costs us \$400 a gallon to deliver 1 gallon of gasoline—fully costed—to the troops at the front line.

Thank you again to Chairman BILL YOUNG and to Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their leadership and to our ranking member on the full committee, the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and to the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, for working with all of our members in order to meet the needs of our Nation and of our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force—those who serve the American people every day so nobly.

Mr. NUGENT. As to the thoughts of the gentlelady from Ohio, I appreciate her comments and her support for the military.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge people to vote "no" on the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider the Van Hollen resolution, which calls on Speaker BOEHNER to proceed to a conference on the budget. It is time for the majority to follow regular order by immediately appointing conferees to negotiate the 2014 budget conference agreement with the Senate.

To discuss that proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. WELCH regarding the importance of this body's having a debate and a vote on whether or not we should be sending U.S. taxpayer dollars to engage and support the rebels in the civil war in Syria. After all, this budget supports the Defense Department, and it also supports the intelligence agency. So this is the time and place to have the debate about taxpayer dollars going to a civil war in Syria.

It is also the time and high time that we get on with passing a Federal budget. We've heard a lot of talk on the floor today about the importance of supporting our military—absolutely

true—but this legislation does nothing to turn off the sequester. So, unless the Congress comes together on a bipartisan and a bicameral basis to resolve the budget, this Defense appropriations bill is going to be cut by about \$48 billion, just as the non-defense parts of the budget will be cut as a result of sequestration.

I don't think the American people recognize that as of today—even though we're working on these spending bills—that the United States Congress has not passed a budget. There is no Federal budget in place today.

Now, we've heard a lot from our Republican colleagues over the last couple of years about how the Senate was derelict in its duty for not having a budget. Guess what? The Senate passed a budget. It passed a budget 122 days ago. Ever since that time, we've said to our Republican colleagues, Let's take the next step in the process—let's have a conference. Senate, House, let's get together to work out those differences.

In fact, Senator MURRAY, who is the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, has asked now 17 times for unanimous consent in the Senate to begin negotiations. We have called upon the Speaker of the House to appoint conferees to negotiate on the budget. He has refused. This motion is very simple. I'm just going to read the Resolved clause:

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Speaker should follow regular House procedure and immediately request a conference and appoint conferees to negotiate the fiscal year 2014 budget resolution.

Very simple. It's calling for exactly what our Republican colleagues have called for for the last 3 years. We've heard from you many times "no budget, no pay." We don't have a budget, but Members of Congress are getting paid.

Now, Senator MCCAIN and a lot of Republican Senators have made the point that it's insane not to go to conference on the budget. Here is what he said, Senator MCCAIN:

I think it's insane for Republicans who complain for 4 years about Harry Reid not having a budget, and now we're not going to agree to conferees? That is beyond comprehension for me.

That sentiment was seconded by lots of other Republican Senators. In fact, I think my colleagues know that I've heard, quietly, from a lot of our House Republican colleagues, saying, frankly, that they're embarrassed at the fact that the House Republicans have refused to appoint conferees and take the next step in the budget process.

Why is it important? We've got to get our economy moving in full gear. The Congressional Budget Office has told us that, as a result of the sequester, we're going to have 700,000 fewer jobs in this country by the end of this calendar year and that it's going to reduce our economic growth by one-third. The budget conference is where we work out our differences and try and remove the uncertainty in the economy.

By not going to budget conference, let's be clear what our Republican colleagues are doing. They want to take us right up to the cliff of a government shutdown in the beginning of October, the next fiscal year. They are talking about, once again, rolling the dice and playing a game of chicken as to whether or not the United States pays its bills on time. That is no way for the Federal Government to conduct itself.

I would ask my colleagues to put aside all of the gamesmanship and to simply, today, appoint conferees so that we can begin to work out these issues on the budget. Right now, as we head into the next school year, the kids of our soldiers who are at Fort Bragg are going to miss 5 days of school this fall because their teachers are going to be sequestered. Because of the sequester, they are going to be furloughed for 5 days this fall. These are the kids of men and women who are fighting to defend this country. That is wrong.

Let's get on with replacing the sequester in a smart way, but we can't do that unless we get on with the budget conference. So I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can go to conference.

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

Mr. Speaker, it's always great to hear from Mr. VAN HOLLEN. He has been in front of the Rules Committee, I think, a half a dozen times on this particular issue, but that's not the issue we're talking about today. Today, we are talking about a rule to bring forward two bills. One is the appropriations bill for the defense of this country.

I appreciate his comments, but he also forgets to mention that, in the last Congress, this House passed two pieces of legislation to actually do what he was talking about doing. And guess what? It went over to that place where they have rocking chairs—where they do nothing. They didn't discuss it; they didn't debate it; they didn't even send it back to us, because they just didn't have the time to do it in their busy schedule, and I understand that.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUGENT. I would be glad to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Look, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman notes, we're in a new Congress right now. In the new Congress, the law requires that we pass a Federal budget by April 15. We are obviously way overdue. It is indisputable that the Senate has passed a budget. Why not go to conference?

Mr. NUGENT. In reclaiming my time, regarding shutting the government down, those are the gentleman's words, not ours. I don't think you've heard that at all from this side. It's not about shutting the government down; it's about passing 12 appropriations bills. That's really what we are supposed to be doing, and we are com-

mitted to doing that. We don't want to see a government shutdown, and I think our bringing appropriations bills to this House floor shows, in fact, that that's not the intent and that that's not the desire.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, just to build on what my colleague Mr. VAN HOLLEN was talking about, the reason we are so frustrated over here is that it seems that the Republican leadership is hell-bent on doing nothing—on stopping everything. We have 16 legislative days left until the end of the fiscal year.

You've only passed three appropriations bills. Notwithstanding the fact that the House passed a budget and the Senate passed a budget, there has been no conference on the budget. We have a debt limit looming, and I hear rumors that you're trying to figure out what pound of flesh you can obtain in order to avoid our defaulting on our financial obligations. This is not the way to run a government.

I would just plead with my colleagues on the other side that you need to get serious about sitting down and negotiating our differences. One of the things about a conference is you don't get everything you want, and they don't get everything they want.

As to these appropriations bills that you are bringing to the floor, their allocations are so low that they are unamendable on the House floor, and they would do great damage to our economy. This THUD bill I don't think will ever see the light of day any more than I think the Ag approps bill, which we gave a rule to, will ever see the light of day. Within that THUD bill are cuts in the Community Development Block Grants, which you cut in half. The devastation on cities all across this country and communities all across this country would be so bad. People are going to lose jobs. The gentleman from Maryland talked about the furloughs and about people losing their jobs because of the sequester, and you sit back and say, Oh, it's not our fault.

This is the body that voted for it. I mean, the people of this House voted for it. I didn't, but the majority of my friends on the other side voted for sequester. It is now the law of the land. That's part of what Congress did. Congress has to change the law so we get our economy back on the right track, and one way to begin is to do what you're supposed to do and go to conference with the Senate on the budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all the Members of an essential rule of decorum in the House. Under clause I of rule XVII, Members are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. May ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has?

Mr. NUGENT. I have none.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 16 minutes remaining.

□ 1315

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

I don't have a problem with what's in this rule; I have a problem with what's being left out of the rule.

We have some serious issues to discuss: the NSA surveillance program, limited debate in this rule. We need to talk about Syria and whether we're going to get sucked into another war. Multiple amendments were offered. All of them were denied, except one that basically reinstates current law.

There are issues about Egypt that ought to be discussed on the floor. And when I hear my colleagues say these are sensitive issues, we shouldn't talk about them on the floor, then where should we talk about them? This is the appropriate bill to talk about those things; yet many of these amendments were not made in order. That's why an open rule would have been more appropriate.

In terms of debate, I don't know why we have to limit debate on the NSA down to 15 minutes a piece. Everybody is concerned about this.

I will just close, Mr. Speaker, by again urging my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so that we can offer an amendment to allow Mr. VAN HOLLEN's language to be made in order that the Republican leadership agree to go to conference with the Senate over the budget.

This sequester and these budget numbers that you are bringing to the floor on these various appropriation bills are destructive. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are hurting this economy. This gamesmanship that my friends on the other side are playing is doing great damage to this country.

We have to stop this. We have to be grownups here and do what we're supposed to do. The most important thing that can happen right now, given the fact there's only 16 legislative days left to the end of this fiscal year, is for my friends on the other side of the aisle to go to conference on the budget and work out a deal so that we don't have these devastating cuts that will impact every city and town in this country, that will throw tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of people out of work, that will do further damage to our infrastructure.

National security means the quality of life that people have here in the United States. It means whether they can have good health care or good education, whether they have good and safe roads to drive on. It means whether they have a job. National security

begins right here at home; and the numbers that my Republican friends have been bringing to the floor, in terms of allocations for these appropriation bills on domestic spending, would be devastating to this economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and I urge a "no" vote on this rule. We should have an open rule where we can talk about all these major issues that are confronting our Nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I do appreciate the comments my friend from Massachusetts has made in a lot of areas, particularly as it relates to the open rule.

I do want to remind him—and I wasn't here in 2010—but the Rules Committee that my good friend sat on made a determination in regards to a structured rule, and that structured rule only allowed for 16 amendments to come to the House floor. That structured rule locked out a lot of folks' ideas in regards to how to better the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense 2011 fiscal year.

I agree with my good friend that this rule is not perfect, but I do want to point out that it does make over 100 amendments in order that are going to be debated here on this floor: an amendment on Syria; an amendment on Egypt; two amendments on the NSA, which are appropriate to have a debate here. And as we talk about authorization, particularly as we look at the NSA, that debate is going to come up in a very robust way because I truly believe that we need to have that.

As it relates to Syria, I have three sons that currently serve in the United States military. The last thing I want to do is see us arm rebels where my sons may have to face those arms at some point in time. I've had sons deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan; and as a Member of this House, there are very few of us that have served in the military in the same way as it relates to having our family members serve in harm's way. So I take it right to heart that we want to make sure that we don't put our sons or daughters in any jeopardy, particularly as it relates to arming those that we have no idea who they are.

I think I've said enough, but my position on arming the Syrian rebels, those that we don't even know who they are or what we're doing in Egypt or what's going on within the NSA as it relates to our civil liberties here in the United States as American citizens, we certainly are going to address those issues as we move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, and I encourage my colleagues to do so, as well. As a father of three sons in the military, I'm disappointed that we've gotten to this point where ideological factions have divided this House so deeply that we're forced to put a struc-

tured rule in place in order to simply consider a bill that funds our Department of Defense.

Just to note, 2 years ago when we were having this discussion, I got a call from one of my sons who was deployed to Iraq, worried that his troopers were not going to get paid because that's what they were being told, because of actions of this House.

The last thing is that when our sons and daughters go off to fight, the last thing they should have to worry about is how they're going to take care of the car payment or feed their children back here at home. They should have one focus, and that's the fight ahead of them and returning back to their families and loved ones in the best possible condition they can be.

To me it's about as pathetic as it gets when these men and women are putting their lives on the line each day and we're playing politics with our national defense and we can't put differences aside long enough not to even agree to a funding bill, but just to agree that we should debate the funding bill at all.

I wish we could have an open rule on both of these appropriation measures. You know I do. But when it comes to funding the Pentagon and when it comes to funding our military, the issue at hand is too important to leave this subject to the political whims of select Members who could tie up the debate for days and end with irresponsible amendments that might ultimately put this Nation and its citizens at risk. That's why we're here. That's why we've taken the three most hot-button politicized issues and selected specific amendments to address each of these concerns while still making in order every other amendment that would not otherwise be subject to a point of order.

I welcome debate on how we need to change the laws of this land. I'm an active proponent in having it. Millions of Americans, including me, are questioning many of the laws right now, especially when it comes to the use of military force and the powers given to the NSA under the PATRIOT Act. It's clear that those are conversations that must happen in this forum here, but we can't let it derail the basic funding of our troops. That's what it comes down to.

This bill cannot possibly give the issues at hand the justice they deserve. It's an imperfect tool, and with only 10 minutes per debate per amendment, it would cut short the conversations that we have. That is why, although it is a departure from the normal appropriation process, this resolution brings up H.R. 2397 under a structured rule.

That said, the second half of House Resolution 312 is proof that this House is still dedicated to the open process. We fulfill our promise to both our constituents and ourselves by providing an open rule on Transportation and Housing appropriations. It's a reminder to us that the Defense bill is an example

of extraordinary times calling for extraordinary measures. At the end of the day, what's most important is that we fulfill our core mission. As anybody in the military will tell you, sometimes we have to adapt.

It's not perfect, but we can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good, especially when we're talking about keeping our troops and our citizens safe. For that reason, I'm proud to support the rule, and I encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

When the Committee on Rules filed its report (H. Rept. 113–170) to accompany House Resolution 312 the summary of amendment numbered 43 was inadvertently omitted. The summary of amendments should have included the following:

43. COLE (OK), KILMER (WA), MCCARTHY, KEVIN (CA), BISHOP, ROB (UT), JONES (NC), LOESACK (IA), MCCOLLUM (MN), SCOTT, AUSTIN (GA): Provides that none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to implement a furlough of Department of Defense federal employees who are paid from the Working Capital Fund (WCF) Account, which is a revolving fund and does not receive direct funding from Congressional appropriations to finance its operations. (10 minutes)

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 312 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 7. 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 resolution (H. Res. 174) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Speaker should immediately request a conference and appoint conferees to complete work on a fiscal year 2014 budget resolution with the Senate. The first reading of the resolution shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of consideration of the resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption 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 resolution, 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 resolution.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the resolution specified in section 7 of this resolution.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1340

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 312; and adoption of House Resolution 312, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2397, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2610, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 312) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 190, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—229

Aderholt	Bachmann	Barr
Alexander	Bachus	Barton
Amash	Barber	Benishke
Amodel	Barletta	Bentivolio