

have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as minority whip the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable STENY HOYER, and as assistant Democratic leader, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable JAMES CLYBURN.

ELECTING OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1

Resolved That Karen L. Haas of the State of Maryland; be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Paul D. Irving of the State of Florida be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Daniel J. Strodel of the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, chosen Chief administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; and

That Father Patrick J. Conroy of the State of Oregon, be, and is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the resolution, but before offering the amendment, I request that there be a division of the question on the resolution so that we may have a separate vote on the Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The question will be divided.

The question is on agreeing to that portion of the resolution providing for the election of the Chaplain.

That portion of the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the remainder of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECERRA:

That Catlin W. O'Neill of the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Diane Dewhirst of the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives; and

That Richard Meltzer of the State of Illinois be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remainder of the resolution offered by the gentlewoman from Washington.

The remainder of the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now swear in the officers of the House.

The officers presented themselves in the well of the House and took the oath of office as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations.

TO INFORM THE SENATE THAT A QUORUM OF THE HOUSE HAS ASSEMBLED AND OF THE ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Senate be informed that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that John A. Boehner, a Representative from the State of Ohio, has been elected Speaker; and that Karen L. Haas, a citizen of the State of Maryland, has been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPOINT A COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 3

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1420

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 4

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected John A. Boehner, a Representative from the State of Ohio as Speaker, and Karen L. Haas, a citizen of the State of Maryland as Clerk, of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 5

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, with amendments to the standing rules as provided in section 2, and with other orders as provided in sections 3, 4, and 5.

SEC. 2. CHANGES TO THE STANDING RULES.

(a) COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS.—In clause 1(d) of rule XI—

(1) in subparagraph (1), strike “the 30th day after June 1 and December 1” and insert “January 2 of each year” and strike “semi-annual”;

(2) in subparagraph (2)(B), insert “in each Congress” after “first such report”; and

(3) in subparagraph (3), strike “second or fourth semiannual”.

(b) VOTING.—

(1) In clause 6 of rule XVIII—

(A) in subparagraph (b)(3), strike “five minutes” and insert “not less than two minutes”; and

(B) amend paragraph (g) to read as follows:

“(g) The Chair may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment. The Chair may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. The Chair may reduce to not less than two minutes the minimum time for electronic voting—

“(1) on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes; or

“(2) on any postponed question taken without intervening debate or motion after the Committee of the Whole resumes its sitting if in the discretion of the Chair Members would be afforded an adequate opportunity to vote.”.

(2) In rule XX—

(A) amend clause 8(c) to read as follows:

“(c) The Speaker may reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on a question postponed under this clause, or on a question incidental thereto, that—

“(1) follows another electronic vote without intervening business, so long as the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions is 15 minutes; or

“(2) follows a report from the Committee of the Whole without intervening debate or motion if in the discretion of the Speaker Members would be afforded an adequate opportunity to vote.”; and

(B) amend clause 9 to read as follows:

“9. The Speaker may reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting—

“(a) on any question arising without intervening business after an electronic vote on another question if notice of possible five-minute voting for a given series of votes was issued before the preceding electronic vote;

“(b) on any question arising after a report from the Committee of the Whole without debate or intervening motion; or

“(c) on the question of adoption of a motion to recommit (or ordering the previous question thereon) arising without intervening motion or debate other than debate on the motion.”.

(c) CLARIFICATIONS IN RULE X.—In clause 1 of rule X—

(1) in paragraph (j)(2), strike “Organization and administration” and insert “Organization, administration, and general management”; and

(2) in paragraph (m)(9), strike “Insular possessions” and insert “Insular areas”.

(d) MODIFICATION OF THE RAMSEYER RULE.—In clause 3(e)(1)(B) of rule XIII, insert “and adjacent provisions if useful to enable the intent and effect of the amendment to be clearly understood,” before “showing”.

(e) CHANGES TO THE CODE OF CONDUCT AND THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—

(1) In clause 3(b)(8) of rule XI—

(A) amend subdivision (A)(ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) upon the day of such decision or vote, make a public statement that the matter, relating to the referral made by the board of the Office of Congressional Ethics regarding the Member, officer, or employee of the House who is the subject of the applicable referral, has been extended.”; and

(B) in subdivision (B)(ii)—

(i) strike “the committee votes to extend the matter” and insert “the matter is extended”; and

(ii) strike “the committee has voted to extend the matter” and insert “the matter has been extended”.

(2) In clause 8(c) of rule XXIII—

(A) strike “spouse” in each place it appears and insert (in each instance) “relative”;

(B) in subparagraph (2), strike “One Hundred Seventh Congress” and insert “One Hundred Thirteenth Congress”; and

(C) add the following new subparagraph:

“(3) As used in this paragraph, the term ‘relative’ means an individual who is related to the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner as father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece, husband, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, stepsister, half brother, half sister, grandson, or granddaughter.”.

(3) In clause 13 of rule XXIII, strike “Copies of the executed oath (or affirmation) shall be retained by the Clerk as part of the records of the House.” and insert “Copies of the executed oath (or affirmation) shall be retained as part of the records of the House, in the case of a Member, Delegate, or the Resident Commissioner, by the Clerk, and in the case of an officer or employee of the House, by the Sergeant-at-Arms.”.

(4) In clause 15 of rule XXIII—

(A) in paragraph (a), strike “paragraph (b)” and insert “paragraphs (b) and (c)”;

(B) in paragraph (b)—

(i) amend subparagraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) the flight consists of the personal use of an aircraft by a Member, Delegate, or the Resident Commissioner that is supplied by—
“(A) an individual on the basis of personal friendship; or

“(B) another Member, Delegate, or the Resident Commissioner.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (4), strike the period and insert “; or”; and

(iii) add the following:

“(5) the owner or operator of the aircraft is paid a pro rata share of the fair market value of the normal and usual charter fare or rental charge for a comparable plane of comparable size as determined by dividing such cost by the number of Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner, officers, or employees of Congress on the flight.”; and

(C) redesignate paragraph (c) as paragraph (d) and insert after paragraph (b) the following new paragraph:

“(C) An advance written request for a waiver of the restriction in paragraph (a) may be granted jointly by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ethics, subject to such conditions as they may prescribe.”.

(f) TECHNICAL AND CLARIFYING CHANGES.—

(1) In clause 12(b)(2) of rule I, strike “Chair of the Committee of the Whole” and insert “chair of the Committee of the Whole”.

(2) In clause 6(c)(4) of rule II, before “the Committee on House Administration” insert “the Committee on Appropriations and”.

(3) In rule V—

(A) in clause 1, strike “telecommunications” each place it appears and insert (in each instance) “communications”;

(B) in clause 2(a), strike “recording of the proceedings” and insert “recording of the floor proceedings”; and

(C) in clause 2(c)(1), strike “political purpose” and insert “partisan political campaign purpose”.

(4) In clause 2(b) of rule XI, strike “unless otherwise provided by written rule adopted by the committee” and insert “if notice is given pursuant to paragraph (g)(3)”.

(5) In clause 2(c)(2) of rule XI, before the last sentence, insert “Such notice shall also be made publicly available in electronic form and shall be deemed to satisfy paragraph (g)(3)(A)(ii).”.

(6) In clause 2(e)(1)(A)(ii) of rule XI, strike “record vote is demanded” and insert “record vote is taken”.

(7) In clause 2(e)(2)(A) of rule XI, strike “all committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files” and insert “all committee records (including hearings, data, charts, and files)”.

(8) In clause 2(1) of rule XI—

(A) strike “that member shall be entitled” and insert “all members shall be entitled”; and

(B) strike “to file such views, in writing and signed by that member,” and insert “to file such written and signed views”.

(9) In clause 3(h) of rule XI—

(A) strike “(h)(1)” and insert “(h)”; and

(B) redesignate subdivisions (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(10) In clause 6(g) of rule XIII, strike “it shall (to the maximum extent possible) specify in the resolution the object of” and insert “it shall to the maximum extent possible specify in the accompanying report”.

(11) In clause 2 of rule XV, strike “standing” each place it appears.

(12) In clause 6 of rule XV, add the following new paragraph:

“(d) Precedents, rulings, or procedures in effect before the One Hundred Eleventh Congress regarding the priority of business and the availability of other business on Wednesday shall be applied only to the extent consistent with this clause.”.

(13) In clause 5(c)(3)(B) of rule XX, after “Minority Leader” each place it appears insert (in each instance) “(or their respective designees)”.

(14) In clause 8(a)(1) of rule XXII—

(A) in subdivision (A), after “in the Congressional Record” insert “or pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXIX”; and

(B) in subdivision (B), before “copies” insert “printed or electronic”.

(15) In clause 2 of rule XXIV, strike “Clerk” and insert “Chief Administrative Officer”.

(16) In clause 1 of rule XXVI, strike the second sentence.

SEC. 3. SEPARATE ORDERS.

(a) INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 1899A(d) of the Social Security Act shall not apply in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(b) BUDGET MATTERS.—

(1) During the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, references in section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to a resolution shall be construed in the House of Representatives as references to a joint resolution.

(2) During the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, in the case of a reported bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to a special order of business, a point of order under section 303 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be determined on the basis of the text made in order as an original bill or joint resolution for the purpose of amendment or to the text on which the previous question is ordered directly to passage, as the case may be.

(3) During the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, a provision in a bill or joint resolution, or in an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, that establishes prospectively for a Federal office or position a specified or minimum level of compensation to be funded by annual discretionary appropriations shall not be considered as providing new entitlement authority within the meaning of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(4)(A) During the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, except as provided in subparagraph (C), a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report a bill to the House shall not be in order if the bill, as amended, exceeds an applicable allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as estimated by the Committee on the Budget.

(B) If a point of order under subparagraph (A) is sustained, the Chair shall put the question: “Shall the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted notwithstanding that the bill exceeds its allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974?”. Such question shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent of the question and an opponent but shall be decided without intervening motion.

(C) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply—

(i) to a motion offered under clause 2(d) of rule XXI; or

(ii) after disposition of a question under subparagraph (B) on a given bill.

(D) If a question under subparagraph (B) is decided in the negative, no further amendment shall be in order except—

(i) one proper amendment, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes 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; and

(ii) pro forma amendments, if offered by the chair or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees, for the purpose of debate.

(5) During the first session of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014, the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 112, One Hundred

Twelfth Congress, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress has adopted such concurrent resolution, and the allocations of spending authority printed in tables 11 and 12 of House Report 112-421 (One Hundred Twelfth Congress) shall be considered for all purposes in the House to be the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) DETERMINATIONS FOR PAYGO ACTS.—In determining the budgetary effects of any legislation for the purposes of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (including the required designation in PAYGO Acts), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may make adjustments to take into account the exemptions and adjustments set forth in section 503(b)(1) of House Concurrent Resolution 112, One Hundred Twelfth Congress.

(d) SPENDING REDUCTION AMENDMENTS IN APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.—

(1) During the reading of a general appropriation bill for amendment in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, it shall be in order to consider en bloc amendments proposing only to transfer appropriations from an object or objects in the bill to a spending reduction account. When considered en bloc under this paragraph, such amendments may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment (following disposition of any points of order against such portions) and are not subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (1), it shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a spending reduction account in the House or in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

(3) It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriation bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill (unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI).

(4) A point of order under clause 2(b) of rule XXI shall not apply to a spending reduction account.

(5) A general appropriation bill may not be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union unless it includes a spending reduction account as the last section of the bill. An order to report a general appropriation bill to the House shall constitute authority for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations to add such a section to the bill or modify the figure contained therein.

(6) For purposes of this subsection, the term “spending reduction account” means an account in a general appropriation bill that bears that caption and contains only a recitation of the amount by which an applicable allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of new budget authority proposed by the bill.

(e) ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) It shall not be in order to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, unless it contains a separate heading entitled “Direct Spending”, which shall include a category for “Means-Tested Direct Spending” and a category for “Nonmeans-Tested Direct Spending” and sets forth—

(A) the average rate of growth for each category in the total amount of outlays during the 10-year period preceding the budget year;

(B) estimates for each such category under current law for the period covered by the concurrent resolution; and

(C) information on proposed reforms in such categories.

(2) Before the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget by the Committee on the Budget for a fiscal year, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record a description of programs which shall be considered means-tested direct spending and nonmeans-tested direct spending for purposes of this subsection.

(f) CERTAIN SUBCOMMITTEES.—Notwithstanding clause 5(d) of rule X, during the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services may have not more than seven subcommittees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have not more than seven subcommittees; and

(3) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure may have not more than six subcommittees.

(g) EXERCISE FACILITIES FOR FORMER MEMBERS.—During the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress—

(1) The House of Representatives may not provide access to any exercise facility which is made available exclusively to Members and former Members, officers and former officers of the House of Representatives, and their spouses to any former Member, former officer, or spouse who is a lobbyist registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or any successor statute or agent of a foreign principal as defined in clause 5 of rule XXV. For purposes of this section, the term “Member” includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress.

(2) The Committee on House Administration shall promulgate regulations to carry out this subsection.

(h) NUMBERING OF BILLS.—In the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, the first 10 numbers for bills (H.R. 1 through H.R. 10) shall be reserved for assignment by the Speaker and the second 10 numbers for bills (H.R. 11 through H.R. 20) shall be reserved for assignment by the Minority Leader.

(i) INCLUSION OF UNITED STATES CODE CITATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable and consistent with established drafting conventions, an instruction in a bill or joint resolution proposing to repeal or amend any law or part thereof not contained in a codified title of the United States Code shall include, if available, the applicable United States Code citation in parenthesis immediately following the designation of the matter proposed to be repealed or amended.

(j) DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—

(1) The chair of a committee may request that the Government Accountability Office perform a duplication analysis of any bill or joint resolution referred to that committee. Any such analysis shall assess whether, and the extent to which, the bill or joint resolution creates a new Federal program, office, or initiative that duplicates or overlaps with any existing Federal program, office, or initiative.

(2) The report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution shall include a statement, as though under clause 3(c) of rule XIII, indicating whether any provision of the measure establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program. The statement shall at a minimum explain whether—

(A) any such program was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111-139; or

(B) the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, published pursuant to the Federal Program Information Act (Public Law 95-220, as amended by Public Law 98-169), identified other programs related to the program established or reauthorized by the measure.

(k) DISCLOSURE OF DIRECTED RULE MAKINGS.—

(1) The report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution shall include a statement, as though under clause 3(c) of rule XIII, estimating the number of directed rule makings required by the measure.

(2) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term “directed rule making” means a specific rule making within the meaning of section 551 of title 5, United States Code, specifically directed to be completed by a provision in the measure, but does not include a grant of discretionary rule making authority.

SEC. 4. COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS, AND HOUSE OFFICES.

(a) LITIGATION MATTERS.—

(1) CONTINUING AUTHORITY FOR THE BIPARTISAN LEGAL ADVISORY GROUP.—

(A) The House authorizes the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress—

(i) to act as successor in interest to the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress with respect to civil actions in which it intervened in the One Hundred Twelfth Congress to defend the constitutionality of section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act (1 U.S.C. 7) or related provisions of titles 10, 31, and 38, United States Code, including in the case of Windsor v. United States, 833 F. Supp.2d 394 (S.D.N.Y. June 6, 2012), aff'd, 699 F.3d 169 (2d Cir. Oct. 18, 2012), cert. granted, No. 12-307 (Dec. 7, 2012), cert. pending No. 12-63 (July 16, 2012) and 12-785 (Dec. 28, 2012);

(ii) to take such steps as may be appropriate to ensure continuation of such civil actions; and

(iii) to intervene in other cases that involve a challenge to the constitutionality of section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act or related provisions of titles 10, 31, and 38, United States Code.

(B) Pursuant to clause 8 of rule II, the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group continues to speak for, and articulate the institutional position of, the House in all litigation matters in which it appears, including in Windsor v. United States.

(2) CONTINUING AUTHORITIES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM AND THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL.—

(A) The House authorizes—

(i) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress to act as the successor in interest to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress with respect to the civil action Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, United States House of Representatives v. Eric H. Holder, Jr., in his official capacity as Attorney General of the United States, filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in the One Hundred Twelfth Congress pursuant to House Resolution 706; and

(ii) the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (when elected), on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Office of General Counsel to take such steps as may be appropriate to ensure continuation of such civil action, including amending the complaint as circumstances may warrant.

(B) The House authorizes the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (when elected), on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and until such committee has adopted rules pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI, to issue subpoenas related to the investigation into the United States Department of Justice operation known as “Fast and Furious” and related matters.

(C) The House authorizes the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (when elected), on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Office of General Counsel to petition to join as a party to the civil action referenced in paragraph (1) any individual subpoenaed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress as part of its investigation into the United States Department of Justice operation known as "Fast and Furious" and related matters who failed to comply with such subpoena, or any successor to such individual.

(D) The House authorizes the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (when elected), on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Office of General Counsel, at the authorization of the Speaker after consultation with the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, to initiate judicial proceedings concerning the enforcement of subpoenas issued to such individuals.

(b) HOUSE DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP.—House Resolution 24, One Hundred Tenth Congress, shall apply in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress in the same manner as such resolution applied in the One Hundred Tenth Congress except that the commission concerned shall be known as the House Democracy Partnership.

(c) TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION.—Sections 1 through 7 of House Resolution 1451, One Hundred Tenth Congress, shall apply in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress in the same manner as such provisions applied in the One Hundred Tenth Congress, except that—

(1) the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission may, in addition to collaborating closely with other professional staff members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, collaborate closely with professional staff members of other relevant committees; and

(2) the resources of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which the Commission may use shall include all resources which the Committee is authorized to obtain from other offices of the House of Representatives.

(d) OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS.—Section 1 of House Resolution 895, One Hundred Tenth Congress, shall apply in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress in the same manner as such provision applied in the One Hundred Tenth Congress, except that—

(1) the Office of Congressional Ethics shall be treated as a standing committee of the House for purposes of section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i));

(2) references to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall be construed as references to the Committee on Ethics;

(3) the second sentence of section 1(b)(6)(A) shall not apply; and

(4) members subject to section 1(b)(6)(B) may be reappointed for a second additional term.

(e) EMPANELING INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.—The text of House Resolution 451, One Hundred Tenth Congress, shall apply in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress in the same manner as such provision applied in the One Hundred Tenth Congress.

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS.

(a) READING OF THE CONSTITUTION.—The Speaker may recognize a Member for the Reading of the Constitution on any legislative day through January 15, 2013.

(b) MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES.—It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of January 4, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend

the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure addressing flood insurance.

Mr. CANTOR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO REFER

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a motion that is at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Norton moves to refer the resolution to a select committee of five members, to be appointed by the Speaker, not more than three of whom shall be from the same political party, with instructions not to report back the same until it has conducted a full and complete study of, and made a determination on, whether there is any reason to deny Delegates voting rights in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union in light of the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in Michel v. Anderson (14 F.3d 623 (D.C. Cir. 1994)) upholding the constitutionality of these voting rights, and the inclusion of such voting rights in the Rules for the 103rd, 110th and 111th Congresses.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to table at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cantor moves to lay on the table the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 187, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Cassidy	Fleischmann
Alexander	Chabot	Fleming
Amash	Chaffetz	Flores
Amodei	Coble	Forbes
Bachmann	Coffman	Fortenberry
Bachus	Cole	Fox
Barietta	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Barr	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Barton	Conaway	Gardner
Benishek	Cook	Garrett
Bentivolio	Cotton	Gerlach
Bilirakis	Cramer	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Crawford	Gibson
Black	Crenshaw	Gingrey (GA)
Blackburn	Culberson	Gohmert
Bonner	Daines	Goodlatte
Boustany	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Bridenstine	Denham	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Granger
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Broun (GA)	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Bucshon	Duffy	Griffith (VA)
Burgess	Duncan (SC)	Guthrie
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Hall
Camp	Ellmers	Hanna
Campbell	Emerson	Harper
Cantor	Farenthold	Harris
Capito	Fincher	Hartzler
Carter	Fitzpatrick	Hastings (WA)

Heck (NV)	Messer	Scalise
Hensarling	Mica	Schock
Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Schweikert
Holding	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin
Hudson	Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner
Huelskamp	Mullin	Sessions
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Shimkus
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Shuster
Hunter	Noem	Simpson
Hurt	Nugent	Smith (NE)
Issa	Nunes	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins	Nunnelee	Smith (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Southerland
Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Stewart
Jordan	Paulsen	Stivers
Joyce	Pearce	Stockman
Kelly	Petri	Stutzman
King (IA)	Pittenger	Terry
King (NY)	Pitts	Thompson (PA)
Kingston	Poe (TX)	Thornberry
Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Tiberi
Kline	Posey	Tipton
Labrador	Price (GA)	Turner
LaMalfa	Radel	Upton
Lamborn	Reed	Valadao
Lance	Reichert	Wagner
Lankford	Renacci	Walberg
Latham	Ribble	Walden
Latta	Rice (SC)	Walorski
LoBiondo	Rigell	Weber (TX)
Long	Roby	Webster (FL)
Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Wenstrup
Lummis	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
Marino	Rogers (MI)	Williams
Massie	Rokita	Wilson (SC)
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Wittman
McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf
McClintock	Roskam	Womack
McHenry	Ross	Woodall
McKeon	Rothfus	Yoder
McKinley	Royce	Yoho
McMorris	Runyan	Young (AK)
Rodgers	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)
Meehan	Salmon	Young (IN)

NAYS—187

Andrews	Engel	Lujan, Ben Ray
Barber	Enyart	(NM)
Barrow	Eshoo	Lynch
Beatty	Esty	Maffei
Becerra	Farr	Maloney,
Bera	Fattah	Carolyn
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Bishop (NY)	Frankel (FL)	Markey
Bonamici	Fudge	Matheson
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	McCarthy (NY)
Braley (IA)	Gallego	McCollum
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	McDermott
Brownley (CA)	Garcia	McGovern
Bustos	Grayson	McNerney
Butterfield	Green, Al	Meeks
Capps	Green, Gene	Michaud
Capuano	Hahn	Miller, George
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	Moore
Carney	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Cartwright	Higgins	Nadler
Castor (FL)	Himes	Napolitano
Castro (TX)	Hinojosa	Neal
Chu	Chabot	Holt
Cicilline	Honda	O'Rourke
Clarke	Horsford	Owens
Clay	Hoyer	Pallone
Cleaver	Huffman	Pascrell
Clyburn	Israel	Pastor (AZ)
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Payne
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Cooper	Kaptur	Peters (CA)
Costa	Keating	Peters (MI)
Courtney	Kennedy	Peterson
Crowley	Kildee	Pingree (ME)
Cuellar	Kilmer	Pocan
Cummings	Kind	Polis
Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)
Davis, Danny	Kuster	Quigley
DeFazio	Langevin	Rahall
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rangel
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Richmond
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
DelBene	Levin	Ruppersberger
Deutch	Lipinski	Rush
Dingell	Loeback	Ryan (OH)
Doggett	Lofgren	Sánchez, Linda
Doyle	Lowenthal	T.
Duckworth	Lowe	Sanchez, Loretta
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Sarbanes
Ellison	(NM)	Schakowsky

Schiff	Smith (WA)	Vela
Schneider	Speier	Velázquez
Schwartz	Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky
Scott (VA)	Takano	Walz
Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Sewell (AL)	Tierney	Waters
Shea-Porter	Titus	Watt
Sherman	Tonko	Waxman
Sinema	Tsongas	Welch
Sires	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Slaughter	Veasey	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Bass	Jones	Mulvaney
Brady (TX)	Lucas	Negrete McLeod
Grijalva	Matsui	Perry
Grimm	McIntyre	Rohrabacher
Gutierrez	Meadows	Schrader
Jeffries	Meng	Van Hollen

□ 1457

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. JOYCE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 3 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall No. 3 on January 3, 2013. I was with my family and unable to make it to the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield the hour to the gentleman from Texas, the chair of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER). During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to sponsor House Resolution 5, the rules package for the 113th Congress. This rules package is straight-forward and builds upon the reforms and transparency implemented in the 112th Congress to address job creation and the economy, control the growth of government, and limit wasteful spending.

We have incorporated a number of significant improvements, including a proposal from the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, JAMES LANKFORD, the gentleman from Oklahoma, to identify duplicative programs and examine the usefulness of existing government programs. This will help ensure that hardworking taxpayers' dollars are not wasted and that we re-

main focused on making the Federal Government smarter and more efficient.

Similarly, two proposals from the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman JUSTIN AMASH, will improve transparency of the legislative process by making it easier to see how proposed legislation would interact with existing law. Additional proposals from the Republican Study Committee chairman, STEVE SCALISE, the gentleman from Louisiana, will help bring more transparency to the regulatory process.

American families and small businessmen and -women already suffer from too much red tape coming out of Washington. This proposal will ensure that the regulatory burden of any proposed bill is part of our deliberations.

Under the current administration, Madam Speaker, we have also seen an explosion in spending for welfare programs. For the first time, we will require our annual budget resolutions include information about the growth of means-tested and non-means-tested entitlement programs. This important reform will allow us to begin to responsibly control the growth of these welfare programs and ensure they can help those who need them most.

I look forward to a productive 113th Congress where we can work together to produce results and make life work for more Americans.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by congratulating my colleague, Mr. SESSIONS, on his new role as chair of the Rules Committee. I've worked with Mr. SESSIONS now for many years, and I look forward to working with him even more closely in the months and years to come. And we will welcome the new class of legislators, as well, today, and we go through the traditions and procedures that have governed our Nation since Thomas Jefferson first wrote his manual.

I'm pleased to welcome our newest colleagues and welcome back old friends. It's a great honor to be chosen by our fellow Americans to represent them in Congress. Our neighbors have placed their trust in us, and we must never take such an honor for granted. With this honor comes a solemn responsibility. Starting today, we have the opportunity to move our Nation forward, and in the words of our Nation's Founders provide for our common defense, promote our general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and for our posterity.

Our work begins today, and one of the first orders of business is considering the rules package for the incoming Congress. During the last Congress, we were promised an open and transparent process, but we unfortunately fell short. Under the majority's leadership, more than one-third of the rules were completely closed, and at times brinksmanship endangered our economy.

Today provides an opportunity for the majority to put these behind them and govern in an open, collaborative, and bipartisan way; and we are willing to meet them every step of the way. With this goal in mind, though, of this Rules Committee, I must say that I look at it with a little bit of trepidation. The most troubling for me is the proposal to, once again, adopt the Ryan budget. Doing so will keep alive dangerous budget proposals, including the repeal of parts of the Affordable Care Act.

In addition, today's resolution makes it easier for Members of Congress to use private planes, and I'm puzzled by that. I don't think Members should be flying around in corporate jets. And it continues the politically motivated campaign over the so-called Fast and Furious operation. To begin by loosening the ethics restrictions and advancing politically motivated campaigns should not be the priorities of Congress.

Finally, with today's resolution, the majority continues their efforts to oppose marriage equality before the courts. In an age where marriage equality is recognized by Americans across the country of plurality, this Chamber should not be using taxpayer money to be standing on the wrong side of history.

We could start our new beginning by joining all the Democratic colleagues and me in finally reforming our broken election laws, and I know everyone wants to do that. In the years since the Supreme Court handed down its ruling in the Citizens United case, unlimited amounts of money from billionaires and hidden special interests have flooded our elections. Led by secret political spending that is hidden from public view, wealthy special interests have tried to buy our airwaves, to fund outrageously expensive campaigns, and to launch dishonest political attacks to persuade the outcome of countless elections.

The Sunlight Foundation reports that during the 2012 election cycle alone, super PACs, as they are called, spent more than \$620 million to affect the Federal elections. Nobody believes that corporations are people, and they should not be able to use unlimited amounts of money to influence our elections.

At the end of this debate, my Democratic colleagues and I will provide the House with an opportunity to consider a constitutional amendment to overturn the flawed Citizens United decision. If approved, this amendment would finally remove the unlimited and untracked political donations from our electoral system.

In addition to addressing the uncontrolled money in our political process, the Congress should be ensuring that every American citizen can easily exercise their right to vote. Voting is fundamental to what it means to be an American; but in recent years, we've seen a concerted effort to discourage voters from casting a ballot.

Under the cover of a cynical and untruthful claim that voter fraud is a serious threat to our democracy, political operatives in States across the country have methodically advanced a number of discriminatory and dangerous pieces of legislation. Their methods range from enacting voter ID laws to reducing the number of voting machines in low-income neighborhoods.

Unfortunately, these discriminatory practices have indeed made it harder for our citizens to vote. This past November, there were numerous reports of voters being turned away from the polls. Many of those who did manage to vote had to wait in line for hours—and sometimes as many as 8 hours—before they could cast a ballot. It is clear as day that keeping people waiting in long lines is purely intended to make them give up and go home.

Later today, my Democratic colleagues and I will ask the House to bring to the floor the Streamlined and Improved Methods at Polling Locations and Early Voting Act, or SIMPLE Voting Act. This legislation would guarantee that no voter would have to wait more than 1 hour to cast their ballot and require that every polling station in the country have the resources it needs to run a smooth and fair election.

□ 1510

When taken together, the overwhelming influence of money in politics and the discriminatory attacks on Americans' right to vote, they have distorted our electoral system and helped to create a broken legislative process that is failing to serve the American public.

As we open the 113th Congress, my colleagues and I stand ready to work with the majority on fixing our broken electoral system and getting back to a bipartisan legislative process worthy of the citizens who sent us here.

I couldn't be happier or more honored to serve in the 113th Congress. I look forward to serving with all of my colleagues, and it is my sincere hope that we'll have an open, transparent, and bipartisan House so that we can produce meaningful results for those whom we represent.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York. I look forward to our time where we will work together day and night, perhaps, with the committee that she will be the ranking member for and I will be the chairman of.

I told the gentlewoman before today that it will be my hope and her hope that we will not only work for the betterment of the institution, but also the Members, to ensure that they stand a better chance to make sure that our committee, the Rules Committee, is

one that we can both look at each other and know that we have done a job that would be fair and appropriate on behalf of the minority leader, the majority leader, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and all of our Members.

The rules package before us today will continue the effort by our Republican majority to make the work of the House as open, transparent, and streamlined as possible. This work began in the 112th Congress under the leadership of former Chairman DAVID DREIER. When a number of important reforms were implemented, DAVID DREIER made sure that they worked. Today, we will continue the tradition of that transparency initiated by Chairman DREIER. The nonpartisan Sunlight Foundation recently praised our endeavors in that effort by saying:

It is clear that the House has become a more transparent institution over the last 2 years.

The accolades there go to the gentleman from California, DAVID DREIER. This body is wholeheartedly committed to advancing that reform process, and I am as its new chairman.

Our work must begin and must always be directed to accountability, to the people who granted us the privilege of serving in this body. But the imperative for accountability is never higher than when we face tough economic times, economic times that each of us bring to the floor because of the demand upon people that we represent. As our national debt skyrockets, our economy limps sluggishly along, and unemployment remains predictably high, the need for a fully transparent and accountable process in this institution to help in that effort of unemployment in this country and to gain more jobs is one of the things which this Rules Committee and the work of the floor should be about.

The rules package that we focus on today for the 113th Congress will help us to achieve that goal. It preserves the important reforms that we made in the previous Congress, while adding a few perfecting amendments and several other ideas.

One such amendment in section 2 will help to streamline and expedite floor voting procedures. It is important to note, however, that these procedures are intended to be used to expedite consideration of questions of the House while ensuring that no Member is denied an adequate opportunity to vote.

Section 2 also makes several improvements and clarifications in the Congressional Code of Conduct in order to more efficiently hold each Member of this body accountable. For example, it expands the current nepotism rule to conform to current law and to add grandchildren to the rule, who are not currently covered under House rules or current law. This is a strongly held bipartisan measure that has received praise from a number of transparency groups, including the Sunlight Foundation, as I mentioned at the outset.

This rules package also amends the restrictions on the use of private aircraft contained in the Code of Conduct so as to harmonize House and Senate rules. These changes provide more flexibility to Members whose districts, including rural and remote locations, are not easily reached by car and do not have scheduled air service. They will also facilitate travel during extraordinary circumstances, such as in an emergency or in the aftermath of a natural disaster. At the same time, the revised rules keep in place safeguards to help ensure that such travel is fully consistent with House and ethics guidelines and rules. The new rules will simply ensure that Members pay a fair market rate for air travel, regardless of the type of aircraft that is used.

Together, the amendments and the clarifications to the Code of Conduct contained in this resolution will better ensure that elective representatives, officials, and employees of the House can execute their official duties in an efficient, ethical, and transparent way.

Section 3 of the rules package makes a number of separate orders. The most significant among them eliminates provisions contained in the Affordable Care Act that limit the ability of the House to respond to recommendations from the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

Now, House Republicans have made it very clear that we oppose ObamaCare. We have acted repeatedly to repeal and to replace this controversial law. But regardless of where any Member may stand on this issue, the question of preserving the prerogative of the House of Representatives to its work and its will without dispute or controversy must be achieved.

Article I, section 5 of the Constitution very clearly states that this body has the right and the responsibility to determine the rules of its proceedings. This provision will ensure that, as we proceed with the issue of health care reform, the ability of the House to respond to the Independent Payment Advisory Board is not abridged.

Sections 3 and 4 go on to make a number of adjustments that enhance our budgetary process, preserve our oversight rules, and strengthen our ethics procedures.

Finally, section 5 allows the Speaker to recognize Members for the reading of the Constitution on any legislative day through January 15, 2013. Every Member of this body has sworn an oath today to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. It is a very worthwhile endeavor to spend time in the first few days of this new Congress, and perhaps any Congress, to review the inspiring words of our Nation's founding document.

The rules package that I have just outlined for you will better enable each of us, as an institution, to perform our constitutional duties and obligations with integrity, transparency, and accountability, while streamlining its operations. Presenting this package to

the House is my first official act as chairman of the Rules Committee for the 113th Congress, and I think it exemplifies our commitment to an open and deliberative process that empowers the majority to work its will while preserving the ability of individual Members, particularly those in the minority, to present their ideas and engage in meaningful debate.

I urge my colleagues to support this rules package, and I will insert, for the RECORD, a section-by-section analysis of the resolution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

H. RES. 5

ADOPTING RULES FOR THE 113TH CONGRESS
SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Resolved Clause.

This section provides that the Rules of the 112th Congress are the Rules of the 113th Congress, except with the amendments contained in section 2 of the resolution and orders contained in sections 3, 4, and 5.

Section 2. Changes to the Standing Rules.

Committee Activity Reports. Subsection (a) reduces the frequency of committee activity reports from four times per Congress to two times per Congress (once per Session). The process for filing end of session committee reports is also modified to allow filings through January 2nd of each year.

Voting. Subsection (b) streamlines the voting process for several specific instances in the House and the Committee of the Whole. Paragraph (1) authorizes the Chair to reduce the time from 5 minutes to not less than 2 minutes for a vote after a quorum call in the Committee of the Whole, which is similar to the Speaker's current authority in the House to shorten votes following a quorum call. It also authorizes the Chair to reduce the time for voting on the first question arising without intervening debate or motion after the Committee of the Whole resumes its sitting. Paragraph (2) authorizes the Speaker to reduce the time for voting on the first question arising without intervening debate or motion after the Committee of the Whole rises and to reduce the time for voting on motions to recommit to not less than 5 minutes. The Rules Committee intends that these parallel authorities will be used following a vote stack in the Committee of the Whole or the House, respectively, where the Chamber is still full, and hence it would be likely that the Presiding Officer would determine that an adequate opportunity for Members to vote exists.

Clarifications in Rule X. Subsection (c) makes two clarifications with respect to clause 1 of rule X. Paragraph (1) clarifies that the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdiction includes the general management of the Department of Homeland Security. This change is intended to clarify the Committee's existing jurisdiction over the organization and administration of the department, and is not intended to alter the pattern of bill referrals to the Committee on Homeland Security, nor is it intended to alter the existing oversight jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. Paragraph (2) conforms terminology used in the Committee on Natural Resources jurisdiction to terminology recognized by the Departments of State and Interior.

Modifications of the Ramseyer Rule. Subsection (d) is intended to improve the readability of the comparative print required by clause 3(e) of rule XIII—commonly known as a "Ramseyer"—by including other contiguous portions of law if they will be useful in

understanding the change made by the amendment. The chair of each committee will determine the portions of the amended law that will be useful to improve readability.

Changes to the Code of Conduct and the Committee on Ethics. Subsection (e) makes several improvements and clarifications to the Code of Conduct. Paragraph (i) clarifies the circumstances under which the Committee on Ethics or its chair must make a public statement following action whereby time for consideration of a certain recommendation from the Office of Congressional Ethics is extended. Currently, the rule could be read to require a public statement when the time is extended by joint action of the chair and ranking minority member, but not when the time is extended by committee vote. Paragraph (2) amends clause 8(c) of rule XXIII to expand the current nepotism rule to conform to current law and adds grandchildren to the rule, who are not currently covered under House Rules or current law. The provision permits grandchildren who were employed by a relative prior to the 113th Congress to retain their employment subject to the same restrictions applied to spouses employed prior to the 107th Congress. Paragraph (3) transfers the responsibility to maintain copies of the executed classified oath, in the case of an officer or employee of the House, to the Sergeant-at-Arms. The Clerk of the House will continue to maintain the executed oaths for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners. Paragraph (4) amends the restrictions on the use of private aircraft contained in the Code of Conduct so as to conform the House rule to the existing rule in the Senate. The changes allow Members to pay their pro rata share for a charter flight based upon the fair market value of the flight, divided by the number of Members, officers, or employees of the House on the flight. It also increases the flexibility of Members with regard to which aircraft may be used. Members may pay for a charter flight authorized under this provision with either personal or official funds. The amended rule would allow House Members to use their campaign funds, in addition to official or personal funds. However, a statute still prohibits House candidates (but not Senate candidates) from using campaign funds for that purpose. Therefore, the rule change only affects personal and official funds unless 2 USC 439a(c)(2) is amended by future legislation. This paragraph also provides that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ethics may jointly waive this rule, subject to such conditions as they may prescribe. This provision is intended to facilitate the use of private aircraft in extraordinary circumstances, such as in an emergency or in the aftermath of a natural disaster.

Technical and Clarifying Changes. Subsection (f) corrects several typographic and other simple errors in the standing rules. Paragraph (1) corrects a typographic error. Paragraph (2) amends rule II (relating to House Officers) to add the Committee on Appropriations to the list of recipients of audit reports prepared by the Inspector General of the House. Paragraph (3) amends rule V (relating to Broadcasting of House proceedings) to address new technology and clarify acceptable uses of coverage of the floor proceedings. Paragraph (4) conforms the process for regular meeting notices to committee practice, which will eliminate the need to cancel the regular meeting if it was never noticed. Paragraph (5) clarifies the process for noticing a special meeting called pursuant to clause 2(c)(2) of rule XI. Paragraphs (6) and (7) are technical changes. Paragraph (8) amends rule XI to clarify that if any Member notifies a committee of the inten-

tion to file views, all Members are entitled to file views. Paragraph (9) makes a typographic change and related conforming changes. Paragraph (10) conforms clause 6(g) of rule XIII to the Rules Committee practice of specifying waivers in committee reports rather than resolutions. Paragraph (11) amends rule XV to clarify that motions to discharge a committee apply to all committees, including select committees. Paragraph (12) clarifies that precedents related to Calendar Wednesday business in effect before the 111th Congress will be applied only to the extent consistent with clause 6 of rule XV. Paragraph (13) clarifies that with respect to a call of the House in the event of a catastrophic circumstance, the Speaker may consult with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their designees. Paragraph (14) conforms rules related to conference reports to existing electronic availability for bills and other measures. Paragraph (15) is a technical change to conform to current House practices. Paragraph (16) eliminates the requirement for physical printing of Member Financial Disclosures in light of online disclosure under the STOCK Act.

Section 3. Separate Orders.

Independent Payment Advisory Board. Subsection (a) eliminates provisions contained in the Affordable Care Act that limit the ability of the House to determine the method of consideration for a recommendation from the Independent Payment Advisory Board or to repeal the provision in its entirety.

Budget Matters. Subsection (b)(1) clarifies that section 306 of the Budget Act (prohibiting consideration of legislation within the Budget Committee's jurisdiction, unless referred to or reported by the Budget Committee) only applies to bills and joint resolutions and not to simple or concurrent resolutions. Paragraph (2) makes a section 303 point of order (requiring adoption of budget resolution before consideration of budget-related legislation) applicable to text made in order as an original bill by a special rule. Paragraph (3) provides that specified or minimum levels of compensation for a Federal office will not be considered as providing new entitlement authority. Paragraph (4) prevents the Committee of the Whole from rising to report a bill to the House that exceeds an applicable allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) (Appropriations subcommittee allocations) as estimated by the Budget Committee and creates a point of order. Paragraph (5) provides that the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 112 (112th Congress), as adopted by the House, and the allocations of spending authority printed in tables ii and 12 of House Report 112-421 (112th Congress) will be in effect until a budget resolution for fiscal year 2014 is adopted.

Determinations for PAYGO Acts. Subsection (c) allows the chair of the Budget Committee to take into account the exemptions provided under 503(b)(1) of H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) for the purpose of complying with Statutory PAYGO.

Spending Reduction Amendments in Appropriations Bills. Subsection (d) carries forward the requirement from the 112th Congress that in each general appropriations bill there be a "spending reduction" account, the content of which is a recitation of the amount by which, through the amendment process, the House has reduced spending in other portions of the bill and indicated that such savings should be counted towards spending reduction. It provides that other amendments that propose to increase spending in accounts in a general appropriations bill must include an offset of equal or greater value.

Estimates of Direct Spending. Subsection (e) prohibits the consideration of a concurrent

resolution on the budget, or any proposed amendment to or conference report on, unless it includes specified information and estimates related to direct spending, including means-tested direct spending and nonmeans-tested direct spending. The subsection also requires the chair of the Committee on the Budget to publish a description in the Congressional Record of covered programs.

Certain Subcommittees. Subsection (f) waives clause 5(d) of rule X to allow the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs up to seven subcommittees each, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure up to six subcommittees. This is a standard provision carried in the rules package during the last several congresses.

Exercise Facilities for Former Members. Subsection (g) continues the prohibition on access to any exercise facility that is made available exclusively to Members, former Members, officers and former officers of the House and their spouses to any former Member, former officer, or spouse who is a lobbyist registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.

Numbering of Bills. Subsection (h) reserves the first 10 numbers for bills (H.R. 1 through H.R. 10) for assignment by the Speaker and the second 10 numbers (H.R. 11 through H.R. 20) for assignment by the Minority Leader.

Inclusion of United States Code Citations. Subsection (i) requires the sponsor of a bill or joint resolution to include, if available and to the maximum extent practicable, the applicable United States Code citation when the legislation proposes to repeal or amend in full or in part any uncodified law.

Duplication of Federal Programs. Subsection (j) authorizes the chair of a committee to request that the Government Accountability Office perform a duplication analysis of any bill or joint resolution referred to that committee. The subsection also requires committee reports to include a statement indicating whether any provision of the measure establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal Program.

Disclosure of Directed Rule Makings. Subsection (k) requires committee reports on bills or joint resolutions to include a statement estimating the number of directed rule makings required by the measure. The subsection defines “directed rule making” to include those rule makings specifically directed to be completed by a provision in the legislation, but does not include a grant of discretionary rule making authority.

Section 4. Committees, Commissions, and House Offices.

Litigation Matters. Subsection (a) carries forward the authority of the House, and certain constituent entities on its behalf, to litigate ongoing matters. Paragraph (1) particularly relates to the House’s litigation through the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, the entity that speaks for, and articulates the litigation position of, the House in all litigation matters in which it appears.

The Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group currently is litigating a number of matters on behalf of the House involving the constitutionality of Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act (“DOMA”). DOMA was enacted in 1996 by overwhelming bipartisan majorities of both houses of Congress and then signed into law by President Clinton. Congress and the President relied, in part, on the Department of Justice’s advice that DOMA was constitutional. See, e.g., Letter from Andrew Foias, Asst. Att’y Gen., to Rep. Canady (May 29, 1996), reprinted in H.R. Rep. No. 104-664, at 34 (1996), reprinted in 1996 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2905 (“House Report”); Letter from Andrew Foias, Asst. Att’y Gen., to Rep. Hyde (May 14,

1996), reprinted in House Rep. at 33-34; Letter from Andrew Foias, Asst. Att’y Gen., to Sen. Hatch (July 9, 1996), reprinted in Defense of Marriage Act: Hearing on S. 1740 Before the S. Comm. on the Judiciary, 104th Cong. 2 (1996).

It is the constitutional responsibility of the Executive Branch to defend the constitutionality of duly-enacted statutes such as DOMA. U.S. Const. art. II, §3 (“[The President] shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed. . . .”). However, on February 23, 2011, the Attorney General notified the Speaker of the House that the Executive Branch no longer would defend the constitutionality of DOMA Section 3. Letter from Att’y Gen. Eric H. Holder, Jr., to the Hon. John A. Boehner, Speaker of the House (Feb. 23, 2011). Remarkably, the Executive Branch abdicated its constitutional responsibility, notwithstanding the Attorney General’s candid acknowledgement that:

- in light of “the respect appropriately due to a coequal branch of government,” the Department “has a longstanding practice of defending the constitutionality of duly-enacted statutes if reasonable arguments can be made in their defense,” id. at 5;

- binding precedents of eleven of thirteen U.S. Courts of Appeals (the other two being silent on the issue) held that sexual orientation classifications are subject only to rational basis review under the Equal Protection Component of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, id. at 3-4 nn.4-6; and
- “a reasonable argument for Section 3’s constitutionality may be proffered under [the rational basis] standard,” id. at 6.

As a result of the Executive Branch’s abdication of its constitutional responsibility, on March 9, 2011, the Speaker of the House, on the recommendation of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of which he is a part, and in accordance with the Rules and precedents of the House, directed the Office of the General Counsel to represent the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, on behalf of the House, in defending the constitutionality of DOMA Section 3 in civil actions in which that statute’s constitutionality has been challenged in order to protect the interests of the House. The House has articulated its institutional position in litigation matters through a five-member bipartisan leadership group since at least the early 1980s, although the formulation of the group’s name has changed somewhat over time. Since 1993, the House rules formally have acknowledged and referred to the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group as such.

Prior to its involvement in the DOMA litigation, the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, or its predecessors, had intervened in at least eleven cases. See, e.g., Adolph Coors Co. v. Brady, 944 F.2d 1543, 1545 (10th Cir. 1991); In re Koerner, 800 F.2d 1358, 1360 (5th Cir. 1986); North v. Walsh, 656 F. Supp. 414, 415 n.1 (D.D.C. 1987); Am. Fed’n of Gov’t Emps. v. United States, 634 F. Supp. 336, 337 (D.D.C. 1986); Synar v. United States, 626 F. Supp. 1374, 1378-79 (D.D.C.), aff’d sub nom. Bowsher v. Synar, 478 U.S. 714 (1986); Ameron, Inc. v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs, 607 F. Supp. 962, 963 (D.N.J. 1985), aff’d, 809 F.2d 979 (3d Cir. 1986); Barnes v. Carmen, 582 F. Supp. 163, 164 (D.D.C. 1984), rev’d sub nom. Barnes v. Kline, 759 F.2d 21, 22 (D.C. Cir. 1985), rev’d on mootness grounds sub nom. Burke v. Barnes, 479 U.S. 361, 362 (1987); In re Prod. Steel, Inc., 48 B.R. 841, 842 (M.D. Tenn. 1985); In re Moody, 46 B.R. 231, 233 (M.D.N.C. 1985); In re Tom Carter Enters., Inc., 44 B.R. 605, 606 (C.D. Cal. 1984); In re Benny, 44 B.R. 581, 583 (N.D. Cal. 1984), aff’d in part and dismissed in part, 791 F.2d 712, 714 (9th Cir. 1986).

In addition, the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, or its predecessors, has appeared on behalf of the House as *amicus curiae* in more

than a dozen other cases—generally cases in which the Executive Branch had not abandoned its duty to defend a duly-enacted statute. See, e.g., Br. of Amicus Curiae the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives in Supp. of Pet’r, Renzi v. United States, No. 11-557, 2011 WL 6019914 (S. Ct. Dec. 2, 2011); Dickerson v. United States, 530 U.S. 428, 430 n.* (2000); Raines v. Byrd, 521 U.S. 811, 818 n.2 (1997); Am. Foreign Serv. Ass’n v. Garfinkel, 490 U.S. 153, 154 (1989); Morrison v. Olson, 487 U.S. 654, 659 (1988); Japan Whaling Ass’n v. Am. Cetacean Soc’y, 478 U.S. 221, 223 (1986); Helstoski v. Meanor, 442 U.S. 500, 501 (1979); United States v. Helstoski, 442 U.S. 477, 478 (1979); United States v. Renzi, 651 F.3d 1012, 1015 (9th Cir. 2011); In re Grand Jury Subpoenas, 571 F.3d 1200 (D.C. Cir. 2009); Fields v. Office of Eddie Bernice Johnson, 459 F.3d 1, 3 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (en banc); Beverly Enters., Inc. v. Trump, 182 F.3d 183, 186 (3d Cir. 1999); United States v. McDade, 28 F.3d 283, 286 (3d Cir. 1994); In re Search of The Rayburn House Office Bldg., 432 F. Supp. 2d 100, 104-05 (D.D.C. 2006), rev’d sub nom. United States v. Rayburn House Office Bldg., 497 F.3d 654 (D.C. Cir. 2007). Accordingly, the intervention by the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group in the DOMA Section 3 cases to articulate the House’s institutional position, and to protect the House’s institutional interests, has been neither unusual nor extraordinary.

Recently, the Supreme Court granted certiorari in one of the cases in which the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group has intervened to defend the constitutionality of DOMA Section 3, i.e., Windsor v. United States, 833 F. Supp. 2d 394 (S.D.N.Y. 2012), aff’d, 699 F.3d 169 (2d Cir. 2012), cert. granted, No. 12-307 (Dec. 7, 2012), cert. pending No. 12-63 (July 16, 2012), and No. 12-785 (Dec. 28, 2012). In granting certiorari in Windsor, the Supreme Court asked the parties to brief, in addition to the merits of the DOMA Section 3 issue, this question: “[W]hether the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the United States House of Representatives has Article III standing in this case.” Op. Granting Cert., Windsor v. United States, No. 12-307, 2012 WL 4009654 (Dec. 7, 2012).

Paragraph (1) is intended to clarify the role of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group generally, and in the Windsor litigation particularly.

Paragraph (2) authorizes the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, through the House Office of the General Counsel, to continue litigation to enforce a subpoena against the Attorney General related to the “Fast and Furious” investigation. This lawsuit was authorized by H. Res. 706 (112th Congress). It also authorizes the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (when elected) to take certain actions necessary to continue the litigation. Parallel authority was contained in H. Res. 5 (111th Congress) on a similar contempt matter.

House Democracy Partnership. Subsection (b) reauthorizes the House Democracy Partnership.

Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission. Subsection (c) reauthorizes the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

Office of Congressional Ethics. Subsection (d) reauthorizes the Office of Congressional Ethics (OCE) for the 113th Congress and clarifies that term limits do not apply to members of the OCE.

Empanelling Investigative Subcommittee of the Committee on Standards and Official Conduct. Subsection (e) continues House Resolution 451 (110th Congress) directing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (now Ethics) to empanel investigative subcommittees within 30 days after the date a Member is indicted or criminal charges are filed.

Section 5. Additional Orders of Business

Reading of the Constitution. Subsection (a) allows the Speaker to recognize Members for the reading of the Constitution on any legislative day through January 15, 2013.

Motions to Suspend the Rules. Subsection (b) authorizes the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to a measure addressing flood insurance at any time on the legislative day of January 4, 2013.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and I thank her for the work that she's doing and has been doing over the years as our representative and leader on the Rules Committee.

I also want to congratulate my friend, Mr. SESSIONS, on attaining the chairmanship of the Rules Committee, an extraordinarily important committee that sets the parameters for debate and consideration of legislation on the floor of this House. I also want to thank him for his discussions with me, his willingness to work together, and I'm looking forward to a positive relationship as we try to make sure that we consider legislation on this floor, giving everybody on both sides of the aisle the opportunity to make their case.

□ 1520

I also want to thank the gentleman. He explained that we are effecting the rules, but I want to thank the Rules Committee—I want to thank the chairman in particular—and, frankly, the Speaker and the leadership for making changes prospectively so that existing individuals are not adversely affected, and I thank the chairman.

Having said that, let me say that I am disappointed, though, that the majority is calling up a rules package that again embraces what I believe to be a partisan budget, which, obviously, there is significant disagreement about, and rejects efforts to compromise toward restoring, in my view, fiscal stability in our country. Despite bipartisan agreement in the Budget Control Act, the continuing resolution and, just this week, on the fiscal cliff, this rules package returns to the partisan stance that Republicans brought to the last Congress on fiscal issues and particularly on the budget.

It deems the amounts in the Ryan budget to be the default funding levels this year, levels well below this week's compromised agreement. We saw that in the last budget process as well. We made an agreement, and lo and behold, the budget came out with numbers substantially below that agreement.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. It also exempts the cost of policies we now know cannot become law: massive tax cuts as well as the cost of repealing the health reform act.

We voted on that over 30 times in this House, and the American people had an opportunity to vote on that. We ought to be focused on making that act as good as it can be—saving as much money as it can and providing access to affordable, quality health care to all of our people. After more than 30 votes in the 112th Congress to repeal, it did not happen; yet this proposed rule signals the 113th will continue along a path that has been rejected.

Another provision in this package continues the policy of denying a voice to 5 million American citizens living in our territories: the District of Columbia—Ms. NORTON is here and will speak—Puerto Rico, as well as Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands. We have extended in Congresses past—and, frankly, when I was the majority leader—the ability for those Representatives to vote on this floor, not to vote on final passage—the Constitution would have to do that—but to vote in the committee, in the Committee of the Whole. They can vote in our committees in the House, and we ought to give them that right here as a show of respect in order to honor their service to American citizens in the territories and in the District of Columbia.

As this new Congress begins, we have an opportunity to commit ourselves to a spirit of compromise, which our constituents so desperately seek from their Representatives. Our Nation continues to face a number of challenges that can only be addressed by working together and giving every family the opportunity, as our leader said when she spoke so eloquently, to make it in America. Let us take advantage of this new session to start off on the right foot and show Americans that we are ready to come together to tackle our greatest challenges.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume as I address the minority leader, if I can, the gentleman from Maryland.

He is a very dear and a fine friend of mine. For a long time, I've enjoyed the opportunity during the years that I've been in this House to know him, to work with him. In fact, what he said is true in that I have offered myself to him in a way that would be fair and good, not just for every Member of this body but also for those whom he represents. I will try and do my very best within the limits and constraints that I have, but my attitude is always to be stellar, and I hope that he knows that he can count on that also. I thank the gentleman very much. I would also extend that to other Members who are here, Madam Speaker, who have come down to express their ideas. Their ideas about how to make this a better place are always important.

The Republican Conference, the majority, had a vigorous time yesterday afternoon as we debated the House rules, as we offered our ideas, as we debated how we could make this a better

place, not just transparent but really work to the efficiency of the people who sent us here. I must say that I'm fresh from that wonderful and invigorating time in which we talked about the ideas, we defended what we did and changed the things that needed to be done. Our Members all were accorded, not just equal time, but a chance to bring their ideas forth, perhaps from back home from a season of election, perhaps from their experiences that they had back home. It was really a good time for not just me as a Member but, I think, for all of us in our body. Today, we enjoy that same opportunity as we come together, Democrats and Republicans, on the floor to talk about the rules of the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, assistant Democratic leader, Mr. CLYBURN.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, today is a day of great pride for every Member who has just been sworn in, particularly our newly elected Members. It is a great honor to be elected to serve in this body. On Election Day, our constituents went to their polling places and voted for us. We should be thankful for that, particularly so when, for far too many of our constituents, regardless of their political leanings, voting on Election Day was an unnecessarily burdensome, time-consuming, and unpleasant experience.

In my home county in South Carolina, voters reported waiting in line for over 4 hours. One young voter thought ahead of time. He brought an iPad, and watched the entire "Hunger Games" movie while in line. Others, understandably, didn't have 3 hours to spare on a workday. In Detroit, Michigan, Gina Porter waited in line for more than 3 hours before giving up. Danielle Wilkins voted after waiting for 4 hours.

In Lee County, Florida, Angela DeFrancisco went to her polling place in the morning with her infant son. Seeing a 3-hour line, she decided to come back later. After finding a babysitter, she returned in the afternoon, at which point the line had grown to 5½ hours. Unable to be away from her infant son that long, she left without voting.

As President Obama said on election night, "We have to fix that." As we take our places in this Congress that we earned on Election Day, now is the time to fix it. This motion to commit would ensure that no voter has to wait longer than an hour to cast a ballot.

We have a long history of struggle over the right to vote in this country. Yet, time and again, we have reaffirmed the principle that every eligible American has an equal right to cast a ballot without facing discrimination. A 3-hour wait is discrimination against those who have to work, those who have to take care of their kids and those whose health prevents them from

waiting in line for such a long time. Long lines are the 21st century version of poll taxes and literacy tests, disenfranchising the least advantaged and the most vulnerable citizens. We have an obligation to ensure that every American has an equal opportunity to exercise his constitutional right to vote.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CLYBURN. My good friend and lifelong colleague, JOHN LEWIS, has called the right to vote “precious, almost sacred,” and “the most powerful, nonviolent tool we have to create a more perfect Union.”

John could not be here to speak on this motion today, but I am proud to stand in his stead with Mr. MILLER. It is a small but important step to fulfilling our obligation to protect the right to vote, and I urge the passage of this motion to commit.

□ 1530

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman coming down with his words today. By the way, the gentleman mentioned a motion to commit and we have yet to see that. So if there is one, I would appreciate it if the gentlewoman from New York or the Clerk could provide that to me.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Will the gentleman yield to me to address that?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. At the proper time, we will submit the motion. We are not yet offering it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, when that is available, we appreciate that opportunity to review the motion that has been spoken about on the floor.

Today what we’re talking about, Madam Speaker, is how we are going to make sure that this Rules Committee and the rules of the House work very effectively. Later we will be calling a Rules Committee meeting. I will be announcing that the gentlewoman from North Carolina (VIRGINIA FOXX) will become the vice chairman of the Rules Committee. The gentlewoman from Rochester, New York, will have a chance to bring her team up, and we’ll begin that process of working together.

Many of the ideas that have been brought forth here are very good ideas. The rules of the House are how we’re going to proceed, and I think a lot of what’s been talked about is legislation that we really need to work on and look at and analyze. I think every single election we learn things from around the country. Not one election have I not learned something we need to make better.

I would say that JOHN BOEHNER, our great young Speaker, is energized to look at all of the ideas that might come from legislation, would be pleased, as I would, to make sure that

we look at these, because the integrity of who serves in this House and the ability that people have back home to go vote is important.

I’m reminded on a regular basis by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairman of the committee, who will be appointed the vice chairman, of how important people are back home that we serve. That when we serve, we serve at the pleasure of others, and that our election to this Republic and the votes that we make are very, very important. And so it’s always good to come down to the floor and be reminded of that as we remember our duty as we move forward. So I’ve enjoyed the opportunity to debate these issues and talk about them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I’m delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for the time and for her extraordinary leadership. I also want to congratulate the incoming chairman, Mr. SESSIONS. I am hopeful that the 113th Congress will be more productive, collaborative, and civil than the 112th. I’m not particularly optimistic, but I’m always hopeful—hopeful that we can return to some semblance of regular order with committees doing their work, bills coming to the floor under an open amendment process, and Members having the opportunity to reflect the will of their constituents.

At the very least, I hope that the outrageous, partisan and closed process we saw during the fiscal cliff crisis is not repeated. That is no way to legislate, and it’s no wonder after that bit of theater that the American people have so little regard for Congress.

One of the best ways that we can help the country is to improve the way we conduct our elections because bad elections lead to bad lawmaking. If 2012 taught us anything, it’s that we desperately need campaign finance reform.

If the previous question is defeated on this rule, Democrats will amend the resolution to give the House a vote on a constitutional amendment to control the corrupting influence of money in politics. The Supreme Court’s terrible decision in the Citizens United case opened the flood gates, and our election system is now awash in a sea of millions of dollars of unregulated money, drowning out the voices of individual citizens. Politicians are increasingly beholden to wealthy special interests. A multinational oil company that doesn’t like a particular Member of Congress can now simply write a big check—undisclosed check—to Americans for Apple Pie and Puppies and watch the negative advertising work their magic.

There are a variety of ways to tackle this problem. In the last Congress, I introduced the people’s rights amend-

ment which would overturn Citizens United and put a stop to the corporate personhood nonsense that it represents. Despite what Governor Romney said on the campaign trail, corporations are not people and they do not deserve the same constitutional rights as American citizens. Other Members will have other ideas. But at the very least, we need to have this debate, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, you know, once again we have a lot of political dogma that’s taking place here. I was a worker in a corporation for a number of years, and I felt like I was a vital part of the success of not only that company and the things that I did, but I felt like in my 16 years, never missing a day of work, that I contributed to the success of customers and other people.

And just like here in this body, there may be some organization or something that somebody doesn’t like that serves this House of Representatives, but everybody is here. They show up at work and they get their work done.

I would say that corporations, employers, are very important to this country. The ability that all people have, just as they’re going to vote, to have a say in the processes that happen. There’s a lot of attacking that gets done in this House of Representatives against employers, against people who go to work and provide honest services, and there are a lot of people who spend a lot of time demeaning others, and I’d like to see that stopped. But it’s not going to.

So people like myself will stand up and hopefully talk about the rights and responsibilities that we all have in an open society to make our country even stronger and better—once again, part of what the rules package is about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I’m please to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, House Republicans in this rule are seeking to authorize lawyer fees for a costly Federal takeover of marriage that would single out legally married couples for discriminatory treatment under Federal law. I’m so disappointed that in the midst of our economic crisis and debt and deficit, House Republicans want to continue to waste millions of dollars of taxpayer money defending a law that the Obama administration has already said they won’t spend a penny on. Typical tax and spend Republican policies.

Last Congress finished with the majority of Republicans voting for the biggest tax increase in the history of our country by opposing the fiscal cliff tax relief bill. And now here we are in this Congress, sticking taxpayers with millions of dollars of unnecessary costs right on day one in the rule of the House itself. At least when Democrats spend money, we build roads and

bridge, educate kids, provide health care. This Republican spending goes right into the pockets of lawyers. Big-spending Republicans on day one spending millions of dollars of taxpayer money on a Federal takeover of marriage and a lawyer stimulus. Wrong foot to start off on. Vote "no."

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for this recognition, and I rise in favor of the motion to commit that I will be offering with Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. LEWIS before the House later today so that we can take a small, but very important, step to protect the right of every American to vote.

I was appalled on this past election day by widespread reports across the country of voters forced to wait in hours-long lines simply to exercise one of our most fundamental rights—the right to vote. Even in some States with early voting, voters were forced to choose between waiting for hours or missing work or taking care of their children in order to cast their vote, or giving up their right to vote altogether.

At some precincts in Miami, hundreds of voters stood in line for over 4 hours, past the 7 o'clock closing time of the polls, even after President Obama had been declared the winner of the election. It offends our basic values that Americans would be denied the right to vote because of a last-minute illness or change in the work schedule, the need to pick up a child from school, or some other unavoidable emergency, meaning that they could not afford to wait in line for several hours simply to exercise that right.

The motion to commit in the House will make two important changes. First, it will require in Federal elections that every State provide for at least 15 days' early voting; and, two, it would require the State to provide adequate resources, staff, and machines at polling places in Federal elections to ensure that voters are not forced to wait in line for more than an hour.

There are numerous changes that need to be made to adequately protect the rights of all Americans to their right to vote, and I support the comprehensive approach to voter protections that has been developed by Mr. LEWIS and Mr. CLYBURN. However, today we have a chance to take a very simple step to make sure that voting is simple for Americans so they can exercise their right, a right that we broadcast to the rest of the world about how we choose our leaders and how we exercise our democracy. But that right and that democracy is now being thwarted by efforts at the local and State levels to make voting more difficult, to pro-

hibit people from voting. We can change all of that in the motion to commit today in this rules package, and I would urge my colleagues to support that.

I want to thank Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. LEWIS for their leadership. I'm very sorry that Mr. LEWIS is unable to be here today with the untimely death of his wife, Lillian.

□ 1540

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

I'm very disappointed that the minority, even upon me asking just a few minutes ago, has chosen not to share the text of the motion to commit with us.

There's a lot of discussion about wanting people to come and vote back home and see things, and there's a lot of debate here about, boy, we're hoping a lot of Republicans vote with us, but we're not providing the text of that as to where our Members would have an opportunity to understand that.

Now, I think it's clearly of great importance to the gentleman, at least, from South Carolina and the gentleman from California, and as a member of the minority leadership, he should know that, while he discusses it with great passion and perhaps wants us to vote for it, we still have not seen a copy of that.

The first edition of the rules package today has been online for nearly a week. The Republican package that we would want people to vote on has been online, available. At our Conference last night, we put out—as soon as we knew what those final revisions were, we put that out. In contrast, we still have not seen that.

I would ask the gentlewoman for a copy of that motion.

I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The proper time, Madam Speaker, to offer a motion to recommit is after the previous question has been approved. When the motion is offered, we'll be happy to provide a copy to the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, I think it's pretty obvious that what the gentlewoman is saying is that they want to stand up and make a point, and they want to have a vote here, and they probably want to end up complaining if they didn't pass something, but they're not willing to share their ideas.

I think it's amazing that we're talking about transparency, accountability, trying to share information where we can work closer together, glean ideas from each other, come together with an opportunity, and yet, at the appropriate time, we'll get a copy of that. So I'm sure that will happen about a minute before we're asked to vote on it.

That's not a way to be transparent, that's not a way that I think we should move forward, but it is consistent, and we'll have a consistent outcome.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me just take a second to say, Madam Speaker, that I would be happy to share anything we can at the proper time, and we will do that. We will follow the rules.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELLEANOR NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the very first vote of the 113th Congress was a vote on whether or not I was entitled to vote for the 600,000 taxpaying residents of the District of Columbia I represent. The motion to table my motion prevailed 224–187.

My motion simply would have required a study of whether there was any reason that Delegate voting should be denied. This would not have been a difficult study because the Federal courts have already done our work for us. Two Federal courts have found that Delegate voting in the Committee of the Whole is constitutional.

What is more painful and arbitrary than not having the final vote, what is more painful and arbitrary than not having even the vote in the Committee of the Whole is having a vote that you have exercised withdrawn, as this vote was today.

In three Congresses we exercised our vote in the Committee of the Whole. No vote should be dependent on which party is in power. The vote in the Committee of the Whole was not a vote on final legislation. It was a symbol of our American citizenship.

You cannot take away our citizenship. In this country, you should never be able to take away a vote once it has been granted.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I think it's well understood that the offices of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and the Delegates of the House of Representatives from American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and now the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, are created by statute and not by the Constitution.

They represent territories and associated jurisdictions, not States. They are not Members of Congress, and they do not possess the same potentiary rights afforded to Members under the Constitution.

They are here in this body. We represent them to each other as important, and we listen to them and they do things, but as it refers to voting on the floor, in the Committee of the Whole, that is an issue that I believe is well understood.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I grant the gentleman that the Delegates are here by statute, but the gentleman should also recognize that the vote we had in three Congresses was a vote that the Federal courts have said is constitutional.

Once we are here by statute, once we get a constitutional vote, it seems to me completely arbitrary to withdraw that vote, particularly for the District of Columbia. As long as you take our taxes, the very least I think the people I represent are entitled to is the vote in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rules package and, in particular, to one specific provision that places the House on the wrong side of history and misrepresents the position of this House and its Members.

Section 4 of the resolution continues to authorize the expenditure of taxpayers' money to defend, in court, the unconstitutional and discriminatory so-called "Defense of Marriage Act." It goes further to state that this partisan effort "speaks for and articulates the institutional positions of the House."

That is simply not true. The original decision to defend DOMA was taken by a party-line vote of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, and all further decisions have been taken by the Republican leadership alone, some in secret.

So far, the Republican leadership has authorized the expenditure of \$2 million of taxpayers' money to defend this discriminatory law. This defense is not supported by the entire House. 145 Members of the House have signed a brief arguing that DOMA should be declared unconstitutional and struck down. So far, every court that decided this question has agreed that DOMA is unconstitutional.

We have repeatedly asked the Speaker for a briefing from the lawyers retained by the Republican majority. The Speaker hasn't even seen fit to give us the courtesy of a response. If these high-priced lawyers really represent the House, they should at least have the courtesy to meet with their alleged clients to answer questions about that representation.

The time has come to call a halt to this farce. At the very least, the rules should reflect the reality that the House is deeply divided on the question and that the outside lawyers acting at Speaker BOEHNER's direction do not speak for the institution as a whole.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rules package.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise for two purposes:

First, to oppose the rule, which institutes, again, the folly of spending taxpayer dollars to defend the unconstitutional, and that is DOMA. This was a

poor waste of our resources in the last Congress. It will be an even worse utilization of scarce taxpayer dollars in this new session.

□ 1550

Second, I rise to raise another issue debated fiercely, and that is campaign finance reform. Clearly, our democracy is broken, with billions of dollars of campaign spending by special interests, much of it anonymous, flooding the airwaves this fall. In the last Congress, I introduced an amendment drafted by constitutional scholar Larry Tribe that would address the central flaw in reasoning underlying many of the Supreme Court's decisions, and that is the artificial distinction between contributions, which may be regulated, and supposedly independent expenditures, which may not.

I don't support a constitutional amendment lightly and have found few that I would even entertain in my 12 years in Congress. Yes, unrestrained spending and the unmistakable tinge of corruption it creates demand action. Disclosure should come first. But the power to reasonably regulate both contributions and expenditures should follow. And that will require a constitutional amendment.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House to defeat the previous question and, in doing so, set the stage for a debate of a constitutional amendment to restore transparency and accountability to our campaign finance system.

Madam Speaker, we have just concluded another long, hard fought election year. Issues were debated, often fiercely, but that is as it should be in a democracy. Yet in one respect our democracy is clearly broken, Billions of dollars of campaign spending by special interests—much of it anonymous—flooded the airwaves this fall. And because of a series of decisions by the Supreme Court, stretching from *Buckley v. Valeo* in 1976 up to *Citizens United* in 2010, regulating and limiting the influence of special interests on our elections is now largely beyond the power of the federal government or the states. We have seen the result all across our television screens as billions in spending by secretive Super PACs that smear candidates of all parties anonymously and unaccountably.

Last Congress, I introduced an amendment drafted by leading Constitutional Scholar Lawrence Tribe that would address the central flaw in reasoning underlying the Court's decisions—the artificial distinction between direct contributions, which may be regulated, and supposedly independent expenditures, which may not. I do not support a constitutional amendment lightly and have found few I would even entertain in my 12 years in Congress. Yet unrestrained spending and the unmistakable tinge of corruption it creates demand action. Disclosure should come first. But the power to reasonably regulate both contribution and expenditure should follow; and that will require an Amendment.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House to defeat the previous question and in doing so, set the stage for debate of a constitutional amendment to restore transparency and accountability to our campaign finance system. That's

what the American people want, and our democracy requires.

Mr. SESSIONS. Once again, I appreciate and respect the opportunity that's afforded in this time for Members of Congress like the gentleman from California and others to come forth and to give their ideas.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. The 113th Congress convenes as we embark on a new year and, we hope, for new politics. Yet anyone with a New Year's resolution knows that self-improvement requires self-reflection. As full of goodwill and common purpose as we are today, we must acknowledge why so many Americans are fed up with our politics. Whether it's the attack ads, the rampant misinformation, or the bitter partisanship, so much of the frustration rises from the big money in our democracy.

Why the frustration? Elderly Americans don't have super PACS, Madam Speaker. Children in poverty don't have corporate lobbyists. The American people count on us to ensure that their voices are heard. That's what they expect from us. Americans' outrage over our inability to govern in the public interest is quickly becoming an accepted frustration, but it shouldn't be that way. It shouldn't be that way, Madam Speaker. In America, we don't have to accept the status quo. We the people make the rules.

It's time for the 28th amendment to the Constitution. Throughout American history, Republicans and Democrats alike have defended our right to decide our destiny as a people. We must restore our democracy to the people. This is the way to do it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Although I do support the changes to our ethics rules contained in the package, I cannot support the overall package, and I rise in opposition to the previous question for the purposes of allowing the House to consider a constitutional amendment to address the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United*.

The 2012 election was the most expensive in our Nation's history. Outside groups, including over 1,200 super PACs spent \$970 million, and \$123 million of anonymous cash was spent in our campaigns. All told, the price tag for last year's election was \$6 billion.

This is only the beginning. In the years to come, spending will expand at the Federal, State, and local levels—megaphones of monied interests drowning out the voices of ordinary Americans. It's time for us to do something about it. And I don't take amending our Constitution, our founding document, lightly. And here on this day,

when we're celebrating and commemorating this year's 150th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, it's time for all Americans to be free in our elections, to free our elections from monied interests, and to amend the Constitution so that Congress can protect the integrity of our elections.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, in closing, it's become glaringly obvious that our democratic process is broken. Due in large part to the overwhelming influence of money in our elections, together with widespread discriminatory laws that seek to suppress the vote, our electoral process is on the brink of dysfunction. My Democratic colleagues and I are committed to fixing our election system and have a chance today to return democracy to the hands of voters.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the resolution to make sure the House votes on a constitutional amendment to overturn Court decisions, including Citizens United, that prohibit Congress and the States from limiting the corrupting influence of money in politics, unlimited political spending in elections, and the proliferation of super PACs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. After our vote on the previous question, we will offer a motion to commit and ask this Chamber to consider the SIMPLE Voting Act. Passing this would ensure that no American would have to wait more than an hour to vote. Nothing is more important than expediting the vote and making sure of that right and that it is attended to.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to commit and a "no" vote on the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, today, we've had a really good time, where we've had a number of Members who have come down to the floor of the House of Representatives.

As I suggested in the beginning, this was done yesterday in the Republican Conference. I'm sure it was done within the Democrat Caucus. We brought those ideas to the floor of the House of Representatives. We've been able to ascertain more about not only what we stand for but perhaps what people are asking for.

I also want to thank our staff. Not just the Rules staff that is here on the

majority side, but also on the minority side. Obviously, every one of these people has spent a lot of time trying to prepare us as we go into this new Congress, and I really do appreciate the hard work by our staffs, the Speaker's staff, the leader's staff; and I'm very pleased that we've been able to begin this process today.

The American people are watching us. They are interested in what we do. They're interested in how open and prepared we are, how we present ourselves, our ideas, and that we talk about the things they talk about around the table, that they talk about at work, and they talk about in educational institutions and, likewise, that they talk about in the field of play that is fair, that is good, and makes this country even stronger.

So I'm delighted that we've done that today. I appreciate the gentlewoman from Rochester for her vigorous analysis today of what we need to do looking forward. I'll continue to listen to that. I know the gentlewoman, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, will be on the Rules Committee, and I look forward to that service that she will be making. And with great enthusiasm we will move forward in this new Congress.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I am inserting the following memorandum of understanding:

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND
THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

JANUARY 3, 2013.

House Resolution 5 of the 113th Congress amended clause 1(m)(9) of rule X to change the jurisdictional statement of the Committee on Natural Resources from "Insular possessions of the United States generally (except those affecting the revenue and appropriations)" to "Insular areas of the United States generally (except those affecting the revenue and appropriations)". The Committees on Foreign Affairs and Natural Resources understand that this amendment was intended to ensure that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources includes areas also under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, namely the Freely Associated States (a group currently comprised of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau). These Freely Associated States are sovereign nations, but each also maintains a special relationship with the United States pursuant to its respective Compact of Free Association, and is considered an insular area by certain Federal agencies. The committees understand that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will continue to exercise jurisdiction over insular areas that are sovereign nations and that the jurisdiction of other committees is not affected.

EDWARD R. ROYCE

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

DOC HASTINGS,

Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, we have just sworn to uphold the Constitution. We have taken an oath to pursue the ideal of a more perfect Union.

We take that oath proudly, believing that the United States of America is the world's great democracy.

Yet our pride should never blind us to the imperfections that remain.

Because, as this 113th U.S. House of Representatives begins its business, some 5 million Americans are not really represented here.

Yes, we have Delegates and a Resident Commissioner.

We have offices and staff. We have membership—and votes—in House committees.

But we do not have a vote when legislation comes before this body.

The 5 million Americans we represent live under laws not fully of their making.

That is not the ideal of representational democracy our founders envisioned in the Constitution.

My colleagues and I ask today to have our vote in the Committee of the Whole restored.

Yet, ultimately, we must all set our eyes beyond that limited goal and decide that every United States citizen—no matter where in America they may live—must be fully represented here in the people's House.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Speaker, for the second straight Congress, I oppose the rules package, because it sends a message of exclusion to residents of the territories and the District of Columbia.

Under a rule in place for the last three Democratic-controlled Congresses, the delegates were permitted to vote on amendments when the House met in the Committee of the Whole. The rule, which provided for a revote if our votes were decisive, was upheld by the federal courts and did not impede the work of the House.

The rule promoted responsible government by requiring the delegates to take public stands on issues. It also sent a message of inclusion to our constituents. Yet, once again, in a move that is as unnecessary as it is unjust, the new rules will deprive us of this privilege.

As Resident Commissioner, I represent 3.7 million U.S. citizens, more than any House member and 44 senators. My fellow delegates represent about one million people. Our constituents are part of the American family. They fight—and many have died—in defense of our nation. The rules package demeans their sacrifice.

In November, a referendum in Puerto Rico showed a clear majority wants to end the Island's undemocratic status, and that more voters support statehood than any other status option. Today's rules demonstrate why the status quo must—and will—end. I look forward to the day when Puerto Rico will have equal representation in the government that makes its national laws, rather than having to plead for the reinstatement of a limited and largely symbolic vote.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rules Package which once again denies the opportunity for Delegates to Congress and the Resident Commissioner to vote on amendments in the Committee of the Whole. We were privileged to have this right first in the 103rd Congress and then again in the 110th and 111th.

Mr. Speaker, the over 4 million citizens in the U.S. territories are among the most patriotic Americans you will find anywhere in our country. They have served and died for their country in every war and conflict since the First World War including the recent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Much like their fellow citizens on the mainland they are a diverse group of individuals. Some were born in the territories under the American flag, some have

migrated there and embraced our culture and our values before naturalization, and others were born in the states and have chosen by virtue of their chosen occupation or by love of our islands to make the territories their home. All are Americans in every sense of the word, except for full representation in the House of Representatives and the ability to vote for the President of the United States.

We had hoped and expected that our colleagues in the House would recognize the contributions of their fellow American insular residents and afford their representatives the opportunity to participate more fully in the decisions of the “people’s House”, unfortunately however the rules package being voted on has once again proven to us that we still have a long way to go to ensure equality and justice for all. It is ironic and sad, that the United States is the leading voice calling for people around the world to have more, not less say in the governance of their countries, while the rules of the House of Representatives disenfranchise the representatives of American citizens living in U.S. Insular Areas and the District of Columbia.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 5 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 6. At any time before January 31, 2013, it shall be in order to consider in the House a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would overturn the Supreme Court decision in Citizens United and other court cases that prohibit Congress and the states from limiting the corrupting influence of money in politics, unlimited political spending in elections, and the proliferation of Super PACs by secret donors that erode democracy and result in voter apathy, whenever called up by the Minority Leader or her designee. All points of order against the joint resolution and its consideration are waived. The joint resolution shall be debatable for three hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the joint resolution specified in section 6 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 resolution, 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 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 resolution 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. SESSIONS. Madam 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 191, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]
YEAS—227

Aderholt	Barr	Black
Alexander	Barton	Bonner
Amash	Benishek	Boustany
Amodei	Bentivolio	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Barletta	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)

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

NAYS—191

Andrews	Clyburn	Farr
Barber	Cohen	Fattah
Barrow	Connolly	Foster
Bass	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Beatty	Cooper	Fudge
Becerra	Costa	Gabbard
Bera	Courtney	Gallego
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Garamendi
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Garcia
Bonamici	Cummings	Grayson
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Braley (IA)	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Grijalva
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Gutierrez
Bustos	Delaney	Hahn
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hanabusa
Capps	DelBene	Hastings (FL)
Capuano	Deutch	Heck (WA)
Cárdenas	Dingell	Higgins
Carney	Doyle	Himes
Carson (IN)	Duckworth	Hinojosa
Castor (FL)	Edwards	Holt
Castro (TX)	Ellison	Honda
Chu	Engel	Horsford
Ciilline	Enyart	Hoyer
Clay	Eshoo	Huffman
Cleaver	Esty	Israel

Jackson Lee	Meeks	Schiff
Jeffries	Meng	Schneider
Johnson (GA)	Michaud	Schrader
Johnson, E. B.	Miller, George	Schwartz
Jones	Moore	Scott (VA)
Kaptur	Moran	Scott, David
Keating	Murphy (FL)	Serrano
Kennedy	Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Kildee	Napolitano	Shea-Porter
Kilmer	Neal	Sherman
Kind	Negrete McLeod	Sinema
Kirkpatrick	Nolan	Sires
Kuster	O'Rourke	Slaughter
Langevin	Owens	Smith (WA)
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Speier
Lee (CA)	Pascrell	Swalwell (CA)
Levin	Pastor (AZ)	Takano
Lipinski	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Loebback	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Lofgren	Perlmutter	Tierney
Lowenthal	Peters (MI)	Titus
Lowey	Peterson	Tonko
Lujan Grisham	Pingree (ME)	Tsongas
(NM)	Pocan	Van Hollen
Luján, Ben Ray	Polis	Vargas
(NM)	Price (NC)	Vela
Lynch	Quigley	Velázquez
Maffei	Rahall	Visclosky
Maloney,	Rangel	Walz
Carolyn	Richmond	Wasserman
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Schultz
Markey	Ruppersberger	Waters
Matheson	Rush	Watt
Matsui	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
McCarthy (NY)	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
McCollum	T.	Wilson (FL)
McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth
McGovern	Sarbanes	
McNerney	Schakowsky	

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Doggett	Mulvaney
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Peters (CA)
Cartwright	Larson (CT)	Veasey
Clarke	McIntyre	

□ 1621

Messrs. HOLT, JONES, WAXMAN, and Ms. TITUS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Stated for:

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 4, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, on January 3, 2013—I was not present for rollcall vote 4. If I had been present for this vote, I would have voted: “Nay” on rollcall vote 4.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California moves that the resolution (H. Res. 5) be committed to a select committee composed of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader with instructions to report it forthwith back to the House with the following amendment:

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

SEC. 6. TO SHORTEN VOTING LINES AND PROTECT EARLY VOTING OPPORTUNITIES.

Not later than January 31, 2013, 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 a bill consisting of the text specified in section 8 of this resolution, to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to promote early voting in

elections for Federal office and to prevent unreasonable waiting times for voters at polling places used in such elections, 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 House Administration. 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. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 8 of this resolution.

SEC. 8. The text referred to in section 6 is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Streamlined and Improved Methods at Polling Locations and Early (SIMPLE) Voting Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR EARLY VOTING AND FOR REDUCING WAITING TIMES FOR VOTERS IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15481 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating sections 304 and 305 as sections 306 and 307; and

(B) by inserting after section 303 the following new sections:

“SEC. 304. EARLY VOTING.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall allow individuals to vote in an election for Federal office on each day occurring during the 15-day period which ends on the second day immediately preceding the date of the election, in the same manner as voting is allowed on such date.

“(b) MINIMUM EARLY VOTING REQUIREMENTS.—Each polling place which allows voting prior to the date of a Federal election pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

“(1) allow such voting for not less than 10 hours on each day; and

“(2) have uniform hours each day for which such voting occurs.

“(c) LOCATION OF POLLING PLACES NEAR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.—To the greatest extent practicable, a State shall ensure that each polling place which allows voting prior to the date of a Federal election pursuant to subsection (a) is located within reasonable walking distance of a stop on a public transportation route.

“(d) STANDARDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall issue standards for the administration of voting prior to the date scheduled for a Federal election. Such standards shall include the nondiscriminatory geographic placement of polling places at which such voting occurs.

“(2) DEVIATION.—The standards described in paragraph (1) shall permit States, upon

providing adequate public notice, to deviate from any requirement in the case of unforeseen circumstances such as a natural disaster, terrorist attack, or a change in voter turnout.

“(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections held on or after January 1, 2014.

“SEC. 305. PREVENTING UNREASONABLE WAITING TIMES FOR VOTERS.

“(a) PREVENTING UNREASONABLE WAITING TIMES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall provide a sufficient number of voting systems, poll workers, and other election resources (including physical resources) at a polling place used in any election for Federal office, including a polling place at which individuals may cast ballots prior to the date of the election, to ensure—

“(A) a fair and equitable waiting time for all voters in the State; and

“(B) that no individual will be required to wait longer than one hour to cast a ballot at the polling place.

“(2) CRITERIA.—In determining the number of voting systems, poll workers, and other election resources provided at a polling place for purposes of paragraph (1), the State shall take into account the following factors:

“(A) The voting age population.

“(B) Voter turnout in past elections.

“(C) The number of voters registered.

“(D) The number of voters who have registered since the most recent Federal election.

“(E) Census data for the population served by the polling place, such as the proportion of the voting-age population who are under 25 years of age or who are naturalized citizens.

“(F) The needs and numbers of voters with disabilities and voters with limited English proficiency.

“(G) The type of voting systems used.

“(H) The length and complexity of initiatives, referenda, and other questions on the ballot.

“(I) Such other factors, including relevant demographic factors relating to the population served by the polling place, as the State considers appropriate.

“(3) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Commission shall establish and publish guidelines to assist States in meeting the requirements of this subsection.

“(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to authorize a State to meet the requirements of this subsection by closing any polling place, prohibiting an individual from entering a line at a polling place, or refusing to permit an individual who has arrived at a polling place prior to closing time from voting at the polling place.

“(b) DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTINGENCY PLANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall develop, and implement to the greatest extent practicable, a contingency plan under which the State shall provide additional poll workers, machines, ballots, and other equipment and supplies (as the case may be) on the date of the election to any polling place used in an election for Federal office, including a polling place at which individuals may cast ballots prior to the date of the election, at which waiting times exceed one hour.

“(2) APPROVAL OF PLAN BY COMMISSION.—The State shall ensure that the contingency plan developed under paragraph (1) is approved by the Commission prior to the date of the election involved, in accordance with such procedures as the Commission may establish.

“(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections held on or after January 1, 2014.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating the items relating to sections 304 and 305 as relating to sections 306 and 307; and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new items:

“Sec. 304. Early voting.

“Sec. 305. Preventing unreasonable waiting times for voters.”

(b) REPORT BY ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Not later than June 30 of each odd-numbered year, the Election Assistance Commission shall submit to Congress a report assessing the impact of sections 304 and 305 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by subsection (a)) on the administration of elections for Federal office during the preceding 2-year period, and shall include in the report such recommendations as the Commission considers appropriate.

(c) NO EFFECT ON AUTHORITY OF STATE TO PROVIDE FOR LONGER PERIODS OF EARLY VOTING OR GREATER AMOUNT OF RESOURCES AT POLLING PLACES.—Nothing in this section or in any amendment made by this section may be construed to prohibit a State, with respect to any election for Federal office—

(1) from providing (in an equitable and nondiscriminatory manner) a longer period for early voting than the minimum period required under section 304 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by subsection (a)); or

(2) from providing (in an equitable and nondiscriminatory manner) a greater number of systems, poll workers, and other election resources at any polling place than the minimum number required under section 305 of such Act (as added by subsection (a)).

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENTS FOR COUNTING PROVISIONAL BALLOTS; ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIFORM AND NONDISCRIMINATORY STANDARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15482) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

“(d) STATEWIDE COUNTING OF PROVISIONAL BALLOTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a)(4), notwithstanding the precinct or polling place at which a provisional ballot is cast within the State, the appropriate election official shall count each vote on such ballot for each election in which the individual who cast such ballot is eligible to vote.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall apply with respect to elections held on or after January 1, 2014.

“(e) UNIFORM AND NONDISCRIMINATORY STANDARDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the requirements of this section, each State shall establish uniform and nondiscriminatory standards for the issuance, handling, and counting of provisional ballots.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall apply with respect to elections held on or after January 1, 2014.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 302(f) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15482(f)), as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by striking “Each State” and inserting “Except as provided in subsections (d)(2) and (e)(2), each State”.

SEC. 4. AVAILABILITY OF CIVIL PENALTIES AND PRIVATE RIGHTS OF ACTION TO ENFORCE HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF CIVIL PENALTIES AND PRIVATE RIGHTS OF ACTION.—Section 401 of

the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15511) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 401. ENFORCEMENT.

“(a) ACTION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action against any State or jurisdiction in an appropriate United States District Court for such declaratory and injunctive relief (including a temporary restraining order, a permanent or temporary injunction, or other order) as may be necessary to carry out the requirements of subtitle A of title III.

“(2) ASSESSMENT OF CIVIL MONEY PENALTY.—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1), if the court finds that the State or jurisdiction violated any provision of subtitle A of title III, it may, to vindicate the public interest, assess a civil penalty against the State or jurisdiction—

“(A) in an amount not to exceed \$110,000 for each such violation, in the case of a first violation; or

“(B) in an amount not to exceed \$220,000 for each such violation, for any subsequent violation.

“(3) INTERVENTION.—Upon timely application, a person aggrieved by a violation of subtitle A of title III with respect to which a civil action is commenced under paragraph (1) may intervene in such action, and may obtain such appropriate relief as the person could obtain in a civil action under subsection (b) with respect to that violation, along with costs and a reasonable attorney fee.

“(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than December 31 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress an annual report on any civil action brought under paragraph (1) during the preceding year.

“(b) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

“(1) AVAILABILITY.—A person who is aggrieved by a State’s or jurisdiction’s violation of subtitle A of title III may bring a civil action in an appropriate United States District Court for such declaratory or injunctive relief as may be necessary to carry out the requirements of such subtitle.

“(2) COSTS AND ATTORNEY FEES.—The court may award to a person aggrieved by a violation of subtitle A of title III who prevails in an action brought under paragraph (1) the costs of the action, including a reasonable attorney fee.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by amending the item relating to section 401 to read as follows:

“Sec. 401. Enforcement.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to violations alleged to have occurred on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 229, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—194

Andrews	Green, Gene	Nolan
Barber	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Barrow	Gutierrez	Owens
Bass	Hahn	Pallone
Beatty	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bera	Heck (WA)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Holt	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Bustos	Huffman	Polis
Butterfield	Israel	Price (NC)
Capps	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Capuano	Jeffries	Rahall
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jones	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Keating	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kuster	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Schneider
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Levin	Serrano
Costa	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Loeb	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Loeb	Sherman
Cuellar	Lofgren	Sinema
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Maffei	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Maloney, Carolyn	Tierney
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Deutch	Markey	Tonko
Dingell	Matheson	Tsongas
Doggett	Matsui	Van Hollen
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Vargas
Duckworth	McCollum	Veasey
Edwards	McDermott	Vela
Ellison	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	McNerney	Visclosky
Enyart	Meeks	Walz
Esty	Meng	Wasserman
Farr	Michaud	Schultz
Fattah	Miller, George	Waters
Foster	Moore	Watt
Frankel (FL)	Moran	Waxman
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Gabbard	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Galleo	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Neal	
Garcia	Negrete McLeod	
Grayson		
Green, Al		

NAYS—229

Aderholt	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Alexander	Bucshon	Culberson
Amash	Burgess	Daines
Amodei	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Bachmann	Camp	Denham
Bachus	Campbell	Dent
Barletta	Cantor	DeSantis
Barr	Capito	DesJarlais
Barton	Carter	Diaz-Balart
Benish	Cassidy	Duffy
Bentivolio	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Coble	Ellmers
Black	Coffman	Emerson
Blackburn	Cole	Farenthold
Bonner	Collins (GA)	Fincher
Boustany	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Fleischmann
Bridenstine	Cook	Fleming
Brooks (AL)	Cotton	Flores
Brooks (IN)	Cramer	Forbes
Broun (GA)	Crawford	Fortenberry

Foxx	LoBiondo	Rooney	[Roll No. 6]	Edwards	Levin	Quigley
Franks (AZ)	Long	Ros-Lehtinen		Ellison	Lipinski	Rahall
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Roskam	YEAS—228	Engel	Loeb	Rangel
Gardner	Luetkemeyer	Ross		Enyart	Lofgren	Richmond
Garrett	Lummis	Rothfus		Eshoo	Lowenthal	Ruiz
Gerlach	Marchant	Royce		Esty	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Gibbs	Marino	Ryunan		Farr	Lujan Grisham	Rush
Gibson	Massie	Ryan (WI)		Fattah	(NM)	Ryan (OH)
Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Salmon		Foster	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda
Gohmert	McCaul	Scalise		Frankel (FL)	(NM)	T.
Goodlatte	McClintock	Schock		Fudge	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Gosar	McHenry	Schweikert		Gabbard	Maffei	Sarbanes
Gowdy	McKeon	Scott, Austin		Gallego	Maloney	Schakowsky
Granger	McKinley	Sensenbrenner		Garamendi	Carolyn	Schiff
Graves (GA)	McMorris	Sessions		Garca	Maloney, Sean	Schneider
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Shimkus		Grayson	Markey	Schrader
Griffin (AR)	Meadows	Shuster		Green, Al	Matheson	Schwartz
Griffith (VA)	Meehan	Simpson		Green, Gene	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Grimm	Messer	Smith (NE)		Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Scott, David
Guthrie	Mica	Smith (NJ)		Gutierrez	McCollum	Serrano
Hall	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)		Hahn	McDermott	Sewell (AL)
Hanna	Miller (MI)	Southerland		Hanabusa	McGovern	Shea-Porter
Harper	Miller, Gary	Stewart		Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Sherman
Harris	Mullin	Stivers		Heck (WA)	Meeks	Sires
Hartzler	Murphy (PA)	Stockman		Higgins	Meng	Slaughter
Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer	Stutzman		Himes	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Heck (NV)	Noem	Terry		Hinojosa	Miller, George	Speier
Hensarling	Nugent	Thompson (PA)		Holt	Moore	Swalwell (CA)
Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Thornberry		Honda	Moran	Takano
Holding	Nunnelee	Tiberi		Horsford	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Hudson	Olson	Tipton		Hoyer	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Huelskamp	Palazzo	Turner		Huffman	Napolitano	Tierney
Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen	Upton		Israel	Neal	Titus
Hultgren	Pearce	Valadao		Jackson Lee	Negrete McLeod	Tonko
Hunter	Perry	Walberg		Jeffries	Nolan	Tsongas
Hurt	Petri	Walsh		Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke	Van Hollen
Issa	Pitts	Walden		Johnson, E. B.	Owens	Vargas
Jenkins	Poe (TX)	Walorski		Jones	Pallone	Veasey
Johnson (OH)	Pompeo	Weber (TX)		Kaptur	Pascrell	Vela
Johnson, Sam	Posey	Webster (FL)		Keating	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
Jordan	Price (GA)	Wenstrup		Kennedy	Payne	Visclosky
Joyce	Radel	Westmoreland		Kildee	Pelosi	Walz
Kelly	Reed	Whitfield		Kilmer	Perlmutter	Wasserman
King (IA)	Reichert	Williams		Kind	Peters (CA)	Schultz
King (NY)	Renacci	Wilson (SC)		Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)	Waters
Kingston	Ribble	Wittman		Kuster	Peterson	Watt
Kinzing (IL)	Rice (SC)	Wolf		Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Waxman
Kline	Rigell	Womack		Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Welch
Labrador	Roby	Woodall		Larson (CT)	Polis	Wilson (FL)
LaMalfa	Roe (TN)	Yoder		Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Yarmuth
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Yoho				
Lance	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)				
Lankford	Rogers (MI)	Young (FL)				
Latham	Rohrabacher	Young (IN)				
Latta	Rokita					

NOT VOTING—6

Eshoo Mulvaney Speier
McIntyre Pittenger Takano

□ 1639

Messrs. McHENRY and JOYCE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TANAKO. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 5, on the Motion to commit, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated for:

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 196, not voting 5, as follows:

NAYS—196

Andrews	Capuano	Costa
Barber	Cárdenas	Courtney
Barrow	Carney	Crowley
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Beatty	Cartwright	Cummings
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bera	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Bishop (GA)	Chu	DeFazio
Bishop (NY)	Cicilline	DeGette
Bonamici	Clarke	Delaney
Brady (PA)	Clay	DeLauro
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	DelBene
Brown (FL)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	Dingell
Bustos	Connolly	Doggett
Butterfield	Conyers	Doyle
Capps	Cooper	Duckworth

NOT VOTING—5

McIntyre Ribble Yoho
Mulvaney Sinema

□ 1656

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 6 on H. Res. 5, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 5.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.