heading households and being the primary breadwinner, it's a matter of economic security for American families. These women face the same financial pressures as any other American. They certainly don't get a 23 percent discount on their rent or mortgage payment, on the groceries they buy or on the children's shoes they have to replace.

We must pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, which the Senate plans to vote on next week and the House passed in the last Congress. I ask my Republican friends, Mr. Speaker, why the Republicans aren't making this a priority instead of today we're voting on a divisive abortion bill that criminalizes a woman's most private health care decisions.

Women do not need yet another attack on their reproductive rights. What they need is economic justice. When will the majority get it?

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, imagine the shocked faces of daughters and sons all across the country when they open up their July billing statement, add up all the figures, and find it's cheaper to buy a home than pursue their higher education.

Come July 1, Republicans are going to let interest rates on student loans double. At the same time, they're making sure wasteful tax breaks for yacht and private jet owners stay in place. In fact, it's the best way for them to keep the Millionaires Club an exclusive club for good old boys, by blocking the best avenue for success that this country has ever known—a college education.

The GOP is turning the aspirations of young Americans into a revenue stream for the wealthy. They're financing reckless tax policies on the hopes and dreams of our children. I urge them to join Democrats in a serious proposal to stop these interest rates from doubling. The next generation is counting on us to act responsibly.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION REFORM ACT

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Food and Drug Administration Reform Act and, in particular, the provisions it contains to address critical drug shortages. Across the country, patients are not getting critical medications they need to battle diseases and stay healthy. This crisis is hitting cancer patients especially hard, with serious shortages of chemotherapy drugs.

In response to this crisis, I introduced the Drug Shortage Prevention Act with my colleague, Representative LARRY BUCSHON. I'm pleased that key provisions of this bill are included in the legislation that the House passed last night. These provisions help FDA and the DEA fix some of the regulatory problems that are causing these shortages.

This is not a partisan issue. Drug shortages affect all of us. I'm pleased that the Senate passed its own version of this legislation last week, and I'm hopeful that both Chambers can quickly come together to present a final package for the President's signature.

When a family gets hit with a diagnosis like cancer, they have enough things to worry about. Running out of chemotherapy drugs should not be one of them.

SUPPORT LOCAL BROADCASTERS

(Ms. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the official start of this year's hurricane season. As ranking member of the Subcommittee of Emergency Communications Preparedness and Response that supports the Department of Homeland Security, I'm speaking today to note that broadcasters have demonstrated a continued commitment to local communities in providing critical information during times of disaster.

When disaster strikes, Americans depend upon their local television and radio stations for access to lifesaving information and emergency announcements. Broadcasters' commitment to public service is never more apparent than in the time of a crisis.

As we typically see during times of disasters, whether it's a hurricane, flood, fire, tornado, earthquake, or a widespread power outage, broadcasters remain to cover the dangerous situations, and, most importantly, they provide vital assistance to those who might need it.

During an emergency, broadcasters deliver comprehensive, up-to-date warnings and information to those affected areas, which helps victims and also brings comfort to family members who are awaiting any kind of information. This issue is very important to all of us. Broadcasters can provide information in a moment's notice when we need it most.

I ask my colleagues to join me to commend our local broadcasters for their work, their continued readiness, and the important role that they play in the time of an emergency.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as has just been mentioned by my colleague from California, tomorrow, June 1, is the official start of the 2012 Atlantic hurricane season, which would potentially mean bad news for areas across the Nation, including folks on Long Island in my congressional district.

Last year, Hurricane Irene and the earthquake felt along the east coast reminded us of the importance of the Nation's first responders, specifically, the importance of our broadcasters.

Emergency plans are only effective if they are able to be communicated to the folks in need. This fact underscores the importance of our broadcasters.

With that in mind, I have constantly supported efforts for both the Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Communications Commission to explore the potential benefits of including radio tuners in mobile telephones. Since technology would ensure that folks have an outlet to receive critical information in times of need, I encourage this Congress to act swiftly to consider any and all opportunities that would facilitate communication during emergencies.

As we embark on hurricane season, let's take this moment to recognize the importance of broadcasters and all of our first responders that selflessly provide services in our time of need.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5743, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5854, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5855, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5325, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, upon adoption of House Resolution 667, amendments number 4 and 6 printed in House Report 112–504 be modified to include the amendatory instructions that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modifications.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendatory instructions for amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112–504:

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

Amendatory instructions for amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112–504:

At the end of title IV (page 21, after line 2), add the following new section:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the modifications?

Without objection, that will be the order.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 667 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 667

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. 5743) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, 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 Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of any bill specified in section 3 of this resolution. The first reading of each such bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. General debate on each such bill shall be confined to that 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 each such bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in each such bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of each such 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 any such bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on that bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. The bills referred to in section 2 of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 5854) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 5855) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

(c) The bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

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

□ 1240

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution and of the four rules that it contains.

The rules provide for the consideration of critically important pieces of legislation meant to fund the Federal Government, provide for our Nation's veterans and protect our national security. With this resolution, I have the distinct honor of bringing three appropriations bills to the House floor under open rules. I'm not sure when the last time is that somebody got to say he was bringing three open rules to the House floor at one time, but I am proud to be able to do that today.

House Res. 667 continues the majority's promise to the American people to bring openness, debate, and transparency back to Congress. As a father of three sons in the military and as the Representative of over 116,000 veterans, I'm particularly happy that this resolution provides an open rule for the bill that funds our Nation's veterans programs and meets our military construction needs. We owe our veterans a debt that can never be repaid, but the very least we can do is provide them with the benefits they so bravely and so selflessly earned.

I applaud the Appropriations Committee for the bipartisan way they worked together to fund these programs for our American heroes and their families. It shouldn't go unnoticed that at a time when it seems difficult to work across the aisle, the Appropriations Committee did just that, and they passed it unanimously. We shouldn't play politics with our veterans, and the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill doesn't.

House Res. 667 includes a structured rule for the Intelligence Authorization Act for 2013. This is a bill that authorizes our Nation's intelligence and intelligence-related activities. It includes our National Intelligence Program and Military Intelligence Program. It specifically ensures that nothing in this bill gives the government the authority to conduct any intelligence activity not otherwise authorized by the U.S. Constitution or our laws.

Although this rule may not be an open rule, it is necessarily so. The classified nature of the Intelligence authorization bill means that we can't debate a lot of the specifics of the underlying bill on the House floor. If we were to debate some of these amendments, we would be put in the impossible position of supporting or opposing the amendments based on facts that we simply can't discuss for reasons of national security. Still, in our efforts to be open, the Rules Committee managed to allow nine amendments on this debate. Seven of those amendments are Democratic, and two are Republican. This too is a bipartisan bill, and the Intelligence Committee passed it unanimously with a 19–0 vote. As the minority views of this bill stated, the stakes are simply too high to make our intelligence programs political.

For all of these reasons, I am proud to support this resolution, a resolution that provides for an extremely open process while balancing the transparency with our national security when it comes to debating our intelligence programs.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Departing for the moment at hand, Mr. Speaker, just to identify that, today, the bipartisan Foster Youth Program has on the Hill with many of us foster care youth from around this Nation. This bill directly affects their lives. I have the good fortune of having a constituent, Breon Callins, and Washington, D.C. youth Goldie Brown following me today, and I hope they hear my remarks and understand the importance to them and to all children in America's future.

The rule provides for the consideration of four bills—the Intelligence authorization, Energy and Water appropriations, Homeland Security appropriations, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations. While I agree with my colleague Mr.

NUGENT that it is important that this is customarily an open process—and I commend my Republican colleagues in that regard—I do as I did in the Rules Committee—and he was there last evening—object to the significant number of amendments that were not allowed, and I am sure there are Members who will be present to speak to them.

Once again, we are looking at broken Republican promises on spending levels. Once again, we are shortchanging our future for the selfish demands of today.

□ 1250

And once again, we're missing the opportunity to fully invest in our Nation. The choices made in these bills make no sense to me, Mr. Speaker. Nuclear weapons instead of nonproliferation. Fossil fuels instead of renewable energy. Divisive abortion provisions instead of bipartisan agreement on Homeland Security.

It's almost as if Republicans enjoy jabbing a finger in the eye of progress. They seem to be doing everything they can to find ways not to grow our economy and create jobs. They do not seem to understand that clinging to fossil fuels and nuclear weapons at the expense of scientific research and energy efficiency will not bring about the kind of progress that this great Nation needs. When you cut the Office of Science, when you cut the Advanced Research Projects Agency, and when you cut energy-efficiency programs, you harm our ability to invest in the kinds of research that lead to innovation and job creation.

Mr. Speaker, I could go through all of these bills and point out everywhere the majority has not sufficiently invested in the kinds of programs we need to make progress. It would not be hard, because unless it involves military spending or oil, you can be sure that the majority has cut it under the argument that we're in a fiscal crisis and cannot forward it.

Mr. Speaker, I reject that notion. We can afford to invest in our future, we can afford to create jobs, and we can afford to make the choices now that will reap the benefits for future generations, including those foster children that I mentioned.

When President Bush wanted to invade Iraq, Congress spent a trillion dollars. When Republicans wanted to cut taxes for the best off among us in America, Congress spent a trillion dollars. When Congress wanted to fight the war on terror, it appropriated and still does nearly unlimited funding to do so. So this is not about the deficit. The United States does not lack the money to prioritize our future. What we do lack is the political willpower and the leadership necessary to set gainful priorities.

Spend some now, save more later. What is obvious to middle class and working poor Americans seems entirely lost to my Republican colleagues. This Nation should be benefiting from American ingenuity and products made here in America. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rather let other countries take the lead in scientific advancement, energy efficiency, and clean energy. I'm not just talking about this year's appropriations, Mr. Speaker. I'm talking about the trend under the Republican majority of defunding and deprioritizing the long-term needs of the Nation. It's just plain depressing.

I know that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would prefer to see climate change as a liberal hoax, clean energy as a Socialist cabal, and science as a Communist plot. But drastic changes are upon this country and indeed upon this world, and our failure to adequately address these challenges now will cost us more in the future.

We need energy efficiency, not environmental degradation. We need nuclear nonproliferation, not more nuclear weapons. And we need more investments in science, because the next generation—including those foster children that I spoke about—of American scientists and innovators might not be one of the billionaires or millionaires so beloved by my Republican colleagues, but instead might be a desperate entrepreneur in need of a little bit of Federal assistance in order to make that great scientific breakthrough.

The sacrifices continually demanded by the Republican majority—in order to provide ever more money for foreign wars and tax cuts for the wealthy, including those of us in Congress—are shortchanging the future of this Nation. Rather than work with Democrats to develop bipartisan policies and funding priorities to address the country's challenges, House Republicans are continuing to use the appropriations process for partisan gimmickry and political gamesmanship, and pretending by deeming something that ain't going to happen in the Senate as law.

I can't tell you what business anti-abortion provisions have in a bill about funding the Department of Homeland Security. I can't tell you why it's more important for the Republicans to target women's health than it is to achieve bipartisan consensus on funding our Nation's first responders. And I can't tell you why, Mr. Speaker, we still have to debate this issue when there are so many other pressing concerns before us today.

Rather than garner Democrat support for the Homeland Security bill, Republicans felt the need to poison the legislation with the erroneous abortion provisions regarding the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency. Rather than take seriously the need to fund disaster relief—and, yes, it is true, tomorrow hurricane season begins, and we haven't done all or nearly as much as we should have, and there were amendments that would have addressed some of the things that we should, in fact, be prepared to do. Rather than take seriously firefighter assistance grants, cybersecurity efforts that are growing exponentially, the Coast Guard, the Secret Service, and other Federal frontline agencies, the majority has cast aside cooperation in the name of what I believe is reckless ideological point-scoring.

So in this latest season of appropriations, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves yet again cutting from valuable, worthwhile, and essential programs that would create jobs made in America, grow our economy, and ensure prosperity for the millions of Americans still struggling to get by.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I'm always at a loss sometimes when I hear certain things, but this is really about there is no energy policy in America. We're talking about actually investing in some of the resources that we're standing on today in America to help us become more energy independent, not more energy dependent.

We've seen what Solyndra did. We've seen what some of these ideas have been. While some are very intuitive or can lead to some directions that we want to go in, we have resources here today in America that can help us become more energy independent. This appropriations bill actually increases that R&D, that development of clean coal. We have over 300 years of energy just in coal alone. Why would we not look at how we can clean it by utilizing technology to do so? This bill does that.

Mr. Speaker, as we move forward, you've got to remember that three of these bills are open for amendment. My good friend on the other side probably remembers back to the 111th Congress when they never had an open rule on appropriations. But with this, we have three open rules and one structured rule. So if you don't like something that's contained in any one of those three bills, you have the opportunity to amend it on the floor. You can do that.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I personally tire of using one bad example on energy creation—Solyndra, which was and is a bad example—and ignoring all of the other kinds of investments that we have made in this Nation that are going about the business of solar and wind. I saw in my congressional district this weekend a wind program that is the future that is working with existing energy infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a former member of the Rules Committee.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, since I was elected to office in 2005, increasing the level of Sacramento's flood protection has been my highest priority. Sacramento is the most at-risk metropolitan area for major flooding, as it lies at the confluence of two major rivers—the Sacramento and the American. Sacramento is home to California's State capitol, an international airport, and half a million people. If Sacramento were to flood, the economic damages would range up to $40 billion. We have a lot at risk.

We are all well aware of our country's austere budget environment, but it is imperative that Sacramento's basic flood protection needs be met. The Federal Government must continue to fulfill its commitment to protect the lives and the livelihoods of the capital area of the largest State in the Union.

I want to applaud the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee for including adequate funding for Sacramento's top flood protection projects:

For the American River Common Features, the bill includes more than $6 million, which would be for work within the American River watershed, including American River Common Features General Reevaluation Report, further design work in support of levee improvements in Natomas and levee improvements on the American River.

For the Folsom Dam Joint Federal Project and Dam Raise Project, the bill includes more than $87 million to continue construction on the auxiliary spillway, which will provide greater efficiency in managing flood storage in Folsom Reservoir and critical dam safety work.

Mr. Speaker, each one of the projects is a critical component in improving the flood protection for the entire Sacramento region. Taken together, these projects help us to achieve the flood protection levels that families and businesses throughout the Sacramento area need and deserve. In addition, the legislation includes a reserve fund that will allocate over $92.5 million to the Corps for the purpose of funding flood protection projects.

Since I remain concerned that the Corps did not request its full capability for Sacramento flood protection projects in their budget, I will work vigorously to secure additional funding for Sacramento's flood protection priorities during the Corps' reserve fund competitive process, as outlined in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to push for higher levels of funding to meet our flood protection needs and priorities, not only for the Sacramento area region but for the country as a whole.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. I want to thank my good friend for his able management of this important rule.

I say to my friend from Fort Lauderdale, I'm really surprised to see Democratic opposition to this rule. Why? Well, we're dealing with an issue that has been near and dear to my friend from Ft. Lauderdale for years—intelligence issues. He served with distinction on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and we have come up with a structured rule.

That structured rule makes seven amendments in order that were submitted by Democrats and two amendments in order that were submitted by Republicans. If you look at the litany of those amendments the Democratic Members are offering, it's very clear that we have—we will have a wide-ranging debate, which, as we all recognize, Democrats and Republicans alike, has to be somewhat limited when we're discussing our Nation's intelligence issues.

So we've got a rule that makes in order seven Democratic amendments and two Republican amendments to deal with intelligence. Then we have three appropriations bills—three appropriations bills—all of which—all of which—under this proposed rule will be considered under an open amendment process, regular order, full, open amendment.

I have got to say that when I think back to being in the minority—and we served for 4 years in the minority here—if our friends on the other side of the aisle had come up with a structured rule that made seven Republican amendments in order and only two Democratic amendments in order on the Intelligence authorization bill and they had three completely open rules, I would feel very sanguine in saying that we would not only embrace, but we would enthusiastically support, that kind of rule.

That's why I've got to say that as the American people continue to ask us to work together, I mean, we have the CBO report that came out, just came out, talking about the prospect of another economic recession coming after the first of the year if we don't deal with issues like spending and taxes. And I'm not going to get into a big debate on that. We all know where we stand on those issues. But if we don't deal with those, we face the threat of another serious economic downturn based on this study that the Congressional Budget Office has just put out. They're saying to me, as I talk to people in California and around the country, they want us to work together. We've come forward with a rule, Mr. Speaker, that allows for three open rules.

To remind my colleagues what that means is it means that any Member, Democrat or Republican, will have the opportunity to stand up and submit their amendment, debate it here on the House floor and have an up-or-down vote on it, and we're going to deal very responsibly in what I believe will be a bipartisan way with intelligence issues.

Now, I understand, to be fair, that there are some concerns of what was included in the appropriations bills themselves. But the process itself is one which has existed under both Democrats and Republicans. It provides protection for the work product of the Appropriations Committee but has an open amendment process on floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I hope that as we move ahead with these appropriations bills and other items that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will recognize that we would have been grateful—we would have been grateful on our side of the aisle when we were in the minority—to have the kind of treatment that is now being rejected when we have put it forward on our side. Again, this is a very fair opportunity which recognizes the rights of Republicans and Democrats alike, and I hope we will have a bipartisan vote in support of the rule and then move to this very, very important work that we have that lies ahead.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 18 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my classmate and good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, when the Republican majority came to power, they promised transparency and greater debate. But today they have once again failed to keep that promise by refusing to allow a vote on a critical amendment requiring a report on human rights abuses in Argentina over 30 years ago.

For 20 years, I have fought for human rights and transparency in this House, and today the majority refuses to spare me 10 minutes for debate. But what's worse is they won't spare 10 minutes for the hundreds of children born in prison camps, for the thousands of grandparents that still hold out hope day after day that they will be reunited with their lost loved ones, for the 30,000 people who've disappeared at the hands of a brutal military regime and the millions of Argentine citizens who still seek justice and closure.

This amendment has been made in order numerous times in the past and has even been accepted without objections by both Democrats and Republicans. But it seems this year the House Republican leadership doesn't have time for human rights.

As I have said before, with this amendment we have an opportunity to provide answers to thousands of families who have waited for years to learn the fates of their loved ones and help

close this troubling chapter in Argentina's history. To reject my amendment would have been one thing, but to silence it entirely is unconscionable.

The majority's handling of this issue is irresponsible and shameful. I urge opposition to this rule so these critical facts can be made clear for our country and for Argentina.

□ 1310

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's amendment, I believe, was made in order in 2001 when it was Democratically controlled—and it failed in the House. In fiscal year 2012, the Rules Committee actually made the amendment in order but the gentleman failed to submit it on the House floor.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. If the fact that something failed in one year allows that it's not to be brought up another year, then we would be out of business around this joint. But if my colleague is seeking me to yield, I understand your point in the end, but I just want to say that Mr. HINCHEY should have had an opportunity to make his presentation.

Mr. NUGENT. If the gentleman would yield, I understand his position as it relates to something that occurred 30 or 40 years ago. But last year he didn't even offer it. It was made in order during the fiscal year, and he didn't even offer it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Well, he offered it now and we didn't accept it. Therefore, perhaps he'll get another chance.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), with whom I served on the Intelligence Committee for 8 years.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule which covers, in part, the Intelligence authorization debate.

I want to address not what the bill contains, but what it does not. It does not contain any prohibition on the executive branch using drones to target American citizens for death. I offered a commonsense proposal to address this matter, but the Rules Committee declined to allow it to come to the floor for a vote.

Also missing from this bill is any kind of protection for national security whistleblowers who seek to report waste, fraud, abuse, or criminal conduct to the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. I offered a proposal to address that problem, expanding on language from a whistleblower provision that passed this House in 2002 as part of the bill creating the Homeland Security Department—a proposal that likewise was blocked from being considered on the floor.

Finally, among other things, this bill contains no provision to tell Americans in simple raw numbers how many Americans have had our private communications intercepted by the government over the past several years. Just the number is all we were asking for. That proposal as well was blocked from floor consideration.

The Intelligence authorization bill should never serve simply as a rubber stamp for funding and programs that the intelligence community wishes. This committee, the Intelligence Committee, was created to provide oversight of that community, particularly for the most controversial programs and practices. The bill before us today fails on those counts, which is why the rule and the bill should be opposed.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, my good friend, Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill, H.R. 5854, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Act, as related to project labor agreements. This bill would prohibit the use of project labor agreements. It takes away the ability of the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, and the Arlington National Cemetery to use a project labor agreement business model to determine what would be the most optimal and effective way to build construction projects.

Currently, all of these agencies have two choices: either ''yes'' to use a project labor agreement or ''no'' to not use a project labor agreement. The bill before us eliminates the choice for these agencies in seeking the most effective and efficient use of taxpayers' money to perform construction projects in the best interest of our brave men and women.

By banning project labor agreements it would contribute to delays in new construction and add more cost to the projects. If we want smart government, then I encourage all of my colleagues to vote ''no.'' And without passage of the Grimm amendment, I would oppose both the rule and the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friends on the other side, remember that that's an open rule. If you don't like a portion of it, then amend it. Bring an amendment to the floor. I know they're confused about that, and I know they didn't have it in the 111th Congress, but in this Congress you have the ability to amend it.

No piece of legislation is perfect. That's why you have the ability for amendments. So I would encourage my friends on the other side, or any Member, Republican or Democrat alike, if they want to see something different, amend it. That's the beauty of this.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to require that immediately after we adopt this resolution, the House will consider H.R. 1519, the Paycheck Fairness Act, introduced by my friend, Ms. DELAURO. And I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut, my friend, Ms. DELAURO.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to the previous question. Defeating the previous question will allow the gentleman from Florida to amend the rule to include consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act, an act that addresses the financial pressures facing women today and the need to close the gender wage gap.

Almost 50 years after Congress passed the Equal Pay Act to end the ''serious and endemic'' problem of unequal wages, women—now one-half of the workforce—are still making only 77 cents on the dollar as compared to men. This holds true across occupations and education levels.

Some have called unequal pay a ''myth'' or a ''distraction.'' It is neither. Women should be paid the same as men for the same work. That is what paycheck fairness is all about—same job, same pay.

Yesterday, the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee heard from two women affected by pay discrimination—Ann Marie Duchon and Terri Kelly. Both women were eloquent in sharing their stories of fighting for 7 years to see that their pay and equity was remedied.

And like the nearly-two thirds of women today who are either a breadwinner or co-breadwinner, both women said that their families depend and rely on their income. Pay discrimination not only affects them, but their children and their husbands.

Pay inequity is at the root of the financial pressures facing women today. It is critical that we pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. Take steps to stop discrimination in the first place by putting an end to pay secrecy, strengthen workers' abilities to challenge discrimination, and bring the equal pay law into line with other civil rights law. The House has passed the bill twice on a bipartisan basis. Let's do it again.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California, my friend, Mr. MILLER.

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

I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and amend this rule to allow consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act. This bill is critical to women and families, and its time

has come. It's not only about basic fairness for women—getting equal pay for equal work. It's also an economic issue for families. Getting paid less for just being a woman means fewer resources to pay the mortgage or to put food on the table.

Today, women earn 23 percent less than men do for doing the same job. But those women don't get a 23 percent cut in their health care costs. They don't get 23 percent off their rent. They don't get 23 percent off their grocery bill. But they do get 23 percent off their paycheck.

It's outrageous that this Congress is not doing all it can to eliminate pay discrimination, and it's outrageous today that American corporations have as a matter of their business plan to pay women less than they pay men for the identical jobs, identical responsibilities, identical education, and identical experience.

□ 1320

Corporations have made a decision that they will pay those women less, and that's why women earn only 77 cents for every $1 that their male counterparts earn for doing the same job.

Congress ought to let us take up this bill and get rid of this inequity to America's women, women who are working to support their families and to provide for their families.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you advise again how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) with whom I served, again I say, on the Intelligence Committee for 8 years.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would help end the pay disparity between men and women in the workplace. You heard that women earn 77 percent of what men earn; that's the average. But for African American women, it's 62 percent, and Latinas, it's only 53 percent. In Illinois, as a group, full-time working women lose approximately $21 billion a year due to the wage gap. If the Illinois wage gap, which amounts to nearly $12,000 a year, were eliminated, a working woman in Illinois would have enough money for approximately 108 more weeks of food, 7 more months of mortgage and utility payments, 14 more months of rent, 36 more months of family health insurance premiums, and over 3,000 additional gallons of gasoline.

American families and our economy are paying the price of this wage discrimination, and it is time to end it. I urge all my colleagues who support fairness, who support women, to support the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 1 minute to another of my classmates, the gentlewoman, my good friend from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question and the consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act to correct a terrible injustice where women are systematically paid less than men for doing the same work.

On average, women receive 77 cents for every dollar paid to male workers. This disparity means a loss of nearly $11,000 a year, or the equivalent of 4 months of groceries, 5 months of child care, and over 6 months of rent and utilities.

The wage gap is even more pronounced for black and Latina women, who receive just 62 cents and 54 cents, respectively, for every dollar paid to white men. It is unbelievable that in the 21st century, wage discrimination against women remains so rampant in a Nation that values family and fairness so highly.

In good conscience, how can this House do nothing while our wives, daughters, mothers, and grandmothers are discriminated against in the workplace? Don't they deserve equal pay for equal work and the opportunity for a better life?

I urge my Republican colleagues to do the right thing and help pass the Paycheck Fairness Act to fulfill our Nation's promise of fairness, equality, and justice for all.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who is my good friend and also has served on these committees for a long time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. HASTINGS for his leadership and for yielding, and also to Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO for her relentless leadership on the Paycheck Fairness Act and also as the ranking member of the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee.

I rise to support the Paycheck Fairness Act. It's totally unacceptable that in 2012 women continue to be blatantly discriminated against in the workplace in terms of equal pay for equal work. This is just downright wrong. It contributes to the economic insecurity of women, also of children and of men.

In 2011, African American women earned 62 cents to every dollar earned by white males, and for Latinas, it was 62 cents per dollar. This discrimination against women of color and all women must end.

Now it's been nearly 50 years since the passage of the Equal Pay Act, but at the rate we're going, if we continue to do nothing, women will not have pay equity until the year 2056. So we need a comprehensive solution to this historical and systemic discriminatory practice, and that is what Congresswoman DELAURO has introduced.

So I urge consideration and passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act. Women deserve economic justice.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) with whom I served on the Intelligence Committee for 8 years.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The Paycheck Fairness Act deserves attention, and it deserves attention now. We passed the Lilly Ledbetter Act very quickly because it was essential. It shows that this House can work together when it wants to. We kept the courthouse doors open for recourse for pay discrimination. More has to be done to prevent that discrimination from happening in the first place.

My mother worked split shifts when we were growing up. My father worked sometimes two jobs, but his income was limited. Every dollar my mother brought home was critical to our family and to our household, and that's true in so many households across this country today.

A household's bills don't go down by $10,000 just because a woman is treated unfairly and paid less. The clothing bills don't go down; the gas bills don't go down; the food bills don't go down. So it's important that we get this bill moving at this point in time.

The Paycheck Fairness Act reasserts the principle that women should get equal pay for equal work. It holds employers accountable if they discriminate. It puts an end to pay secrecy so women will be able to determine whether or not they are getting treated fairly. And it prohibits retaliation for someone who wants to talk about paycheck fairness.

This bill is important for families across this country. It deserves attention. I urge my colleagues to take it up now and pass it.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask of my good friend from Florida whether he intends at this time to have any additional speakers other than himself?

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to close.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I do and will urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question.

But at this time, I will close by saying our future economy, national security, and way of life depend on harnessing the power of scientific advancement, technological progress, and clean energy. And in this respect, America has no peers in the world. These efforts will enable us to reduce our dependence on oil, develop better energy infrastructure, and mitigate the effects of climate change. At the same time, we have to ensure our frontline homeland security resources are adequately funded and sufficiently prepared to meet new challenges.

We cannot be distracted by ideological poison pill amendments on abortion. We cannot be dissuaded from making the necessary investments because of false claims that we cannot afford them. And we cannot be so willing to sacrifice our Nation's future prosperity to fund more tax cuts for the wealthiest—and I continue to say, including those of us in Congress, the wealthiest Americans—and more nuclear weapons for the military.

These appropriations measures are Congress's best opportunity to set our Nation's priorities and to invest in our economy. Continually defunding these programs is the opposite direction of where we need to go. We must provide the funds necessary to make the advances that will ensure America's continuing global leadership.

□ 1330

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to defeat the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This is a responsible use as relates to a budget that we passed in this House. These appropriations bills live within the confines of the budget that was passed within this House. Now, I can't say that's always been the case here. As we look back over the last 4 years prior to my coming here, that was definitely not the case in regards to living within a budget, living within our means.

Mr. Speaker, I've heard some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle complain about certain provisions in the underlying appropriations bills. Once again, I'd just like to remind our colleagues this is not the 111th Congress that you're used to. The beauty is that you have an open amendment process, one that did not exist in the last Congress. So you can offer whatever amendment you want as it relates to any of these issues—strike it, defund it, do whatever you want to it. You can do that on this floor. That's why we have the open amendment process.

Remember, it's different than it was in the 111th Congress—at least that's what I've read. You know, you get to vote on the issues that are important to the American people. I hope that anyone who opposes any one of the underlying bills will join me in supporting this rule because it gives you the ability to actually amend it and craft it in a way that you think is best for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and encourage my colleagues to support it as well. We're talking about issues today that already have bipartisan agreement. You hear those on the other side of the aisle talk about issues that are in these appropriations bills, but they passed out of committee unanimously. Democrats and Republicans alike all voted for it unanimously to pass those out of committee. That's pretty telling in regards to what's contained within the appropriations bill. So I can't say it enough: they were passed out of committee unanimously, Democrats and Republicans alike, without dissension.

We're talking about funding the Federal Government, something that is fundamental to what we do, something that we have to do as a Member of Congress. And we're doing it in a fiscally responsible way that provides for our government, our veterans, our Homeland Security, and our intelligence community, while simultaneously taking steps to reduce Federal spending, which is what we have to do.

I commend the Appropriations and Select Intelligence Committees for their diligent, bipartisan work on these four underlying pieces of legislation. I commend Chairman DREIER and my fellow Rules Committee members on bringing these bills to the floor in an open process.

I know that my good friend from Florida likes the open process. We hear about it every time we have a Rules Committee meeting about the open process and the ability to amend it on the floor. "Let the House work its will" is what we talk about, and we have that opportunity. While some may not know how to do that because they just haven't had the experience, we're all in this together. We're learning as we go along what that open process means and allowing Democrats and Republicans alike to come to the floor and debate the issues that they want to make a piece of underlying legislation better.

That's what's good about this whole system. We know it can be better, and we're making sure that the House does work its will in allowing these amendments.

Mr. Speaker, it's about changing how we do business in this House, and we're taking one of the first steps in doing this through our appropriations process and having an open process to allow the ability to submit amendments on the House floor to make all of these pieces of legislation better. That's the goal. I know that's the goal on both sides of the aisle when they submit these amendments—I hope that is. We'll see how the House works its will on all of the amendments.

So I support this resolution, I support the open process, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. If they want to make a bill better, then offer the amendments on the floor on the three appropriations bills that you have the ability to do it on. Under the structured bill, there are already seven Democratic amendments made in order and two Republican.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 667 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause (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. 1519) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, 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 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 4 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry,

asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 667, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 3541.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 180, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—233

Adams
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
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
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
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
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—180

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

NOT VOTING—18

Aderholt
Burton (IN)
Davis (KY)
Doyle
Ellison
Fortenberry
Guinta
Heinrich
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Mack
McCarthy (CA)
Pascrell
Rangel
Roby
Slaughter
Velázquez
Young (FL)

□ 1359

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, HONDA, LYNCH, GARAMENDI, and Ms. SEWELL changed their votes from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 166, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—246

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

Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
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
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—166

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

NOT VOTING—19

Burton (IN)
Davis (KY)
Doyle
Ellison
Fortenberry
Guinta
Heinrich
Johnson (GA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Mack
McCarthy (CA)
Pascrell
Pelosi
Rangel
Roby
Slaughter
Velázquez
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1406

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.

PRENATAL NONDISCRIMINATION ACT (PRENDA) OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3541) to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or race, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 168, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—246

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
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
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—168

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján