

America. This bill also includes funding for critical county school payments. 780 counties in 42 States will get critical funding for law enforcement, search and rescue, and struggling rural schools.

My district, the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, will avert a disaster if this legislation is adopted.

I thank the Democratic leadership for leading us in a new direction on energy and fulfilling their commitment to rural counties.

The ball was dropped by the Bush administration and by the Republicans. We're taking it up for all America here today by passing this bill.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE IMPRISONMENT OF AYMAN NOUR

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the third anniversary of the imprisonment of Egyptian parliamentarian and presidential candidate Ayman Nour. He was jailed on charges of forgery during the 2005 presidential elections in Egypt.

Nour suffers from numerous health problems. He has been subjected to documented physical abuse and has been denied visitation rights afforded to other prisoners. His health condition continues to worsen.

Many Members of Congress stand in solidarity with Ayman Nour and respectfully call on President Mubarak to grant his unconditional release. December 10 is Human Rights Day, marking the anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In honor of that day, the Egyptian Government should release Ayman Nour. This action would symbolize a recommitment to the inherent dignity of all people and to their equal and inalienable rights.

THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the United States Postal Service, and I use that term because that's their formal name, has announced that they're going to stop using, having vending machines at the post office. That means that Americans will not be able to go to the post office when they need to get a stamp this holiday season, tax time or whatever, and realize they need stamps and be able to go to the postal service to buy a stamp. It seems the U.S. Postal Service is taking service out of their name.

Older people can't just very easily decide to learn how to use the Internet or have an Internet and poor people don't either. The postal service says people can buy stamps online. They can call an 800 number. They can buy them by mail. But if you need something for an

immediate postage, if you don't have the Internet, if you're old, and it's difficult to stand in line because you're handicapped or disabled, this is a great disservice to America.

They say the machines aren't working. Well, Federal Express wouldn't do something like this. They'd improve the machines or find a new machine. And if the machines didn't work at Coca-Cola, Coca-Cola would buy new machines.

The United States Postal Service should be for service and for the customer and maintain the vending machines. I'm preparing legislation, and I'll be sending a Dear Colleague out, Mr. Speaker, and hope all will join us in putting service back in the USPS.

□ 1015

THE TEDDY BEAR AND ISLAM

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, in the third world country of Sudan, the government is controlled by the religion of Islam. Religious hard-liners were successful in prosecuting a British first grade teacher for insulting Mohammed. She was sent to jail. Her crime: her 7-year-old students named a class Teddy Bear "Mohammed," and that was supposedly an insult to the Prophet. The punishment could have been worse. She could have received 40 lashes. In fact, thousands of Sudanese citizens marched demanding the school teacher be executed for the insult!

Of course, the teacher never meant to insult Islam, but the truth was not an issue in her trial.

The Sudan, this is the same "righteous" government that is allowing ethnic cleansing and genocide of its own citizens in Darfur.

But thanks to two Muslim members of the British House of Lords who disagreed with the arrest, the school teacher, Gillian Gibbon, was pardoned after serving 8 days in jail.

This case is an example of what happens when government punishes people for violating a religious doctrine.

And, by the way, the Teddy Bear was originally so named to honor the great President Theodore Roosevelt.

And that's just the way it is.

SUPPORT THE ENERGY BILL

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support today's energy bill. This is the change we need, for America needs a reliable energy partner, one that is home grown.

This bill restores our Nation's independence and will help to secure our future. It will also stimulate our economy and protect our environment. It will allow for clean, renewable energy

and move us away from the dangerous dependency on Arabian oil. It will also decrease our imported oil by 2 million gallons per day. It will create jobs and strengthen our economy as we move towards efficient, clean, and renewable energy resources.

This bill answers the question whose side are we on. Do we stand with Big Oil and the past or do we stand with the future?

I stand with the future and will continue to fight to cut the price of energy and fight hard for the people of Northeast Wisconsin.

BUY PRODUCTS MADE IN THE USA

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, defective, unsafe products, toys with poisonous lead paint, American jobs going overseas lured by cheap labor and unfair trade practices, these issues concern every American. But all of us can take a stand this holiday season.

One way is that instead of judging products by cheap prices, look for quality and safety that comes with American products. This holiday season shoppers will be buying gifts made from all over the world, but let's make an extra effort to look for American products.

This Christmas check the label for "Made in the USA" and support jobs for hardworking Americans and American quality. "Made in the USA" may be the best gift ever this Christmas.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 6, ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 846 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 846

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6) to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a single motion offered by the Majority Leader or his designee that the House concur in each of the Senate amendments with the respective amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees.

The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of the motion to concur 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.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against consideration of the rule because the rule contains a waiver of all points of order against the bill and its consideration. Therefore, it is in violation of section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden to identify the specific language in the resolution on which the point of order is predicated. Such a point of order shall be disposed of by the question of consideration.

The gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Vermont each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

After that debate the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: "Will the House now consider the resolution?"

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office says that there are unfunded mandates in this bill, but we really don't know what's there because we got this thousand-page bill, thousand-page bill, just about 12 hours ago.

As we know, we have a House rule that says we are supposed to get a bill like this 72 hours before instead of 12. Common practice has been if you can't get 72 hours, then at least 24. We've cut that in half, just 12. And most of that was during the time when most of us were asleep. I can guarantee you that few, if any, in this body have read this bill; yet we are voting on it, a billion dollar bill that virtually nobody knows what's in it.

We do know, however, and that's the reason this point of order lies against the bill, there are unfunded mandates in the bill.

We also have rules with regard to earmarks air-dropped in a bill like this. It's not a conference report of an appropriation bill but an actual bill where they are dropped in at the last minute. The truth is, with a bill that's over a thousand pages long, we simply don't know what's in there; yet we are being told we have got to pass it, we've got to move this thing today. That's simply wrong.

I would like the assurance of those from the Rules Committee that there are no unfunded mandates in the bill or there are no earmarks that have been added to the bill.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, this point of order is really essentially about whether or not we are going to consider the rule and, ultimately, the Energy Independence and Security Act. In fact, I would say that it may well be an effort by folks who are opposed to the legislation to find a way to kill the legislation itself. We believe that this legislation should proceed.

The fact is that the other side had absolute control in this body or had a majority in this body for 12 years, enjoyed control in both bodies and in the administration for the past 6, for most of that 6, and did not come up with an energy policy that did anything other than raise the cost of oil, home heating oil, gasoline, increase our dependence on foreign oil, weaken our national security and contribute to global warming. This legislation is about changing the direction of American energy policy, and the issues that have been raised in this legislation are ones that have been debated outside of this body for several years.

The legislation now brings to this body for its consideration such topics as increasing fuel efficiency, energy efficiency, green buildings, cellulosic agriculture-based energy efforts that will be vital to the farm sector and rural sectors of our economy.

So we believe that the House is going to have an opportunity to vote on this point of order and reach its judgment about whether it wants to proceed on the important question of changing the energy policy in this country.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I would gladly yield to the gentleman if he will answer the question if there are any unfunded mandates in this bill in violation of the rules, had the rules not been waived, or if there are any earmarks in the bill.

Would the gentleman answer that question? Are there unfunded mandates in the bill or any earmarks in the bill?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I am not aware of any earmarks in the bill. I'm completely unaware of any earmarks in the bill. There is CBO information suggesting that the unfunded mandates, which is a separate one, is not within any of the rule provisions as it applies to the public sector, maybe as it applies to the private sector.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman.

Let me read from the CBO: "These provisions also contain several private sector earmarks. CBO estimates that their aggregate costs would well exceed the annual threshold established in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act for private sector mandates, \$131 million in 2007, adjusted annually for inflation."

There is the answer to the question of unfunded mandates. They are in the bill. We're waiving those points of order so we can get around that.

I would suggest that at some point you've got to say, are we living up to the promises that were made at the beginning of the year?

Now, the majority has made a habit, and I don't blame them, of saying this is what you Republicans did while you were in the majority. That is true. Many of us stood here and raised these same points of order when our own party did it. I would love to see on the other side somebody stand up and say this is the wrong thing to do. If it was wrong when Republicans did it, it's wrong when Democrats do it.

With regard to earmarks in this legislation, nobody has been able to do anything more than a cursory read of a thousand-page bill that we got just 12 hours ago. But in the biofuels subtitle, we've found a university-based research and development competitive grant program. This grant will be for universities to conduct research and development of renewable energy technologies for "trees dying of disease or insects infestation as a source of woody biomass." This grant is for universities that are near "trees dying of disease or insect infestation as a source for woody biomass." That smells a lot like an earmark to me. It sounds like there is probably just one university, a particular university, or two that meet that qualification. That is certainly an earmark. And that's why these rules were waived again to get around that kind of thing.

The Democrats put in some good earmark rules at the beginning of the year, but your rules are only as good as your willingness to enforce them. And that's the problem here. We are not enforcing our own rules.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, if he would be so kind, I have been reviewing the bill since it was made available to us last night, and I was wondering, that earmark that he referred to, if he has any idea where it would be.

Mr. FLAKE. I have no clue.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I will continue looking, then.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you. I know it's a very difficult thing. That is a very large bill.

That earmark is somewhere in here. We have no idea where. My guess is there are a lot more of them.

Let me just talk about one other one. Another questionable provision that looks like an earmark to me is a provision terminating the remaining portions of the New York Liberty Zone tax incentives program. The House-passed previous version of the energy bill gave New York a tax credit of \$2 billion to build a rail line from JFK to Lower Manhattan.

□ 1030

The bill now purports to reduce the cost of the New York tax provision to \$1.1 billion, but the result is only true thanks to some very creative drafting.

In fact, passage of the bill would still let New York keep a total of \$2 billion of Federal taxpayer money, with at least \$900 million of that coming between the year 2018 and 2019.

Again, that creative drafting is somewhere in this document that we got last night, 12 hours ago. And we're expected to go through this and make sure that it complies with the rules. Why are we doing this? Why are we doing this when we have very specific rules?

And as I mentioned, I was the first to commend the majority for putting in some good transparency and accountability rules in January. I felt they were better than what we did last year. But your rules are only as good as your willingness to enforce them, and there seems to be no willingness here. That's the problem.

So I would be glad to hear from the other side. I will retain my time and hope to hear an explanation of whether or not there are actual earmarks in the bill or unfunded mandates.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 3½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Vermont has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I am going to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR). But before I do, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona; I would like to thank him for the good work that he has done on earmarks that he did when he was a member of the majority and now as a member of the minority.

But I would also remind the gentleman that, in fact, under the leadership of the current Chair of the Appropriations Committee, there has been a massive change in direction on earmarks. In fact, it's been a reason why some of the budget bills took longer than last year because there has been an exhaustive effort to go through and identify anything that can be called an earmark to allow Members who wish to address it to raise their points.

What I've said to the gentleman is that we are unaware of any earmarks in this legislation. And I appreciate your late-night work at finding provisions that, as you have presented them, you're characterizing as possible earmarks. I am aware of absolutely no earmarks.

The so-called unfunded mandate, there is language in a letter, Mr. Speaker, from the CBO that suggests that there may be a slightly above the threshold under the rule, but that's a decision that this body can make and will make. It's incidental, not significant, to the overall policy.

So having said that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR. I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee, and I rise in support of the Energy Independence and Security Act and this rule.

Today, we break the stranglehold that Big Oil and the special interests

have had over Washington, D.C. and over our country's energy policy.

We're going to hear many maneuvers today and protestations, delay, resistance, points of order because this is a fundamental shift in the Nation's energy policy.

The contrast between the policies of the past and our forward-looking bill could not be more clear. Remember just 7 years ago when the administration's Energy Task Force met behind closed doors? It consisted of oil executives, and the administration fought to keep everything secret. Renewable sources of energy were not a priority, the Earth's climate change was not a priority, and the recommendations involved more drilling, more mining, more of the same, which led to record gas prices for our families, and record profits for oil companies, and disastrous national security consequences.

In contrast, our ground-breaking effort today sets our country on a path towards energy independence, particularly from the Middle East and the most volatile parts of this world.

Better gas mileage for automobiles is the cornerstone of our bill. That alone will save families from \$700 to \$1,000 per year at the pump, and that is great news for our neighbors back home.

What has been missing is the political leadership and the political will to make this happen in America. So today we will cast aside the politics of the past and for the first time in decades set the right priorities for America. This bill repeals the subsidies to the big oil companies and instead invests in renewable energy and biofuels technologies.

And to the folks back home in Florida, whom I have the privilege to represent, we're going to demonstrate here today that there is no need to put our tourism economy and beautiful beaches at risk to more oil drilling offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. Instead, we're going to rely on American ingenuity and resourcefulness.

The status quo in Washington is not acceptable anymore, and we will chart a fundamental new direction on energy policy.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman's comments that we have finally removed special interests from the energy field with this bill, when you have a bill like this, I guarantee you it's full of special interest provisions, many of which we haven't discovered yet.

I mentioned you have one earmark in here, a grant for universities that are near "trees dying of disease or insect infestation as a source of woody biomass." I would suggest it's probably one particular university in mind, or some special interest, that an earmark will be going to. The New York Liberty Zone provision is another special interest provision.

I would also make the point that this is technically not a conference report; there wasn't a conference. This is a House amendment to a Senate amend-

ment to H.R. 6, if I'm not mistaken. What that means is the point of order that I would have liked to have raised against the provisions that may include earmarks in the bill doesn't lie against the bill because it's not a conference report, because it's a House amendment to a Senate amendment. That's another creative way to get around the rules that the majority themselves have put in place.

If you say that there are no problems with this bill, why are we waiving all points of order against it? Of course it's to hide things in it. People should be skeptical whenever they see something a thousand pages long, a thousand pages long that nobody, not anybody on the Rules Committee, not anybody anywhere has had the opportunity to read, 12 hours, 12 hours to read that. I don't think Evelyn Wood, with a speed-reading course, or anybody could get through this. And when the majority can simply say, We're not aware of anything, I mean, you can take the Fifth, you can plead the Fifth in court, but I don't think you can do it here. I don't think that that flies, certainly not outside of the Beltway. Certainly people around here should be skeptical of a multi-billion-dollar bill with special interest provisions rife throughout it that we've had 12 hours to review before voting on.

When all the majority can tell us is, We're not aware of things in there, let me remind the majority that we had an instance earlier this year, or several instances, where the chairman of the Appropriations Committee signed off on an appropriation bill saying, There are no earmarks in this bill, which prevented us in the minority from actually lodging a point of order against the bill, after Members had already issued press releases claiming credits for their earmarks in the bill.

So clearly you can pass some good rules, which you have, but you have got to enforce those rules, and they're not being enforced here. That's why we should uphold this point of order and not move forward and proceed with this bill. You cannot put a thousand-page bill, give it to us with 12 hours to review, with problems rife throughout it, and not have problems.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been a long time coming. As a freshman Member of this body, I am proud to rise in support of the rule and this energy legislation that will make significant strides in our effort to address global warming, save our families money on their energy bills and at the pump, and bolster our national security by mapping out a more energy-independent future for our country.

This energy bill includes a long overdue increase in CAFE standards and improves vehicle efficiency standards to 35 miles per gallon by 2020, the first

increase of this kind since 1975. This significant increase in vehicle emission standards will save American families between \$700 and \$1,000 per year at the pump, reduce oil consumption by 1.1 million gallons per day by 2020, which is one-half of what we currently import from the Persian Gulf. And these new standards will reduce greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to taking 28 million of today's average cars and trucks off the road.

Science tells us that CAFE increases are possible and necessary, and we must implement them now. And while implementing necessary environmental protections, this legislation will preserve tens of thousands of American manufacturing jobs in places like Avon Lake, Ohio, where my constituents produce passenger vans.

This bill will provide our auto manufacturers domestically with the tools and incentives they need to produce the vehicles of tomorrow here in the United States, keeping jobs at home, and allowing us to all move forward together. Keeping high-paying auto manufacturing jobs in this country will in turn help retain hundreds of thousands of related jobs in the electronics, steel, textiles, glass, plastics and rubber, and countless other sectors that produce auto parts, while also laying the groundwork for jobs in the future.

The American people have spoken loud and clear that we cannot turn a blind eye to the crisis of global warming and astonishing gas prices squeezing the budgets for our working families.

I urge support for the rule and the bill.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reclaim my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. FLAKE. Let me just make one point with regard to special interests, that they have been removed from this process. Because we were trying to get copies of this legislation and couldn't yesterday, we couldn't get it from the majority, so many of the Republicans were actually getting excerpts and pieces of this legislation from firms along K Street, from the special interests themselves. They seemed to have copies before we in the majority did. There is something wrong with this process. We only get it last night from the majority, but we were getting it yesterday from special interests downtown who already had copies of it, or portions, at least.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong support of this legislation, the bill, H.R. 6, and also on the rule.

H.R. 6, as you know, will lower energy costs, strengthen our national security, and reduce global warming emissions, and create what I say are "green collar" jobs. Major investments in renewable energy could create over 3 million jobs in 10 years. It would also eliminate the outsourcing of good-paying jobs.

Here I am in a classroom in East Los Angeles. If we have the political will to do this now, why can't we put our money where our mouth is and help the American public better understand that this new technology, the greening of our country, should be made available to everyone? Leave no one left behind, whether in the Bronx, whether in East Los Angeles, across this country. There is a whole new wave of emphasis and trust and hope that we here in the Congress are going to do the right thing.

I don't have any earmarks. I know my staff has worked very diligently with our committee and as a member of Energy and Commerce to see that we do the right thing. We spent laborious hours working on this legislation.

I ask for Members to support the bill and the rule.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for his comments and his arguments here on this point of order, and also for the work that he has done.

I happen to believe that process does matter, but I also think substance matters, and they have to go together. Ideally, when we're working in a perfect world, they do. But one of the major reasons that we don't have an actual conference committee report is because our friends in the other body refused to go to conference, refused, refused to go to conference to discuss our energy future, Mr. Speaker. How is that right? Is that a proper use of process?

The reason we are here and the way that we're here is because there has been a decision made by the majority of the American people that they want a new energy policy, and the basic question for this body is whether we want to give that new energy policy or we don't.

The best process is going to get the best bill, but it takes cooperation on both sides. And if we have, in the other body, a refusal to even go into conference, it leaves leadership in this body with a single choice: do nothing and capitulate, or move ahead.

On this question of earmarks, we have given you as much assurance as we can possibly give you that there are not earmarks in here. We have the CBO letter about so-called unfunded mandates in the private sector. That's going to be a decision for the body.

I urge all Members to vote "yes" on this motion to consider.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the question of consideration will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 3505.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 188, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 1134]

YEAS—214

Abercrombie	Gordon	Murphy (CT)
Ackerman	Green, Al	Murphy, Patrick
Allen	Green, Gene	Murtha
Altmire	Grijalva	Nadler
Andrews	Gutierrez	Napolitano
Arcuri	Hall (NY)	Neal (MA)
Baca	Hare	Obey
Baldwin	Harman	Olver
Barrow	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Bean	Herseht Sandlin	Pascarell
Becerra	Higgins	Pastor
Berkley	Hill	Payne
Berman	Hinchev	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Peterson (MN)
Blumenauer	Hodes	Pomeroy
Boren	Holden	Price (NC)
Boswell	Holt	Rahall
Boucher	Honda	Rangel
Boyd (FL)	Hoyer	Reyes
Boyda (KS)	Inslee	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Israel	Rodriguez
Braley (IA)	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Rothman
Butterfield	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Jefferson	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Cardoza	Jones (OH)	Ryan (OH)
Carnahan	Kagen	Salazar
Carney	Kanjorski	Sánchez, Linda
Castor	Kennedy	T.
Chandler	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kilpatrick	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kind	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Klein (FL)	Schiff
Cohen	Kucinich	Schwartz
Conyers	Lampson	Scott (GA)
Cooper	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lantos	Serrano
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Sestak
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Cramer	Lee	Sherman
Crowley	Levin	Sires
Cuellar	Lipinski	Skelton
Cummings	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (TX)
Davis (CA)	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	Mahoney (FL)	Snyder
Davis, Lincoln	Maloney (NY)	Solis
DeFazio	Markey	Space
DeGette	Marshall	Spratt
Delahunt	Matheson	Stark
DeLauro	Matsui	Sutton
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Dingell	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher
Doggett	McDermott	Taylor
Donnelly	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	McNerney	Tierney
Ellison	McNulty	Towns
Ellsworth	Meek (FL)	Tsongas
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Udall (CO)
Eshoo	Melancon	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	Michaud	Van Hollen
Farr	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Filner	Miller, George	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Mitchell	Walz (MN)
Giffords	Mollohan	Wasserman
Gillibrand	Moore (KS)	Schultz
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Waters

Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch (VT)

Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu

Wynn
Yarmuth

SECURITIES LAW TECHNICAL
CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2007

Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne

Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster

Simpson
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—188

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx

Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave

Neugebauer
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Arcuri
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Stearns
Stupak
Berman
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Manzullo
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Moran (KS)
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brale (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke

NOT VOTING—29

Baird
Bishop (GA)
Carson
Clay
Cole (OK)
Cubin
Culberson
Engel
Fattah
Feeney

Hinojosa
Hoooley
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Lewis (GA)
Lucas
Lynch
Miller, Gary
Moore (WI)

Myrick
Nunes
Oberstar
Ortiz
Paul
Platts
Souder
Weiner
Young (AK)

□ 1107

Messrs. GILCHREST, BURTON of Indiana and MCHENRY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3505, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3505, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 1135]

YEAS—404

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Hill
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Bono
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Jordan
Kagen
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke

Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Hill
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Bono
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Jordan
Kagen
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke

Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hersteth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinche
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin

NOT VOTING—27

Baird
Carson
Clay
Cole (OK)
Cubin
Culberson
Engel
Fattah
Feeney

Hinojosa
Hoooley
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Lucas
Lynch
Miller, Gary
Moore (WI)

Myrick
Nunes
Oberstar
Ortiz
Paul
Platts
Souder
Weiner
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are less than 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1116

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.