

rights. Let's stand up and fight to keep jobs here. Let's fight for American families. Let's defeat H.R. 2587.

□ 1230

STUDENT LOAN DEBT FORGIVENESS

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as we're on the verge of facing government default, there are several proposals on the table for us, as Members of Congress, to consider. And in my opinion, none of these proposals go far enough. Yes, they cut money in hopes of reducing our deficit and reducing our debt.

But here's what they don't do. They don't cut, they don't cap, and they don't forgive student loan debt.

Look, people. We want to create jobs. We want our families to have financial security. We need to help them get out of personal debt. And the most powerful way to get this economy moving again and to get our people the education they need is to help forgive certain student loan debt.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1938, NORTH AMERICAN- MADE ENERGY SECURITY ACT

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 370 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 370

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1938) to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, 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, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order

except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WEBSTER. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS)—who has a nice colorful Florida tie on today—pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this rule and the underlying bill. House Resolution 370 provides for a structured rule for consideration of House Bill 1938, the North American-Made Energy Security Act.

The rule makes 11 of the 13 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee in order for robust debate here on the floor of the House of Representatives. All 11 amendments made in order are Democrat amendments, and this legislation passed out of Energy and Commerce with bipartisan support, gathering "yes" votes from six Democrats on the committee, including the former chairman, Mr. DINGELL.

This bill has moved through the committee process with bipartisan support because it does not require anything in the extraordinary to do. Distilled in its simplest form, it directs the President to make a decision. It does not prescribe his decision one way or another; it just simply asks him to act, say "yes" or say "no."

After nearly 3 years of review, study, and comment, the President would have to decide whether or not to issue a Presidential permit permitting the Keystone XL pipeline.

This bill does not allow any corners to be cut, any environmental consider-

ations to be glossed over. In fact, not only has it required an Environmental Impact Statement to be executed, but several supplemental statements have been performed as well.

Furthermore, upon receipt of the final Environmental Impact Statement, but not later than November 1, the President still has an additional 30 days to weigh the evidence and make up his mind. After nearly 3 years, he does not have to approve the project nor disapprove the project; he simply has to make a decision.

And what exactly is at stake? What hinges upon the approval or disapproval of this monumental infrastructure project? American job creation, overdue economic growth, and increased national energy security.

TransCanada believes that the approval of the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline will create about 20,000 shovel-ready construction and manufacturing jobs, adding about \$6.5 billion in personal income for those workers. It injects more than \$20 billion in private sector investment in the U.S. economy.

It generates more than \$585 million in new taxes for States and communities along the pipeline route. It pays more than \$5.2 billion in property taxes during the life of the pipeline; undeniably strengthens America's energy security by enabling expanded importation of 830,000 barrels of oil a day from our U.S. neighbor and ally instead of importing it from other unfriendly sources.

In fact, according to the United States Department of State, if the pipeline is not approved, "the U.S. would not receive a reliable and cost-efficient source of crude oil from Canada and would remain dependent upon unstable foreign oil supplies from the Middle East, Africa, Mexico, and South America."

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. Relevant committees of jurisdiction have worked to provide us with a bipartisan bill which, at its core, is quite simple. It simply directs the administration to make a decision on America's energy and security and job creation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my friend for yielding and compliment him on his sunshine tie, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 1938 and feel that, much like the majority's previous legislation attempts to increase offshore drilling, this backwards-looking dirty energy bill will not lower the price of gasoline for the average American today, tomorrow, or in the future.

It manages, this bill does, to completely ignore the pressing needs to develop clean, sustainable energy. In fact, only the large oil companies will

benefit from this bill. In its very application for the Keystone XL pipeline expansion, TransCanada indicated that it believes this expansion will actually raise oil and gasoline prices.

The pipeline expansion connects Canadian oil to the Gulf of Mexico, making it possible to ship tar sands oil out onto the world market for the first time.

□ 1240

The pipeline will allow TransCanada to bypass the Midwest, reducing what the company called, and I quote, price discounting in the Midwest due to what it considers an, I quote, oversupply. The oil will run past Montana, right through Texas, ignore Nebraska completely, and wave good-bye to the United States while it rides right out of the country.

Providing Canadian oil companies access to this new market is the only reason to want to expand the pipeline. TransCanada's application actually indicates that it expects the price of crude oil to increase by \$6.55 per barrel in the Midwest and \$3 everywhere else after the expansion is completed.

Ultimately, the expansion would lead to a windfall for Canadian oil companies of between \$2 billion and \$3.9 billion by the year 2013, while increasing the cost of gasoline for hardworking Americans between 10 and 20 cents per gallon. The people of the United States will bear all the risks of an onshore oil spill and reap absolutely none of the benefits.

Let there be no mistake about this: the risk of an oil spill from these tar sand pipelines is very real. The oil is so much more corrosive than traditional crude oil that even Canada has yet to approve a dedicated pipeline conveying it to its coasts. The oil eats away at the pipelines, compromising them and leading to frequent spills. For example, the very pipeline for which the majority bill hastens expansion suffered 12 spills in its very first year. The first spill in June 2010 occurred only 1 month after the pipeline went into operation. Just this last May, the Keystone spewed 21,000 gallons of oil in North Dakota.

Already, Mr. Speaker, Americans are paying the price for a project which delivers to them absolutely no benefit. A similar pipeline recently discharged 840,000 gallons of oil into Michigan's Kalamazoo River, causing one of the largest oil spills ever in the Midwest. On July 1, a pipeline broke and spewed approximately 42,000 gallons of oil into the Yellowstone River. Between 1990 and 2005, there were over 4,700 related oil spills. The Keystone pipeline expansion would expand the risk of a BP-sized oil spill from the Gulf of Mexico to front yards across the heart of this country.

After its initial impact statement received harsh and extensive criticism, the State Department issued a supplemental draft statement. The period for public comment on that draft closed on

June 6. The State Department is currently reviewing the comments it received in response to this second statement in a process expected to take several months. Nonetheless, the State Department has reasonably indicated that a decision can be expected by the end of the year. Yet this bill would require a decision within 30 days of the issuance of the final environmental impact statement and no later than November 1.

Without further justification, Republicans seem to think it necessary to short-cut the process, compromising the discussion and its analysis. There are still many questions that need to be answered regarding the pipeline, including information on greenhouse gas emissions, safety, alternative routes, and environmental justice considerations.

This year, the Republican majority has offered three offshore drilling bills that have utterly failed to preserve and protect our environment. It is clear that my friends in the majority are more concerned with keeping big oil companies happy than implementing a workable energy policy for the future. Instead of crafting policies to ensure that the growing sustainable energy industry is filled with American workers, the majority wants to enrich Canadian oil companies at a cost of America's economy and environment.

These kinds of dirty energy bills keep us mired in the muck of fossil fuels when what we need to do is focus on making our energy use more efficient. We need to develop the next generation of clean energy technology. Unfortunately, Republicans seem intent on enabling our country's oil addiction. This is not good policy today and will certainly not be good policy in the future. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank my friend from Florida for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled by Congressman HASTINGS' remarks in opposition to the rule. This is a very fair rule. The Rules Committee received 13 amendments from the minority. They made in order 11 of those. One amendment was not germane and the other amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) would have restricted the oil to the United States and not allowed any of the product to be refined and sent overseas possibly, and that's a function that the Rules Committee felt should be a market function and not prohibited.

So 11 amendments by the minority were made in order. This is a bill that came out of my committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, on a bipartisan vote. All the Republicans supported it and between a fourth and a third of the Democrats supported it.

The underlying thesis of the bill is pretty straightforward. Under current

law, you're supposed to make a decision on pipeline permits between 180 and 90 days. The Obama administration EPA has had 2 years on their watch and 1 year under the Bush administration. EPA has had over 3 years if you count towards this September, next month, or right after August, and has not made a decision. The bill says make a decision. Make a decision.

There is an existing pipeline. The Keystone pipeline would connect an existing pipeline that ends in the Midwest to the gulf coast. It would go to Congressman POE's district in Port Arthur and go over into Louisiana. It would create tens of thousands of jobs in construction; it would bring approximately a million barrels of oil per day into the United States to provide competition for existing oil supplies; it would be refined in U.S. refineries; and most of the product, if not all, would probably be consumed by U.S. consumers.

This is a good bill. This is a good rule. I would ask that we support the rule and then listen to the debate and hopefully decide to support the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if I could engage the gentleman from Texas just a moment, I will yield myself 30 seconds before yielding to my colleague from Virginia.

I just am curious to know if this will cause the price of gasoline to go down, in your judgment.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. In my judgment, providing more fuel supply for our refineries would liken the possibility that prices would go down.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Likely possibility. I'll take that pretty much as a "no."

Mr. BARTON of Texas. No, that's a "yes." Take it as a "yes." Competition drives prices down.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague and my friend from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, and I rise in opposition on substantive grounds. The Rules Committee approved for our consideration here on the floor every germane amendment but one, the Markey-Connolly amendment, which would have required a simple certification that the bulk of this oil to be transported by this proposed pipeline be for and designated for domestic consumption.

□ 1250

We hear a lot of rhetoric about the need to expand American production and/or access to secure oil to lessen our dependence on foreign suppliers. That,

indeed, is a noble goal. It's one in which I share, but not at any price, and I don't want to be sold a pig in a poke.

The fact that the Rules Committee would not put that amendment on this floor, going into content rather than procedure, finding it germane but still not allowing a fair debate and its consideration on this floor, I think gives the lie to the intent behind the extension of this pipeline.

This oil is not for domestic consumption; this oil is for foreign export. It has very little to do with domestic oil supply or it might have very little to do with domestic oil supply. A simple requirement that the preponderance of it be for domestic supply I think would have made prudent domestic policy and I think would have allowed a fair and interesting debate here on the floor of the House as to what the real intention of this pipeline is.

So I say to the American public, I urge you not to be fooled by propositions from the other side that this is going to be good for American consumers. This is going to be good for Chinese consumers.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding. I also admire the gentleman from Florida with the exotic tie and his comments. But I stand in support of the rule and, of course, the underlying bill. The rule is a fair rule.

I represent southeast Texas. We still think we're the energy capital of the world. The pipeline from Canada will go down into southeast Texas, Port Arthur, Texas, which actually has high unemployment. The pipeline will go to the refineries. The refineries will be able to expand and hire refinery workers to refine that crude oil. I think that's a good idea.

The Canadian oil sands will be able to produce 175 barrels of oil reserves, second only to Saudi Arabia. The idea that we need to move away from Middle Eastern oil is a good idea. Maybe we ought to support our loyal allies that are in a stable country.

A medium-sized pipeline, just to give you some statistics, pumps about 150,000 barrels a day. To replace that, you would have to have 750 trucks a day or a 75-car train every day.

Pipelines are the safest way to transport crude oil. Seventy-five percent of the accidents occur with a third party causing the accident to the pipeline. But if we don't make a decision—that's what we're asking the President to do—make a decision. And as my friend from Florida knows, being former judges, we made decisions. It didn't take us 3 years to make a decision. You get the evidence; you make a ruling. And it has taken, I think, the Federal Government way too long to make a decision on this issue.

But failure to act—delay, delay, delay—is tantamount to a “no,” and eventually the Canadians will sell that

crude oil that they have to China or other buyers. So I think it's quite important that we go ahead and make a decision, have the Federal Government rule on this issue.

There are 500,000 miles of pipelines into the United States; about half of those run through Texas. I'm told that a third of all those pipelines run through my congressional district. We have a lot of pipelines. And I think it's important that we continue to try to take care of ourselves, use a safe product from Canada, make sure that all the environmental requirements are imposed in making this pipeline that creates jobs in America—build a pipeline, create jobs in southeast Texas for Americans and the refinery business—because we still rely on crude oil.

And last I would say, I agree, we need to eventually have green energy, but we don't have that now. So if we cut off all of this, what will we use?

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

Mr. WEBSTER. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. POE of Texas. So I urge support of the rule. I urge adoption of this legislation so that we can move forward with construction, American jobs, and deal fairly on the issue of energy reliance upon ourselves and getting that from our allies instead of Third World dictators like Chavez and the Middle East.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, Judge POE, that we have to start—and we are starting—the green energy movement. I readily understand the economic impact on Port Arthur, the State of Texas, and I also am deeply concerned for the ranchers in the Midwest, specifically Montana, Nebraska, those States, North Dakota, that are bypassed. And the possibility of their oil and gas costing more is, at the least, disturbing.

But I do want to share a report that was formulated regarding tar sands and their potential by the IHS Cambridge Energy Research Association, and it's under the aegis: “Growth in the Canadian Oil Sands.” What it says is:

“Tar sands, which are also known as ‘oil sands,’ are a combination of clay, sand, water, and bitumen, a heavy, black, asphalt-like hydrocarbon that cannot be extracted through a well like conventional oil. It is estimated that Canada's economically recoverable tar sands deposits in Alberta total 173 billion barrels, making Canada”—as Judge POE pointed out—“second after Saudi Arabia in oil reserves.

“Producing fuel from tar sands has significant environmental impacts. Extracting tar sands bitumen and upgrading it to synthetic crude oil produces roughly three times greater greenhouse gas emissions than producing conventional oil on a per-unit basis. Tar sands development also destroys boreal forests and wetlands and wildlife habitat, kills migratory birds, and degrades water quality and air quality.”

That said, tar sands oil contains, on average, 11 times more sulfur, 11 times more nickel, six times more nitrogen, and five times more lead than conventional oil. These pollutants are harmful to human health, causing lung and respiratory problems such as asthma and bronchitis, and the metals found in tar sands are neurotoxic. The pollutants released by refining tar sands causes acid rain, smog, and haze, and communities living near these refineries report elevated levels of cancer.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us overrides current law for the sake of padding the pockets of oil company CEOs and fails to create significant sustainable jobs for the average American in the growing sustainable energy sector. This bill will never become law and is once again a waste of our time.

I oppose this unnecessary opportunistic legislation for many of the same reasons that I have made very clear, as have others, but I have made the vow to be the last man standing in the fight against expanding offshore drilling, and I may be among those that will continue to stand against transborder tar sands being transmitted here for purposes of going out onto the world market and not allowing for any reduction in the cost of gasoline in the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

□ 1300

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for ample and open debate, allowing our colleagues from across the aisle to offer their legislative proposals to this bill.

Furthermore, the underlying bill addresses two critical concerns, if you listen to speeches made in this Chamber every day, of every Member of this House: unemployment and dependence on OPEC oil.

As I have stated, 20,000 shovel-ready jobs can be created with the approval of this infrastructure project. Approval of the Keystone XL pipeline will also serve to increase oil imports from our friend and neighbor in the north, Canada, while driving down our dependence on oil from countries that, quite frankly, do not share our ideas about democracy and freedom.

Most important, this bill does not force the President to approve this job-creating infrastructure project. It simply asks him, requires him to make up his mind after coordinating with all of the appropriate stakeholders.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in voting in favor of this rule and passage of the underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1311

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- adoption of H. Res. 370, by the yeas and nays;
- motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1383, by the yeas and nays;
- approval of the Journal, by the yeas and nays.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1938, NORTH AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 370) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1938) to direct the President to expedite the consideration and approval of the construction and operation of the Keystone XL oil pipeline, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 171, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 637]

YEAS—246

Adams	Bachus	Biggert
Aderholt	Bartletta	Bilbray
Akin	Bartlett	Black
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Blackburn
Altmire	Bass (NH)	Bonner
Amash	Benishkek	Bono Mack
Austria	Berg	Boren

Boustany	Hartzler	Petri
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Brooks	Hayworth	Platts
Broun (GA)	Heck	Poe (TX)
Buchanan	Hensarling	Pompeo
Bucshon	Herger	Posey
Buerkle	Herrera Beutler	Price (GA)
Burgess	Huelskamp	Quayle
Burton (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Calvert	Hultgren	Rehberg
Camp	Hunter	Reichert
Campbell	Hurt	Renacci
Canseco	Issa	Ribble
Cantor	Jenkins	Richardson
Capito	Johnson (IL)	Rigell
Carter	Johnson (OH)	Rivera
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Chabot	Jones	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Chandler	Kelly	Rogers (KY)
Coble	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Coffman (CO)	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Cole	Kingston	Rokita
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney
Cravaack	Kissell	Ros-Lehtinen
Crawford	Kline	Roskam
Crenshaw	Labrador	Ross (AR)
Culberson	Lamborn	Ross (FL)
Davis (KY)	Lance	Royce
Denham	Landry	Runyan
Dent	Lankford	Ryan (WI)
DesJarlais	Latham	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	LaTourette	Schilling
Dold	Latta	Schmidt
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Schock
Duffy	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Long	Scott (SC)
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Lummis	Sessions
Farenthold	Lungren, Daniel E.	Shimkus
Fincher	Mack	Shuler
Fitzpatrick	Manzullo	Shuster
Flake	Marchant	Simpson
Fleischmann	Marino	Smith (NE)
Fleming	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Flores	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Forbes	McCaul	Southerland
Fortenberry	McClintock	Stearns
Fox	McCollum	Stivers
Franks (AZ)	McCotter	Stutzman
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Sullivan
Galleghy	McKeon	Terry
Gardner	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Garrett	McMorris	Thornberry
Gerlach	Rodgers	Tiberi
Gibbs	Meehan	Tipton
Gibson	Mica	Turner
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)	Upton
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Walden
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Walsh (IL)
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Webster
Gowdy	Myrick	West
Granger	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Graves (GA)	Noem	Whitfield
Graves (MO)	Nugent	Wilson (SC)
Green, Gene	Nunes	Wittman
Griffin (AR)	Olson	Wolf
Griffith (VA)	Owens	Womack
Grimm	Palazzo	Woodall
Guinta	Paul	Yoder
Guthrie	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Hall	Pearce	Young (FL)
Hanna	Pence	Young (IN)
Harper		
Harris		

NAYS—171

Ackerman	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Andrews	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Baca	Chu	DeLauro
Baldwin	Cielline	Deutch
Barrow	Clarke (MI)	Dicks
Bass (CA)	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Becerra	Clay	Doggett
Berkley	Clyburn	Donnelly (IN)
Berman	Cohen	Doyle
Bishop (GA)	Connolly (VA)	Edwards
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Ellison
Boswell	Cooper	Engel
Brady (PA)	Costa	Eshoo
Braley (IA)	Costello	Farr
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Fattah
Butterfield	Critz	Filner
Capps	Crowley	Frank (MA)
Capuano	Cuellar	Garamendi
Cardoza	Cummings	Gonzalez
Carmahan	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Carney	Davis (IL)	Grijalva

Gutierrez	Maloney	Rush
Hahn	Markey	Ryan (OH)
Hanabusa	Matsui	Sanchez, Linda T.
Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
Heinrich	McGovern	Sarbanes
Higgins	McIntyre	Schiff
Himes	McNerney	Schrader
Hinojosa	Meeks	Schwartz
Hirono	Michaud	Scott (VA)
Hochul	Miller (NC)	Scott, David
Holden	Miller, George	Serrano
Holt	Moore	Sewell
Honda	Moran	Sherman
Hoyer	Murphy (CT)	Sires
Inslee	Nadler	Slaughter
Israel	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Jackson (IL)	Neal	Speier
Jackson Lee	Olver	Sutton
(TX)	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Pastor (AZ)	Tierney
Keating	Payne	Tonko
Kildee	Pelosi	Towns
Kind	Perlmutter	Tsongas
Kucinich	Peters	Van Hollen
Langevin	Peterson	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Pingree (ME)	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Polis	Walz (MN)
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Levin	Quigley	Schultz
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Watt
Lipinski	Rangel	Waxman
Loeback	Reyes	Welch
Lofgren, Zoe	Richmond	Wilson (FL)
Lowey	Rothman (NJ)	Woolsey
Lujan	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth
Lynch	Ruppersberger	

NOT VOTING—15

Bachmann	Fudge	Nunnelee
Bilirakis	Giffords	Schakowsky
Bishop (UT)	Hinchey	Stark
Blumenauer	Johnson (GA)	Waters
Cleaver	McDermott	Wu

□ 1336

Messrs. HOLDEN, LUJÁN, and BECERRA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 637, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

RESTORING GI BILL FAIRNESS ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1383) to temporarily preserve higher rates for tuition and fees for programs of education at non-public institutions of higher learning pursued by individuals enrolled in the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs before the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvements Act of 2010, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows: