

first time in 12 years, but we are taking care of it in a way that would surprise them. And our Nation's veterans are very grateful that we are finally giving them the respect they deserve.

And I will tell you that this House, by a vote of 409-2, passed the Veterans appropriations bill. And, yes, we do need to go to conference; but we will do that when the conferees are appointed in the Senate, when it is appropriate to do it. We have passed, this year, an additional appropriation of \$3.4 billion to take care of our Nation's veterans. We will, in fact, make sure that all the veterans are taken care of. In fact, on November 11 of this year we will celebrate tremendous respect for our Nation's veterans and will, in fact, do everything that we have promised to do, and more.

We just saw today three bills taken up by the Veterans' Committee to, in fact, take care of the needs of our Nation's veterans. And I am highly offended by the insinuation that we are in some way acting in a partisan way not to take care of our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to H.R. 1011, this bill is, in fact, an important bill to protect the natural resources of the State of Virginia, a vital area for our country. Mr. BOUCHER and the delegation from Virginia have done a fabulous job in crafting this proposal. It is a bill that preserves tens of thousands of acres of pristine wilderness in Jefferson National Forest. It is necessary that these beautiful, natural landscapes remain protected and untouched so that they may be enjoyed by our children and our grandchildren for years to come. It deserves the strong support of all the Members on the floor today.

That is the bill that we will be moving the previous question on. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 763 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. The House disagrees to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2642, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon. The Speaker shall appoint conferees immediately, but may declare a recess under clause 12(a) of rule I for the purpose of consulting the Minority Leader prior to such appointment. The motion to instruct conferees otherwise in order pending the appointment of conferees instead shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two additional legislative days after adoption of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic 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 definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1483, CELEBRATING AMERICA'S HERITAGE ACT

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 765 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 765

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1483) to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the authorization for certain national heritage areas, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 1483 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 765.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 765 provides for consideration of H.R. 1483, the Celebrating America's Heritage Act. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources and makes in order the substitute reported by the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule also contains a self-executing provision to the base text consisting of a technical correction that

inserts a map reference for a map that was not completed yet by the National Park Service prior to filing the reported bill. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin to address the rule and the underlying bill, I want to also extend my feelings of empathy and concern for those out in California dealing with the fires that are plaguing that area of our country. We are all watching and we are all, in spirit, hoping that the fire ravaging will end. We appreciate the hard work and the fearless dedication of our fire service and our firefighters, and we hope that that situation is under control in the very, very near future.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. At the outset, I would like to commend my Republican colleague and neighbor, Congressman REGULA, for his leadership in sponsoring this bipartisan piece of legislation.

This bill will provide additional support to nine national heritage areas and allow for the designation of six new heritage areas, making them eligible for Federal support.

I am proud that the Ohio and Erie National Heritage Canalway is among these nine national heritage areas. And I can tell you from firsthand experience that I've had with the Ohio and Erie National Heritage Canalway, that these heritage areas are an invaluable asset, both to the local communities and to our Nation, from the preservation of local culture and history, to increasing tourism, and as centerpieces for economic growth.

The designation of heritage areas provides for a partnership approach to heritage development, allowing the sites to be locally managed with a local organization coordinating in partnership with local residents.

These areas provide unique opportunities to understand the larger context of these regions' traditions, landscapes and people, and the heritage of this great country.

The Ohio and Erie National Heritage Canalway is not a traditional park. It's a lived-in region where the national, cultural, historic and recreational resources combine to form a nationally significant landscape that celebrates the significance of the Ohio and Erie Canal and its contribution to the region, the State of Ohio, and the United States.

The Ohio and Erie Canal helped connect the Ohio frontier with New York and New Orleans in the early 19th century, playing a key role in linking a previously isolated Ohio with economic centers east and south. And the canal was crucial to the development of Ohio's economy, attracting businesses to the area and providing a viable transportation route for emerging industries.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that with increased Federal support, the Ohio and Erie National Heritage

Canalway and other heritage areas included in this legislation will continue to play central roles in their communities and equally important roles in our national heritage.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Ohio and Erie National Heritage Canalway, the Celebrating America's Heritage Act will provide support to the National Coal Heritage Act in West Virginia, the Tennessee Civil War Heritage Area, the Augusta Canal and National Heritage Area in Georgia, the Steel Industry American Heritage Area in Pennsylvania, the Essex National Heritage Area in Massachusetts, the South Carolina National Heritage Corridor, America's Agricultural Partnership in Iowa, and the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area in New York.

This legislation will also recognize and bring the benefits of heritage areas to six new communities throughout the Nation: Journey Through Hallowed Ground Heritage Area in Virginia, Niagara Falls National Heritage Area in New York, Muscle Shoals National Heritage Area in Alabama, Freedom's Way National Heritage Area in Illinois, and Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area in Arizona.

And it's important to note, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation specifically includes language that protects private property rights. And the bill makes clear that a national heritage area designation does not alter existing regulations or land use plans.

This is a good bill that will help communities and our country celebrate our heritage and use our history for future prosperity and collective pride. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I'm proud to be a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation. And, again, I would like to thank Congressman RALPH REGULA from my home State of Ohio for introducing this bill and for being a champion of Ohio's heritage.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation.

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

□ 1600

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule and urge my colleagues to oppose it as well. Mr. Speaker, this rule is the 39th closed rule the House will be considering this year. The Democrats have not just broken their promise to the American people to cooperate in an open and honest manner, they are actually doing it in a record-setting manner. In fact, this Democrat-controlled Congress has considered more than twice as many closed rules,

twice as many, Mr. Speaker, as the previous Republican-controlled Congress did at the same point in the session.

So they didn't just break their promise, Mr. Speaker, they have shattered it. Most troubling of all is that this rule would prevent Representatives from offering amendments to adjust and alter the bill out of concerns directly affecting the districts and people that those Representatives were elected to represent.

The Celebrating America's Heritage Act authorizes \$135 billion to be spent over the next 15 years for nine already established National Heritage Areas and six new National Heritage Areas. One of the new National Heritage Areas created in the bill is the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area, which includes land in Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia and Virginia. Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. GOODE of Virginia have expressed concerns that the land in the districts they represent is included in this new National Heritage Area and that this bill does not guarantee local residents will be allowed to participate in decisions affecting the area in their districts. If Congress is going to dictate how land is to be used, we must make sure that those who are directly affected by such designations are, in fact, supportive of the legislation.

I believe that all Members should be afforded an opportunity to have their voices heard on behalf of those they represent when their district is directly impacted. It was remarked yesterday in testimony before the Rules Committee by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, "That is just good government." What he was referring to obviously was to have a Member talk about issues that affect their district. Unfortunately, if adopted, this 39th closed rule of the year will deny Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GOODE and, in fact, all Members of the House, the opportunity to bring forth their concerns to attempt to amend—to perfect this bill. Although National Heritage Areas typically do not create additional Federal lands, the Federal Government can significantly impact the use of the land in and surrounding National Heritage Areas.

Mr. Speaker, coming from an area in my area in central Washington that is 40 percent federally owned, I want to take this opportunity to discuss my concerns with future actions that could lead to additional Federal lands. As I have said many times before on this floor, I believe Federal land management agencies simply have too much land to manage effectively. Federal land agencies continue to struggle to maintain trails and facilities on public lands as well as to manage unnaturally high fuel loads that can lead to catastrophic wildfires. We had that discussion on the previous rule; yet, year after year we are spending precious tax dollars to buy up more private property to take off local tax rolls.

There are far more pressing issues affecting public lands management that

we could be considering today. For example, Mr. Speaker, we should be discussing the extension of payments to forested counties for rural schools and roads or for development of clean energy on public lands. These are far more pressing issues, and they are not going to go away. I believe the House should act quickly in a bipartisan manner to address them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a closed rule, as I mentioned in my opening remarks. In closing, I would like to read a quote from the distinguished majority leader (Mr. HOYER) from Congress Daily PM on December 5, 2006, a little more than 10 months ago. He said, Mr. Speaker, "We intend to have a Rules Committee that gives opposition voices and alternative proposals the ability to be heard and considered on the floor of the House."

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader said that a little bit more than 10 months ago. Unfortunately, the Democrat majority is once again not living up to the promises they made to Americans just less than a year ago. We are shutting out the people and the Representatives who are directly impacted by this legislation with this closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote against this, the 39th closed rule of the year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my colleague from Washington that this legislation does not affect private property rights. The bill makes it clear that a National Heritage Area designation does not alter existing regulations or land use plans, either.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS).

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1483, amending the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act.

Early this year, I introduced the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area Act with Congressman GRIJALVA. I am pleased that our bill has been included in H.R. 1483.

By designating the Santa Cruz Valley as a National Heritage Area, this beautiful and thriving region will receive modest Federal support for promoting the area's history, cultural resources and indigenous wildlife habitat. We are ensuring that the Santa Cruz Valley visitors can experience the unique watershed and diverse societies it has supported, Native American tribes, descendants of Spanish ancestors, American pioneers, and, now, members of our diverse Sonoran Arizona communities.

Widely supported from Marana, Arizona, to Patagonia, the Santa Cruz

Valley will protect private property rights and public use of this federally managed land.

So I support this bill. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the underlying bill to support preserving Arizona's National Heritage.

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

Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks, my colleagues on the Rules Committee and I have highlighted loopholes in the House rules related to earmark transparency. While this is an important issue that still must be addressed, there is still a more pressing issue that the House must act on immediately.

Mr. Speaker, it has now been 130 days, 130 days, since the veterans funding bill was approved by the House. The Senate passed a similar bill. Mr. Speaker, contrary to what was said in the debate in the last bill, the Senate has appointed their conferees over 6 weeks ago. Sadly, the Democrat leadership in the House has refused to move forward on this bill and name conferees and instead has chosen to put partisanship and politics ahead of ensuring our veterans' needs are met. Every day the Democrats choose not to act to move this bill forward, our Nation's veterans lose \$18.5 million.

Last week, Republican Leader BOEHNER took a positive step toward naming House Republican conferees. Now, Speaker PELOSI must follow suit and take the steps necessary to ensure that work can begin on writing the final veterans funding bill that can be enacted into law.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, this is one of those bills that enjoys strong bipartisan support. It is troubling to me that Democrat leadership chose to consider a simple resolution today supporting and encouraging greater support for Veterans Day each year, but thus far, has refused to demonstrate meaningful support for our Nation's veterans by working on this final funding bill. Our veterans, and all Americans, want us to put partisanship and politics aside and work together to do what is in the best interests for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I see no better time than right now. Therefore, I will be asking my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that I can amend the rule to allow the House to immediately act to go to conference with the Senate on H.R. 2642, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs funding bill and appoint conferees.

The amendment to the rule I am offering would allow the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of consulting with the minority leader prior to the appointment of conferees. Further, it would provide that the motion to instruct conferees otherwise in order pending the appointment of conferees instead shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within 2 additional leg-

islative days after adoption of this resolution. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we can act on this as quickly as we possibly can.

By defeating the previous question, the House will send a strong message to our veterans that they have our commitment to write a final bill providing them the funding and increase they need, deserve and were promised.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question on the 39th closed rule the House is considering this year, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I only wish the same commitment and tenacity on behalf of veterans that is being expressed here today continues into the future, and I wish that it had been a little bit more at the surface in the past.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats, when they came into the majority in this House, passed the biggest increase for veterans health care in history. They passed in the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill \$6.7 billion above the fiscal year 2007 budget, which, by the way, was the largest single increase in the 77-year history of the VA, \$3.8 billion above the President's request. So we are indeed on the same page in terms of protecting our Nation's veterans, and we are working diligently, not just with our words, but with our votes and with our actions to make sure that we live up to the promise that we make to our veterans.

Returning to the legislation and the rule at hand, Mr. Speaker, the Celebrating America's Heritage Act would provide support for some of our Nation's cultural treasures and will expand support to additional heritage areas. I cannot overstate the importance of many of these areas, not only to the local communities and the regions in which they exist, but to preserving the history of the United States, that history that those veterans fought for, by the way, and these heritage areas stand out for national parks and they are overseen by a coalition of local leaders, community members and local organizations all with an interest in the preservation in their areas' traditions and culture and in the continued vitality of their communities. These heritage areas play a key role in spurring economic development, which serve as a bridge to the future for communities as well as a constant reminder of our past and the cumulative history that has led to where we are today.

I know what the Ohio and Erie National Heritage Canalway means to northeast Ohio, and I know what increased Federal support will do to help it continue serving our community and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 765 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. The House disagrees to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2642, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon. The Speaker shall appoint conferees immediately, but may declare a recess under clause 12(a) of rule I for the purpose of consulting the Minority Leader prior to such appointment. The motion to instruct conferees otherwise in order pending the appointment of conferees instead shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two additional legislative days after adoption of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic 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 definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress,

(page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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.

□ 1615

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 763, by the yeas and nays;

Adopting House Resolution 763, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 765, by the yeas and nays;

Adopting House Resolution 765, if ordered; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1955.

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. 1011, VIRGINIA RIDGE AND VALLEY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on order-

ing the previous question on House Resolution 763, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 190, not voting 17, as follows:

	[Roll No. 990]	YEAS—225
Abercrombie	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Ackerman	Grijalva	Neal (MA)
Allen	Gutierrez	Obey
Altmire	Hall (NY)	Olver
Andrews	Hare	Ortiz
Arcuri	Harman	Pallone
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Pascrall
Baird	Herseth Sandlin	Pastor
Baldwin	Higgins	Payne
Bean	Hill	Perlmutter
Becerra	Hinchey	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Hinojosa	Pomeroy
Berman	Hirono	Price (NC)
Berry	Hodes	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Holden	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Richardson
Blumenauer	Honda	Rodriguez
Boren	Hooley	Ross
Boswell	Hoyer	Rothman
Boucher	Insllee	Royal-Allard
Boyd (FL)	Israel	Ruppersberger
Boyd (KS)	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Brady (PA)	Jackson-Lee	Ryan (OH)
Braley (IA)	(TX)	Salazar
Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Sánchez, Linda
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	T.
Capps	Jones (OH)	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Kagen	Sarbanes
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Schakowsky
Car纳han	Kaptur	Schiff
Carney	Kennedy	Schwartz
Castor	Kildee	Scott (GA)
Chandler	Kilpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clarke	Kind	Serrano
Clay	Klein (FL)	Sestak
Cleaver	Kucinich	Shea-Porter
Clyburn	Lampson	Sherman
Cohen	Langevin	Shuler
Conyers	Lantos	Sires
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Skelton
Costa	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Costello	Lee	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Levin	Snyder
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Solis
Crowley	Lipinski	Space
Cuellar	Loebssack	Spratt
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Stupak
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Mahoney (FL)	Tanner
Davis, Lincoln	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
DeFazio	Markey	Taylor
DeGette	Marshall	Thompson (CA)
Delahunt	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Matsui	Tierney
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Dingell	McCullom (MN)	Tsongas
Doggett	McDermott	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McGovern	Udall (NM)
Doyle	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Edwards	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellison	McNulty	Viscosky
Ellsworth	Meek (FL)	Walz (MN)
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Wasserman
Engel	Melancon	Schultz
Eshoo	Michaud	Waters
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Watson
Farr	Miller, George	Watt
Fattah	Mitchell	Waxman
Filner	Mollohan	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Welch (VT)
Giffords	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gillibrand	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Murphy, Patrick	Wu
Gordon	Murtha	Wynn
Green, Al	Nadler	Yarmuth
	NAYS—190	
Aderholt	Bachus	Bartlett (MD)
Akin	Baker	Barton (TX)
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Bigert
Bachmann	Barrow	Bilirakis