down vote on Justice Priscilla Owen. Justice Owen has been elected by the people of Texas to the State Supreme Court two times, the second time in the year 2000 with an overwhelming popular majority. During her last election, Justice Owen was endorsed by every major newspaper in the State of Texas.

Mr. C. Boyden Gray, writing an article about this, said: “The members of the Texas legal community know Justice Owen to be a jurist of the highest integrity, one who is committed to following the law, no matter where it leads.”

The Dallas Morning News editorialized after she was nominated 4 years ago that “Justice Owen’s lifelong record is one of accomplishment and integrity. She is one of the few judicial nominees to receive the unanimous ‘well-qualified’ rating from the American Bar Association.”

The chairman of the Texas Commission on Judicial Efficiency, Baylor University President Herbert Reynolds, said, “Based on my knowledge of Justice Owen for the past 30 years, I believe you simply cannot make a more solid choice for the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.”

I urge the other body to have an up-or-down vote.

RECOGNIZING THE 216TH ENGINEER BATTALION OF THE OHIO NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. NEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 216th Engineer Battalion of the Ohio National Guard stationed in Chillicothe, Ohio, for their exceptional service during the war on terror.

The 216th completed more than 350 successful missions. They played a critical role in the construction of protective barriers to protect soldiers from enemy fire. And in preparation for Iraq’s national election on January 30, the 216th placed concrete barriers at hundreds of voting sites to allow Iraqis to vote in a safe and secure environment. However, their service was not without tragedy. Twenty soldiers of the 216th were awarded Purple Hearts for wounds they received in combat, and three soldiers made the ultimate sacrifice.

In recognition of their exceptionally meritorious conduct, the 216th will be awarded the Meritorious Unit Commendation during their Freedom Salute Campaign celebration next month.

It is with great honor that I have the privilege of recognizing them today. The willingness to risk one’s life in defense of the ideals our country was built upon is the truest test of one’s strength and character.

These men and women have excelled as patriots, and we are forever in their debt.
functions; $348 million for maintenance of air and marine vessels; and $93 million for facilities construction and maintenance; $5.7 billion for the Transportation Security Administration, including $2.5 billion for passenger and baggage screening; $983 million for aviation security direction and enforcement; and $36 million for surface transportation security; $4.5 billion for the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, including $3.1 billion for immigration enforcement, detention and removal; and $699 million for Federal air marshals; $3.6 billion overall for terrorism preparedness, including $750 million for formula-based grants to States; $1.2 billion in discretionary grants for high-threat urban ports, port security and public transportation security; $600 million for fire prevention and control grants; $750 million for training exercises and technical assistance grants; and $180 million for emergency management performance grants; $3 billion for emergency preparedness and response, including $2 billion for disaster relief; $861 million for information analysis and infrastructure protection; and $422 million for the Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security, including $380 million for the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology known as US–VISIT program; $14 million for the NEXUS/SENTRI program; and $7 million for the free and secure trade programs.

In providing these much needed funds throughout this legislation, the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and his committee have also focused sharply on the need for strong oversight and Congressional review. Major cuts in the $3.6 billion for terrorism preparedness programs in the country and it де-

ments prepare for the challenges they face every day will be severely cut in this bill.

Madam Speaker, that is the wrong choice. Many of my Republican friends will claim that the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee did the best they could with the allocation provided. The gentleman does not tell the whole truth. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will claim that the Homeland Security Department has no money to spend wisely and efficiently on homeland security.

This much needed emphasis on oversight of the efficiency and effectiveness on how money is spent on defending our country and ensuring that homeland security is barely a twig. And so, Madam Speaker, we see the same things happening in the Department of Homeland Security Department.

Yesterday at the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) testified at length how the Coast Guard refuses to provide detailed plans for their Deepwater program and how the only way to get their attention is to withhold funds for this program. The same is true with the TSA’s implementation of cargo screening measures and the deployment of explosive detection technologies at airports around the country.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that this bill attempts finally to force some kind of accountability from the administration.

But, finally, Madam Speaker, I want to say something about the rule today. I am pleased that it is an open rule. There have been 30 rules considered so far this year, and only three of those rules have been open. That is a bating 100, which will get you kicked off of any self-respecting Little League team. This is no way to run the people’s House.
I am also disappointed with the way this rule jeopardizes much of the oversight language written by this bill, by exposing it to points of order. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers) worked in a bipartisan way, as they should on an issue like this. This rule undercuts that bipartisanship.

Madam Speaker, for the past 3 years the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee has been this body's only source of oversight of the Department of Homeland Security. For this year the Committee on Homeland Security was established. This committee just reported out its first authorization bill, which will be considered later this week.

Madam Speaker, it is not good policy to strip out the oversight language provided by the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), because of a turf fight between two committees.

The Committee on Homeland Security will have a chance to bring forth its bill and in the future, I hope will provide the necessary oversight of the Department so that the Committee on Appropriations does not have to do two jobs; but we should not strike this language from this bill today. The authorizing committee is unhappy. To do so would be irresponsible, and that is why the rule today should be defeated.

I would say to my friends, especially on the other side of the aisle, that it is a little bit frustrating to hear them talk about the fact that we do need accountability, and I would like to think that the Members of Congress, since we had a role in creating this agency, would want to hold this committee accountable.

This is about our safety. This is about protecting the people of this country, and it is clear that we need to rein in the people over at the Department of Homeland Security.

So, Madam Speaker, I would say in closing that, because great respect for the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Ranking Member SABO), I think they provided the Committee on Rules last night with a good bill that had some teeth in it. I think that would hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable, but apparently, the Committee on Rules last night decided to just throw all that away.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the opportunity to be here on behalf of this rule today, as my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern), points out, is all taking place as a result of the hard work the next took place not only between the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Ranking Member SABO); but, really, it was from a lot of work that has taken place over a long period of time, working with the administration, working with the Homeland Security Department.

I must confess that I believe that we should have stronger oversight. I think we agreed on that last night in the Committee on Rules. We are also of the belief that the next took place not only the administration, but working with our appropriators, our authorizers, the people who are very interested in making sure that we move in a collaborative effort forward for Homeland Security.

So I am proud of what the bill is today. I think that what the subcommittee did was good work. We are not going to get a vote today. We are going to debate it. We are going to make it better. I am proud of the progress that we are making.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Well, I appreciate my colleague from Texas talking about the fact this is a good bill. I agree with him. If it is such a good bill, why did the Committee on Rules not half the bill to be stripped out?

During the testimony before the Committee on Rules, I think everybody, Democrat and Republican, on that committee praised the work of the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Ranking Member SABO) and talked about the fact that we do need to hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable. I did not hear any discussion in the Committee on Rules, and we also think it was a good bill.

Yet, here we are with a rule that would basically strip half of the most important provisions out of the bill. I do not think that is very responsible.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, whoever designed this proposition today is a real piece of work. I had already indicated my intentions to support the Republican chairman’s effort. I thought he did a reasonable job, even though he had inadequate resources. This is the bill after the Committee on Rules has gotten done with it. Look at the document. The Committee on Rules has gotten done with it. I was asked if I would work out a process which would enable the majority to pass its appropriation bills in a timely fashion. I have been working with the majority; and so far, we have worked out a process which we expect will enable us to support at least seven of the appropriation bills that are coming to the floor.

I had fully expected to stand shoulder to shoulder today with the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who I consider one of the most thoughtful job in providing necessary oversight for one of the most dysfunctional agencies in this government; and even though he had been given inadequate resources, I had indicated that because of the quality of the oversight I intended to vote for the bill.

That is no longer the case. If this bill is shredded on the floor by points of order by willful single Members, I will vote against the bill because it will make no sense.

What this action does, in making these provisions subject to a point of order by a single Member, this action puts at risk the thoughtful effort that the committee has put together with respect to securing screening of cargo on passenger airplanes. It puts at risk the funding to ensure that we have a rational terrorist watch match list operation. It puts at risk funding for port security and a number of other items critical to the national defense of the country.

This bill is being eviscerated because of a juvenile, a juvenile, dispute within the Republican caucus about committee jurisdictions. It is what Dick Bolling, my old mentor, used to call dung hill politics, where people put the welfare of their own committee ahead of the welfare of this institution and the welfare of the country. It is little league politics at its worst. I do not understand how we can be asked on the minority side to sit down and work out a bipartisan agreement on this appropriation bill, and then after we have done so, we are then told that some whiz kid, either in the Committee on Rules, in the leadership of the minority side, has decided that they do not like the compromise and they are going to open it up, to shred it.

The Committee on Homeland Security, the authorization committee that is objecting to some of these provisions in this bill, this is a committee that has existed for 3 years and never put one bill into law. The one bill that has to pass in order to assure this country
adequate security is this bill, the appropriation bill for homeland security; and yet we are going to follow a process today which not only shreds this bill but makes much less likely the prospect that we will finish our regular approach on time.

If the leadership did not intend to allow this bill to go forward, then why did it even allow it to come up until the authorization committee had gotten off its duff, done its job, completed action on the authorization, so the appropriations committee could bring the bill to the floor? If the House leadership on the major side of the aisle did not think it was important enough to pass this bill, then why are we here? Why are we here? Why are we wasting our time?

All this process means is that in the name of jurisdictional purity, the average member of this House will not have any say whatsoever about the eventual content of the provisions stricken from this bill. But those choices will be made behind closed doors, in conference between the two Chambers, out of reach of the average rank-and-file member on both the Committee on Appropriations and the authorization committees. This is a lousy way to run a railroad.

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

The gentleman makes some very good points about not only his vision and ideas about jurisdictional issues, but I would say to my colleagues today that there is some disappointment on behalf of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers), our great chairman, who behalf of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers) to continue, to go back and do their work, to go back, yes, to the table once again with homeland security and to talk about how important it is that the Homeland Security Department provide information on a timely basis.

It is important for us to continue providing reassurance to the American people that the philosophy, that the plans that are in place and moving forward will meet the continuing threat needs against this country.

What I would say is that we are not going to give up on the process. I do not know that it is perfect. I expressed some reservations myself yesterday in the Committee on Rules about things which I supported, but I believe that our chairman and the ranking member are forthright about their need, their desire to make sure that we will continue to understand the Homeland Security, even when we have the disagreements. This is a strong sense of the support in Congress that we have for the appropriators to go back and continue to do their work.

So I am not sure what we are doing. I do not think it is a sham. I understand completely why we are here today. I think it will be very clear when we vote today, and it will be a strong signal back to the American public that we intend to be serious about not only the threats that are placed against this country but also those avenues that make sure that our border security continues to provide on a moving-forward basis the ability that we have to the House meet the threat that is placed against this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am not proud what we are doing here today. I mean, this is a sham; and I would say to the gentleman that the choice is clear: you either support the chairman and you either support holding the Department of Homeland Security accountable or you do not.

The way the Committee on Rules came up with this rule, which subjects all these very important provisions to points of order, makes it impossible to hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable. I do not know how anybody who sat in that Committee on Rules meeting last night, all who agreed that what is going on in the Department of Homeland Security right now is failing, missing deadlines, not fulfilling requirements that this Congress has asked them to fulfill. I do not know how they could express solidarity with what the chairman and the ranking member were saying and then support a rule like this which undercuts all the accountability. I mean, this is wrong.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking Democrat on the committee.

Mr. SABO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I rise to oppose this rule. Funding government is about money, but it is also about how that money is used. This rule leaves unprotected virtually all of the good government provisions in the homeland security appropriations bill. This rule should be defeated. What does it do? It leaves unprotected provisions that will increase the screening of air cargo trade on passengers and other aircraft.

If my colleagues think we are doing a good job of screening air cargo on passenger planes today, vote “no” on this rule.

This rule leaves unprotected provisions that will fund additional explosive detection equipment to check airline passengers and carry-on and checked bags.

This rule leaves unprotected a provision that will ensure that passenger prescreening programs are secure and that the public’s vital information is protected.

This rule leaves unprotected provisions to protect taxpayers’ dollars from being spent on programs that are not well planned and properly implemented.

This rule leaves unprotected $584 million for checking airline crews and passengers against the government’s terrorist watch list. Is that really what we want to do?

This rule leaves unprotected $150 million for port security grants.

This rule leaves unprotected a provision to ensure that those managing big government contracts have the proper training to do so. If you believe that the Department of Homeland Security and the Transportation Security Agency are managing contracts with quality and professional management, then vote for the rule. If you believe there are troubles, as indicated by report after report from the Inspector General and the General Accounting Office, then vote “no” on this rule.

This rule leaves unprotected a provision to ensure that only truly sensitive information is designated as such. The Department’s current approach permits everyone at TSA to designate any document as sensitive and, therefore, not releasable to the public.

This rule does not allow the Obey amendment to fund the border security requirements of the Intelligence Reform Act and the REAL ID Act.

This rule should be defeated.

The subcommittee developed a responsible bill that provided proper and necessary Congressional oversight of critical homeland security programs. This rule allows that oversight to be defeated.

The fact is that the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers), did an outstanding job in developing a bill with proper oversight to conduct serious oversight of critical homeland security programs. This rule allows that oversight to be defeated.

We are here to conduct serious oversight of the Department of Homeland Security, not simply to rubber stamp the administration’s budget request.

I oppose this rule and urge Members to vote against it.

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

I think we just saw an articulate discussion about how people do need to work together here in Washington and how the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), and
our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers), worked together in their desire to make sure that Homeland Security is listening and to make sure it is a collaborative effort. We are going to keep after it. We are going to keep doing the right things together that the American public understands and gets not only every single dollar’s worth, not a penny more, but every single dollar’s worth of what is paid for that will secure this country, and that involves the efficiency and effectiveness of Homeland Security.

We had a discussion yesterday about the leadership of Homeland Security; how we know it is brand new, how we know the daunting challenge that is ahead of placing together all of these organizations and making them work well together, having them under the same mission statement and making sure that they are funded properly, making sure we hear back from them, making sure they hear back from us. Really, what this debate is about today is that we are not sure that Homeland Security is effectively listening to us, the policies that we would intend for them to place before the American public; to implement those and to make sure safety and security is taken care of properly, and then, lastly, the information back that will allow the ranking member and our great chairman a chance to philosophically add to those changing parameters of threat against this country. I believe that this administration will be serious about it. I believe the new leadership of Homeland Security in their wisdom and ability to work more carefully as time moves on will answer these questions and they will provide those things that are necessary.

But we just saw a prime example of the kind of steady hand, proper leadership that exists in the House of Representatives, and I am proud of that. I am proud of this on both sides of the aisle. I think we will continue working together, and I think that is what this legislation will prove worthy of today.

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

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

This is an incredibly frustrating moment for many Members in this Chamber. The gentleman from Texas talks about the incredible partnership of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Sabo) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers), the bipartisanship and their desire to hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable and to make sure that we are all protected. Then he is urging that we support a rule that would basically cut all the provisions in the bill that would hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable. If that is the case, then it would basically obliterate the bipartisan agreement that we have come to here.

Every Member of this House gets on an airplane probably at least twice a week. And when you look at the state of airline security, when you look at the deadlines that have been missed, when you look at the reports that they have failed to respond to, you have to ask yourself are they doing a better job in holding them accountable and making sure they keep their deadlines?

Again, in the Committee on Rules last night the gentleman from Texas and his colleagues and these provisions that were in this bill to hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable, and now he is on the floor telling us to support a rule that would strip the bill of all these provisions. It just does not make any sense to me. Why do we not do this right?

We know what has to be done, let us just do it. Instead, you are taking a good bill and you are just tearing it apart, and it just does not make any sense to me.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to appreciate the fact that we have a bipartisan bill here, to appreciate the fact that Chairman Rogers and Members of this committee worked tirelessly to make sure we hold this agency accountable. It needs to be held accountable. Nobody disagrees with that. Do not destroy that by voting against this rule, and let us go back and report another rule immediately, one that respects the agreement that has been reached here.

Mr. Speaker, I will also be asking Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so that we can consider the Obey amendment that was not made in order by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the Obey amendment does a lot of things. First, it funds 500 additional border patrol agents, 600 additional immigration investigators, and 4,000 additional detention beds so that the increases called for in the Intelligence Reform Act are fully funded. It also funds the grant program authorizing the REAL ID Act instead of imposing a costly unfunded mandate on our States.

This amendment fully offsets the $500 million in additional funding for this, and its enforcement. The REAL ID Act by capitalizing $138,176 the tax cut people making over $1 million this year will receive.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership likes to talk about making this country more secure and about protecting our lives from terrorists, yet they refuse to provide the funds necessary to do this. They also like to brag about how they would never impose an unfunded mandate on States and local governments, yet just 2 weeks ago they did just that. We have a chance to fix this today by voting for the Obey amendment. It is very disturbing that the Republican leadership of this House would deny Members an opportunity to vote on an amendment to make Americans safer.

As always, I want to emphasize that a “no” vote will not prevent us from considering the homeland security appropriation bill, but a “yes” vote will allow Members to vote on the Obey amendment. However, a “yes” vote will prevent us from adequately protecting our borders and from stopping the major financial burden we are placing on States to implement the REAL ID Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and a description of the amendment immediately prior to the vote.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so that we would have an opportunity to fully fund protection of the border and urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule.

We had a great opportunity in the Committee on Rules last night to do something good and get it right, and they blew it, so vote “no” on the rule as well.

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

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

We have a great opportunity to air out our differences today, our hopes and expectations about what we think the brighter and better future will be for the relationship that we have with Homeland Security, and today is part of that process.

I would like to once again reiterate my support for Chairman Rogers and Ranking Member Sabo, but I would also like to extend to the members of the Homeland Security Subcommittee my thanks for a job well done. They have spent a lot of time not only traveling around the country, with interaction and meeting with very important people who are focused on a daily basis on our homeland security, and so I want to thank those Republicans who are members of this subcommittee: The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTROOK), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CRENshaw), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), and the vice chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTROOK). It has taken a lot of their hard work, along with our friends on the other side of the aisle to make sure that the legislation would get to the floor today.

I would like to congratulate the chairman of the full committee also, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), for his hand in making sure this works.
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution. The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Sessions: On page 2, line 21, strike ""; page 17, lines 21 through 24."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as stated against.

The amendment was agreed to.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 185, answered “present” 2, not voting 24, as follows:

(A Roll No. 175)

AYES—222

DeFazio
DelGatto
DeLauro
Dodd
Engel
Emanuel
Eskridge
Evans
Farr
Filer
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzales
Gordon
Gore
Green (FL)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herrera
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Hoeven
Hoyt
Inouye
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
( TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, R. B.
Johnson (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
KilERVED
Kildee
Kucinich
Lake
Lantos
Lawrence (CA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipsinski
Logren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Martinez
McCarthy
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meek (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Milian
Miller (RI)
Moore (WI)
Moore (VA)
Moran
Moran (WY)
Napolitano
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olive
Olmstead
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Petersen (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Price (OK)
Proxmire
Reed
Reed
Rehder
Reid
Rex
Reynolds
Rogers AK
Rogers (NY)
Rogers (OH)
Rogers (TX)
Rogers (WA)
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryburn
Ryan (RI)
Ryan (WA)
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schellinoth
Schencker
Schiff
Schmitt
Schumer
Scott (CA)
Scott (FL)
Scott (ID)
Scott (IA)
Scott (IL)
Scott (LA)
Scott (NC)
Scott (NE)
Scott (PA)
Scott (VT)
Scott (WI)
Shipley
Shockey
Shelby
Shelton
Sherman
Sherman
Shuster
Shuster
Smith (AL)
Smith (GA)
Smith (HI)
Smith (IN)
Smith (KAN)
Smith (MD)
Smith (MI)
Smith (MN)
Smith (NC)
Smith (NY)
Smith (TN)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WI)
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