

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 846.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 846 provides for consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 6, the Energy Independence and Security Act. The rule provides for a motion by the majority leader to concur in the Senate amendments with the House amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, controlled by the majority and minority leaders, or their designees.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body have worked long and hard to change the direction of energy policy in this country. I can't mention them all, but I would be remiss not to pay special acknowledgment to the Speaker, to Mr. DINGELL, and to Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. Speaker, this House in a very short time will have an opportunity to turn the page on generations of energy policy. Perhaps the best way to characterize what has been the U.S. policy on energy is captured by looking at a photograph that serves as a metaphor. What it shows is the United States hand in hand with OPEC producers, on whom we have become increasingly reliant and dependent, pursuing an energy policy of drill-and-drill, consume-and-consume, spend-and-spend; all with ever-escalating and budget-busting expense inflicted on our families and businesses; all with reckless denial, reckless denial, to the environmental damage that we are doing by this policy to the Earth we all share; and all with cavalier disregard to our national security by depending on regimes that are not our friends.

Mr. Speaker, this bill brought before you does two fundamental things in changing the direction of energy policy. It says that we are going to consume less by taking practical steps, long overdue, to increase mileage standards, to allow American families going to and from work, picking up their kids, going to daycare, bringing

them to soccer games, to travel in safe vehicles manufactured by American workers that get 40 percent more miles per gallon. Mr. Speaker, that will save the average American family \$700 to \$1,000 a year.

Second, by making a strong national commitment to renewable energy, to having energy that we produce, that we keep our American dollars and our American jobs here at home, and by investing in cellulosic ethanol, wind and solar and technologies that have shown promise to give us the energy we need, the jobs we require and the environmental improvement that is essential, this turns the page on what has been an overdue time for change in our energy direction in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the current system just ain't going to work. The ever-escalating cost to our families is not sustainable. In December of 2002, the price of a gallon of gas was \$1.48. Today it is about \$3.09. Five years ago it cost an average Vermont family about \$600 to heat their home during the winter. It is over \$1,500 to \$2,000 now.

The environmental damage is indisputable. With 4 percent of the world's population, we are still consuming about 20 to 25 percent of the world's energy, and we generate roughly 6 billion tons of carbon dioxide into the air each year.

Mr. Speaker, we can't afford to be sending so many American dollars abroad; \$500,000 every minute from the pockets of American consumers and American businesses go to countries that provide us with the oil that we need, when they are not particularly good friends of ours. That is \$500,000 every minute, \$30 million every hour, \$5 billion every week.

This energy bill turns the page from a country that has been excessively dependent on oil consumption to a country that is going to be self-confident in its people, in its resources and its ingenuity, to take on the energy challenge and turn it into energy opportunity.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Vermont, my friend, Mr. WELCH, for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, fairness, openness, sunshine, transparency, bipartisanship, those are just some of the words the new majority used to describe the way they were going to run the 110th Congress. Today, just as we have seen during much of the new majority's stewardship of the House during this year, those have been, at best, hollow promises.

The rule we are considering is being called something similar to a standard conference report rule by the majority. Now, Mr. Speaker, normally considering a conference report under such a rule would not cause much controversy, but this is not a conference report. It never went through the usual

conference process. The majority never named conferees, never held a conference meeting nor gave the minority the chance to offer a motion to instruct conferees.

Last night in the Rules Committee, we met until late. We heard from our friends on the other side the aisle that, well, it is not a conference report because Republicans in the Senate didn't want a conference. But Mr. BARTON was there. He is, as you know, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and he said "I certainly wanted to be part of it. I wanted to be part of the conference." So, again, the blame was on the Republicans, even though, last I heard in November, it was the Democrats that won the majority in the House and in the Senate.

During their campaign, the new majority promised that they would allow for regular order for legislation. They even put their campaign promise in a book called "A New Direction for America," and yet they have consistently broken their campaign promises. And today is no exception.

Now, the rule specifically breaks two promises made by the majority during the campaign. First, they said in "A New Direction for America," "House-Senate conference committees should hold regular meetings at least weekly of all conference committee members. All duly appointed conferees should be informed of the schedule of conference committee activities in a timely manner and given ample opportunity for input and debate as decisions are made toward final bill language."

Now, why is it important, this difference between a conference report and what is being brought forth today? Again, the majority is saying that because the Senate couldn't go to conference, they were using this procedure in lieu of a conference, of a real conference.

Now, debate is structured like a conference report, and they are trying to argue that we are treating this bill like a conference report. But here is how this process differs: Republican Members were never given an opportunity to review the entire text, as conferees would have been; this bill is being considered with less than the 24 hours promised by the new majority for conference reports; there is no list of earmarks in the bill, as would be required in a conference report; and there is no list of air-dropped earmarks, as would be required in a conference report.

That is why it is important, what we are dealing with. It seems somewhat technical, but it is extremely important that a mechanism is being used that has circumvented the conference process. Circumventing the conference committee not only blocks Members from debating and amending the legislation in the committee, but it blocks the minority from using one of the few legislative tools at our disposal, which is, obviously, as I have said, the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, the one time we considered such a rule in the 109th Congress,

my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. McGOVERN, closed his speech opposing the rule by saying things would be different under the new majority. I think his words are particularly relevant today. He said, "We should have a more open process. We should have regular order. We should have hearings. We should have committee markups. We should do this the right way. I hope that in the next Congress that we will set a new standard, one that we can all be proud of, Democrats and Republicans alike."

Well, as I said, I think those words are particularly relevant today, because they point to the vast difference between what was promised and the reality of the performance of the majority in this Congress, and we are already 1 year into that performance of the new Congress.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, this is not regular order, certainly not what the majority promised. I urge my colleagues to oppose this transparent procedural ploy so that we may have a full and open debate on this critical issue of importance to the Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

This is a historic debate. This is a historic day in the history of the United States. Today, we debate energy independence and global warming for the first time in a serious way in our history. This legislation will accomplish things that will send a signal to the world.

In this bill, we will increase the fuel economy standards of the vehicles Americans drive from 25 miles per gallon to 35 miles per gallon. We will produce enough ethanol and cellulosic fuel that we can substitute for oil that by the year 2030, when both provisions are completely implemented, we will be backing out twice the oil that we import on a daily basis from OPEC, from the Persian Gulf. What a signal to OPEC, twice the oil from the Persian Gulf eliminated in one vote.

And, at the same time, because of the efficiencies in light bulbs, in heating, in cooling, in furnaces, in all appliances, in buildings, in homes, we will in this one vote meet 35 percent of our entire goal by the year 2030 in reducing greenhouse gases to protect the planet from global warming. We will meet in this one vote 35 percent of the entire goal between now and 2030. What a moment for this Congress.

It will unleash a technological revolution in new technology so that, rather than importing those technologies, we will be exporting those technologies. It will send a signal to our consumers that we are not going to stand by and allow them to be tipped upside down and have money shaken out of their pocket by OPEC as the

price of oil has gone from \$26 a barrel in President Bush's first year in office to over \$90 a barrel today. Every week, the American consumers send \$5 billion overseas to OPEC and other countries; \$5 billion a week.

This bill today is really a signal to OPEC that we now mean business. And it is a signal to the rest of the world that we are serious about global warming, and it is a signal to our citizens that we are going to begin to create those new green jobs in our country so that we can produce the products that are going to revolutionize the energy sector.

So make no mistake about it as you cast this vote, my colleagues, you are casting the most important energy and environment vote of your career, and you will be remembered for this vote. So I ask you to give a signal to the American people that this Congress, when the Republicans took over in 1995, imported 43 percent of its oil; now we import 61 percent of our oil. It just keeps going up and up and up. So if we are to turn a corner historically and to engage these issues of energy efficiency, these issues of energy independence, these issues of global warming, this is the vote. One vote, later on today. I urge an "aye" vote by all of the Members of this body.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if this were the serious effort that our distinguished colleague has just mentioned, the majority would permit amendments, would permit discussion, would permit a conference on this critical issue, if it were the serious effort that has been described by the previous speaker. Instead, we see a process to shut out debate, to shut out amendments, to shut out ideas. That is not the serious effort just described.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I want to thank my friend from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule as was described by my friend from Florida that allows not a single amendment to be offered on the floor of the House today and in opposition to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill won't become law, and it shouldn't become law. Its priorities are all wrong. It won't lower gas prices; it is going to increase them. It totally ignores nuclear power as a non-emitting energy source. It totally ignores hydropower as a clean, non-emitting energy source. It raises taxes by unknown billions. And, Mr. Speaker, it gives a tax credit to people for riding their bikes to work. I am sorry, but gas prices and climate change aren't going to be fixed by making people ride their bikes to work.

This isn't a plan to make America energy independent and to free us from foreign oil. It is just a dream for the political left in this country. And let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, it raises taxes,

it is anti-nuclear and anti-dams, it forces people out of their cars, and gives tax credits for riding their bike to work.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address an issue, the Secure Rural Schools issue. And you might ask, why do I want to address that issue, because it has nothing to do with energy. And that is a very good question. It has nothing to do with energy, but it is in this bill. It is another cynical way the Democrats have approached this issue.

Time after time this year, Democrat leaders have attached Secure Rural Schools to bills they know will never become law, like this bill, and blocked attempt after attempt to put it in bills that will become law. The way this bill is written, it abandons our rural schools and communities and it moves in the program.

Don't take my word for it. Just last Tuesday, Speaker PELOSI told the Oregonian newspaper in Portland, Oregon, during a visit to Portland that "where we go from here is to see how we can phase this system out."

Mr. Speaker, I submit the full text of the article for printing in the RECORD.

[From the Oregonian, Nov. 28, 2007]

PELOSI SAYS HEALTH CARE CHANGE CAN

START HERE

(By Harry Esteve)

Oregon could become a leader in the drive to establish centralized computer health records for everyone who gets medical care, U.S. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi said Tuesday in Portland.

Pelosi, D-Calif., stressed the importance of records as a way to save billions of dollars in health care costs, reduce medical mistakes and ensure better care in rural communities.

"Electronic records are essential to improving health care," Pelosi said. "This is the future. I see Oregon taking the lead in that future."

Pelosi made her comments after holding a round-table discussion with a group of medical experts, hospital administrators and elected officials, including U.S. Rep. David Wu, D-Ore., and Gov. Ted Kulongoski. The discussion, held at Oregon Health & Science University's South Waterfront office tower, was closed to the media.

Pelosi's visit to Oregon was part of her "innovation agenda," an effort to boost technological progress, such as more broadband access and alternative energy systems, and to increase the number of scientists, mathematicians and engineers coming out of U.S. schools.

At the same news conference, Kulongoski announced the state has received a \$20 million federal grant to install broadband cable at rural hospitals and clinics throughout the state. The grant, from the Federal Communications Commission, would allow a doctor in a remote part of the state to send a digital MRI image to a specialist at OHSU Hospital, for example.

Kulongoski said the grant and Pelosi's initiative are part of a widespread movement toward better communication in the health care industry. He said he saw a recent study that showed savings of \$1 billion in Oregon alone if electronic health care records were in place.

In Oregon, as with much of the country, recent attention on medical issues has focused on the escalating cost of health care and the rapidly rising number of uninsured or under-insured.

After talking to reporters for about five minutes, Pelosi answered two questions. One was about the trade-off between her goal of improved record-keeping and efforts to make health care more affordable to everyone. The other was on an unrelated topic: federal timber payments to Oregon counties.

Pelosi said the push for centralized medical records would not take away from efforts to give health coverage to millions of people who lack it. Medical experts say the ability to transfer records with ease is as important as other medical breakthroughs, such as new medicines or therapies, Pelosi said.

"We're not talking about this as some kind of elitist thing for people who already have health care," Pelosi said. "We're talking about it as essential."

Pelosi all but brushed off the question on timber payments. Oregon's congressional delegation has been pushing to keep federal payments to counties that used to receive millions of dollars from logging on national forests.

That program expired, although Congress passed a one-year extension this year.

"Where we go from here is to see how to phase this system out" over the next few years, Pelosi said Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrat leaders of this House need to stop with these false promises regarding rural schools. Let's get serious. Let's keep the promises that were made, the full promise, not one that dwindles towards nothing. Let's get it done as relates to rural schools in a responsible way before the year ends and before this program expires.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, we stand today on the verge of a new energy horizon, one that promises a more secure America, an America with thousands upon thousands of new manufacturing and high-tech jobs, an America with lower and more stable energy prices, an America at long last responding to the threats of global warming. But this America will only be realized by ushering the legislation before us into law.

This bill reflects a bold vision, a vision to respond to many of the gravest threats facing our Nation, a vision befitting the United States Congress, the world's greatest deliberative body.

There is much to laud in this legislation. This bill would increase American energy independence, strengthen national security, lower energy costs, grow our economy, and create new jobs, reduce global warming. Now, the focus on the renewable electricity standard provision: a Federal RES is long overdue, and I thank you for your commitment to this provision. Thank you to my Democratic and Republican colleagues who joined me in offering this amendment in August and to the 220 Members who supported its passage.

In closing, I would like to remind my colleagues that we are not here to defend the status quo; we are here to lead. We are here to ensure America's standing as a model of ingenuity, creativity, cutting-edge thinking, and revolutionary ideas. Failing to usher this

legislation into law I fear will threaten that standing.

The renewables revolution which we will be ushering in through this bill and the RES provision is good for business, it is good for the environment, and it is good for the security of our Nation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, today, we stand on the verge of a new energy horizon. One that promises a more secure America. An America with thousands upon thousands of new manufacturing and high-tech jobs. An America with lower and more stable energy prices. An America at long last responding to the threats of global warming.

But this America will only be realized by ushering the legislation before us today into law.

This legislation reflects a bold vision. A vision on the scope needed to respond to many of the gravest threats facing our Nation. A vision befitting the United States Congress, the world's greatest deliberative body.

There is much to laud in this legislation. The first increase in CAFE requirements in over 30 years, which will save American families an estimated \$700 to \$1,000 per year at the pump. An historic commitment to American biofuels that will fuel our cars and trucks.

And, of great importance to me and my constituents, the inclusion of a renewable electricity standard. An RES, as it is known, requires electric utilities to generate 15 percent of their electricity through renewable resources and energy efficiency measures.

I would like to thank the Speaker in particular for her commitment to this provision, the several colleagues who joined me in offering this as an amendment in August, and the 220 Members who supported its passage at that time.

Opponents of an RES claim that it would increase electricity costs for consumers. Study after study has shown the contrary. It has consistently been found that a strong Federal RES could actually save American consumers money. A recent study conducted by the Union of Concerned Scientists found an RES would save consumers \$13 billion to \$18.1 billion on electricity and natural gas bills cumulatively by 2020. In March, the energy consulting firm Wood Mackenzie projected that consumers would save more than \$100 billion with an RES in place. They also found that with more diverse energy sources and a decrease in fossil fuel consumption, reduced demand for natural gas would lower prices by as much as 20 percent by 2026.

And while consumers are saving money, a Federal RES also helps make our Nation safer and less dependent on foreign sources of energy. Almost all new electricity generation in the last decade has been fueled by natural gas. The biggest sources for future natural gas supplies are Iran, Russia, and Qatar, which together hold 58 percent of the world's natural gas reserves. Increasing the production of domestic energy from biomass, solar, wind, and other renewable sources helps us reduce our dependence on foreign countries, thereby securing America's energy independence.

The requirements under this RES start modestly, and increase gradually. It includes many provisions both to help utilities meet the requirements, and to reward those utilities that

meet the requirements ahead of schedule. It allows States, many of whom have moved far ahead on this issue, to have standards that are more rigorous. It has support from the business community, the labor community, the faith community, and the environmental community.

It is an idea, Madame Speaker—like all included in this legislation—whose time is long overdue.

My colleagues, we are not here to defend the status quo. We are here to lead. We are here to make the difficult decisions necessary to ensure America's continued standing as a model of ingenuity, creativity, cutting edge thinking, and revolutionary ideas. Failing to usher this legislation into law will, I fear, threaten that standing.

Passing this legislation today should not be considered one of the difficult decisions we have to make. And to those for whom it is a difficult decision, I urge you to join me and the millions of Americans across the country who recognize that the renewables revolution is good for business, is good for the environment, and is good for the security of our Nation.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It has been almost a year now, and we have had a lot of discussion throughout committees and so forth on a number of areas that would promote green technology, and I want to say that it is critical that we move in that direction. CAFE standards are good. Improving better gas mileage for our vehicles is a good thing. Unleashing American ingenuity is a good thing to solve our energy problems. But we should not be picking favorites. This Congress should not pick favorites at the outset with the new development of all these technologies. We need to be technology neutral in this approach, and this bill does not do that. It seeks to pick favorites, and it also does a number of things that would be devastating to our oil and gas industry as it exists today.

Let's be truthful with the American public. We are not going to see energy independence in the short term. We have to manage strategically our energy dependence. The provisions, such as getting rid of the 6 percent domestic manufacturing deduction for our oil and gas companies and our refineries would be devastating to our industry. Getting rid of the foreign tax credit provision as applied only to oil companies is going to be devastating. This will deny the ability of our oil companies to deduct their foreign taxes, in effect creating double taxation on our companies.

What does this mean? The big companies are the ones that have the technology to drill in deep water, to improve our supply; the smaller companies partner with them. If the big companies can't do it, smaller companies

won't be able to do it. And what are we going to do in the short term? The green technology that we all want is not there yet. So we have to strategically manage our dependence, and this bill will actually increase our dependence on foreign oil based on a number of these provisions. There is nearly \$13 billion in new taxes on our oil and gas companies. This is critical. This is going to hurt our energy security.

So for these reasons, I oppose the rule and I oppose the underlying bill. Let's work in a bipartisan way to get a good piece of energy legislation.

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

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, there are three critical priorities that this Congress faces: our independence from foreign oil sources, addressing global warming, but also American competitiveness. I believe that solar energy technology offers one of the best solutions to challenging these great, great problems that we have.

Now, as the House takes up this energy independence bill, I commend the commitment that this legislation makes to solar energy. This bill authorizes new research and development into solar technologies. The bill authorizes programs to help train a qualified solar workforce to install and maintain these technologies, not just in Arizona, but across the country. This bill also contains some tax incentives from my Renewal Energy Assistance Act that will help solar become more affordable, not just to homeowners, but also to businesses. This is what is so critical to spur the innovation and investment that is vital to the creation of our reliable solar market for the country, not just Arizona. But with over 350 days of sunshine every single year, it is critical that we harness the power of the sun.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wonder how Congress could possibly consider addressing an energy bill that has no energy in it.

The House is considering energy legislation which does nothing to expand domestic energy production, develop nuclear or coal-to-liquids technology, and only increases our Nation's dependence on foreign oil and hurts American jobs and the economy.

While promoting the use of alternative energy is a worthy and long-term goal, by mandating and increasing renewable fuels 36 billion gallons by 2022 without concern to the fact that this technology does not exist today and with almost no consideration of cost or price to consumers, it is not the right direction for our country or the Nation's energy industry.

□ 1145

In addition, the renewable portfolio standards mandates in this legislation,

which only nine States can currently meet, can increase the cost to Oklahomans by a whopping \$900 million.

Given our country's current energy needs and our long-term goal of energy independence and security, it is imperative for us to increase our domestic production of crude oil and natural gas while exploring innovative and renewable energy technologies.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are painfully aware that the 110th Congress inherited a failed energy policy. They feel the pain at the pump, they feel the pain in their heating bills, and they know our country is dependent on foreign oil. They know that is dangerous for us. They know that the oil will run out some time, and they know that fossil fuels are damaging our environment and causing health problems. They know that Congress has not increased miles per gallon standards for 32 years.

Now Americans want to know what Congress is going to do. Americans want to know if we are going to continue to fiddle, to delay, to stall, as some in Congress wish to do, or will Congress be bold and show leadership?

This 110th Congress must confront these problems or history will judge us harshly. The leadership is here. The time is now. The bill is good. I urge my colleagues to step up and forward into our future by voting "yes."

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last November Democrats looked the American people in the eye and they promised, they promised they would lower gas prices and become energy independent. Instead, gas prices are almost a dollar higher at the pump and America is more dependent on foreign oil than ever.

This new Democrat Congress has failed miserably; unless, of course, you count promoting energy-efficient light bulbs and threatening to sue OPEC, for whatever that is worth.

To be fair, there are good things in this bill, such as increasing gas mileage for cars and trucks and extending Republican tax incentives to encourage more energy-efficient technology and more renewable energy such as solar, wind, biomass and geothermal.

But this bill is disappointing because it launches yet another attack on Texas and American energy producers who are trying to create jobs and explore for new energy here in America. It also cripples the emerging biodiesel industry which is important to the Nation as we seek alternatives to gasoline.

Let me tell you this: OPEC is going to love this bill. OPEC is going to love this bill, but families who are going to pay more at the pump and pay higher

electric bills at home are going to hate it. Thank goodness this bill is dead on arrival in the Senate.

We need more energy, a balanced approach, not more higher gas prices and higher electric prices. This bill deserves to be defeated.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, his leadership on this bill and for yielding me this time.

Listening to the debate here on the rule, as I sat through the hearing last night in the Rules Committee, I am, frankly, more than a little disappointed in the discussion that has taken place.

First of all, this is a very large and complex bill, but the vast majority of this bill has actually already passed the House at least once, some of it twice. We have had 11 committees that have been involved in this process. It has not somehow been "sprung" on people. There is a large stack of paper that represents the bill, as is the case in most complex legislation. But most of it is familiar to the staff. It is familiar to the Members, if they choose to have been involved with this issue. It has been here before.

The process that has taken place is not one that we would have desired, but the Republicans in the Senate decided that there would not be a conference committee. But there has been a process that has gone on which I don't think it has been fairly characterized, frankly, where there has been extensive back-and-forth, where House and Senate staff committee members from the various jurisdictions met since September, have met in the same room going over these details. And, in fact, you can verify this is you talk to staff members on both sides. Republican staff members have been able to influence what has been going on here. Indeed I think majority staff members will acknowledge positively the technical expertise that has been provided and print out changes Republicans have influenced. But all of that is sort of swept away and ignored. That is wrong.

Fundamentally, we want to talk about what we are for. This deals with a significant increase in CAFE standards. There is lots of new energy here because we focus the alternatives on the energy sources that need tax support. And we pay for it, although it is scaled down from what has already passed the House. I think people ought to look at the RECORD.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to a distinguished leader on the issue of energy in this Congress, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Just yesterday, OPEC told the world that \$90 oil is okay and they won't be increasing production. They want \$100 oil. They want more.

Now, on the surface, Americans will say, Thank God. We have a Democrat energy bill coming to help us as energy prices continue to skyrocket as we move into the cold winter months. However, what hope does H.R. 6 actually give to young families with high home heating costs? Unquestionably, nothing.

What hope does H.R. 6 bring to poor folks living in rural and urban America that struggle to afford fuel to travel to work, to drive their kids to school and do Christmas shopping? Absolutely nothing.

What relief does H.R. 6 bring to seniors living on fixed incomes who struggle to make mortgage payments and stay warm? Absolutely nothing.

What does H.R. 6 do for rural and urban seniors who kept their thermostats at 58 degrees last winter with temperatures below zero because that is all they could afford? Nothing.

What does H.R. 6 do to prevent the tragedy that happened in my district last year when an elderly gentleman living alone tried to keep warm on a subzero night by putting coal in his wood-burning stove and perished when his modest home burned? It does nothing to prevent that.

What does H.R. 6 do for small business owners and manufacturers who happen to be high energy consumers to remain competitive and be able to keep America's best jobs here? It does nothing.

What does H.R. 6 do to the large manufacturers who have to compete in the global marketplace and provide jobs for middle-class America and compete against countries with cheap labor and cheap energy? It does nothing. In fact, it will continue to push more jobs offshore to countries like India and China where energy is cheaper and more accessible.

The working men and women of America who struggle to heat their homes and travel to and from work deserve action from this Congress. We need to provide them with available and affordable energy not 4 years from now but today.

Yes, Congress is the reason we have the highest world energy prices because we have continually locked up our abundant supplies of gas and oil and coal, increasing our dependence on unaffordable, high-priced oil and gas from foreign countries.

H.R. 6 is not an energy bill. Efficiency standards, conservation and renewables are vital to our future, but they are 4 and 5 years down the road before they provide energy. Americans need energy now, not tomorrow. We have the highest prices in the history of this country; and folks, I am going to tell you, they are going higher. The height has not been reached. We are going to have more than \$100 oil because OPEC is in control because we have decided that we are not going to produce energy for America; we are going to buy it from those who are holding us hostage. This bill has some

good futuristic parts, but nothing in the next 5 years to heat and cool this country and allow Americans to drive to work affordably. We need an energy bill.

I challenge the bill Democrats, let's do a bipartisan bill and let's argue the points. Let's bring affordable energy to America.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, every revolution has a start. May 25, 1961, John F. Kennedy, with full confidence in Americans' ability to innovate, said we are going to go to the Moon in 10 years.

Skip ahead a few years, December 6, 2007, the day we are starting a clean energy revolution to give America economic growth through technological progress, and that progress is happening all across America. In every State, that progress is going to take place, because this bill is going to help innovators.

Let's take a quick run-through where: In Michigan, where General Motors plans on building the plug-in hybrid that you can drive 40 miles with zero gasoline and get 100 miles per gallon with batteries designed in Massachusetts.

In Florida, California, Arizona, Mississippi, a whole host of States, where the Ausra Technology Company has designed a solar thermal process to make CO₂-free solar energy within 10 years to be competitive with coal-based electricity. For those who say we can't do energy everywhere, where the sun shines, solar thermal energy will work, including in my State, the State of Washington.

We move forward, virtually every State in the country has the potential for biofuels, and here is a picture of the Imperium Biofuels Company. It is located in a former dying timber town of Grays Harbor, Washington. It is the largest biodiesel plant in the world, something America can be proud about, that we will expand.

And lastly, emerging technologies, some of which people have not heard about. This is a picture of a wave power buoy on the coast of Oregon. We have enough energy in the Pacific coast in a 10-by-10 mile stretch to power all of the electrical needs of the State of California. And this doesn't even start to talk about gains from efficiency.

This bill will help Americans insulate their homes, make sure they are using fairly efficient lighting, and make sure that their furnaces and air conditioning are efficient. And a new report just out this week says that we can cut by 50 percent our growth. Pass this bill and start this clean energy revolution.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished member of the Rules Committee for yielding to me.

I have, in the 23 years that I have been in this body, engaged in, I would say, approximately two dozen, maybe three dozen, debates on various energy bills. Almost every Congress we have some sort of energy bill that comes before this body.

I have to say that my heart is sad today because, in the debate so far in this Congress on energy legislation, it has been fairly one-sided. It has been the majority trying to put their blueprint for America on energy in the committee and on the floor and in the Rules Committee with really no input and no debate from the minority party.

I understand that the majority in the House has the right to work its will. We are not the other body, the Senate on the other side of the Capitol. We have a Rules Committee that is two to one plus one. We stack the deck so that the majority can make things happen. And that's a good thing.

But the majority has responsibilities. One of the responsibilities is to hear the minority and give the minority the opportunity to have input and to have a debate and have their ideas voted on.

In this Congress on energy legislation, the only Republican amendment that has been debated on the floor of the House is the motion to recommit. In the last energy bill, we were given a motion to recommit and we offered a full substitute that had clean coal technology, alternative fuels technology, that had some real energy, had some supply incentives. That motion to recommit was defeated, but at least it was debated. The rule before us today does not give the minority an option to have a motion to recommit. The rule before us today does not give the minority an option to have a substitute amendment.

Once again we are on the floor of the House with one of the major components of our economy, energy legislation, and it is the majority way or no way. Well, I hope we would vote this rule down and go back to the Rules Committee and let us have either a Republican substitute, a Republican motion to recommit, some amendments, the Shimkus amendment on alternative fuels, the Upton amendment on renewable portfolio standards. They were all offered in the Rules Committee last night. They are substantive and real. They would improve the bill if they were allowed to be made in order. But this rule once again is a closed rule with one amendment, a Democrat substitute, no motion to recommit.

The underlying bill is over a thousand pages. The underlying bill had not been seen in public until about 8:30 last evening. Obviously you can't digest a thousand-page bill overnight. I have been reading the table of contents trying to look at some summaries what is in the bill. Most is recycled. It is

things that have been here before, but there are some new things.

There is some provision for the State of New York, for example, in the tax title that diverts State income taxes that would normally be paid to the Federal Government, they are kept by either the State or the City of New York, and it is worth about \$2 billion. There has been no debate on that.

□ 1200

Now, I've got to give Chairman RANGEL, I would assume I would give him credit for easing the tax burden of the people of his city and the people of his State. But there's not been a public debate on that. That's just a little \$2 billion deal in the tax title of the bill. It may have showed up, it may have been there all along, but I just saw it reading through the summary about 10 minutes ago.

So I don't think, if you're going to have a major policy debate on energy, which is worthwhile, and if the majority wants to change the energy policy, that's worthwhile too. But there ought to be a real debate and there ought to be real amendments, and we ought to let this body vote. This rule doesn't do that. This rule doesn't do that.

And most of the things that are being extolled in the bill are things that were in the energy policy act 2 years ago. They're being extended. They're being expanded. That may or may not be a good thing, but we ought to have a debate about it.

Do we really want to put a 36-billion gallon mandate for renewable fuels that can't be met by the current technology on the backs of the American people? This bill does that.

I'm all for renewable fuels. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 had an \$8-billion gallon mandate for renewable fuels. The market is exceeding that. But it's a stretch to go from 8 billion, which is current law, to 36 billion. And the technology doesn't currently exist. So maybe we ought to have a debate, maybe we ought to have some off-ramps, some triggers that we set the goal, but make sure that we have the ability to meet that goal before we put that mandate in.

On the renewable portfolio standard for electricity generators, it only applies to investor owned; doesn't apply to nonprofits and to co-ops. I don't think that's a good idea. It doesn't allow all forms of renewable. For example, new hydro is not included as a renewable. You know, some sort of a clean coal alternative which would be an alternative form is not included. It's very restrictive.

The wind part of this bill, we're for wind power. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 expanded the tax credit for wind. This bill rescinds part of that. So there's a renewable form that they're being regressive.

So just in summary, I would hope that the majority understands that being in the majority gives you the right to set the agenda, but it

shouldn't give you the right to stifle debate so that the minority has absolutely no input. And in this bill that's before us today, the minority in the House of Representatives has had zero, nada, zip, no input; and that's not good for democracy.

So I hope that we'll defeat the rule, take it back to the Rules Committee, let's have a debate. Let's have some amendments made in order and then bring a real energy bill that's bipartisan back to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in strong support of the underlying bill, the Energy Independence and Security Act, whose provisions, in the main, have been debated, reviewed, talked about and considered in this House for a year.

This legislation, while not perfect, and no legislation is, represents a historic opportunity to move our country toward a secure future. The bill marks a turning point in the Nation's history and answers the call for change that the American people sounded in 2006.

The harsh partisan rhetoric from the other side, Mr. Speaker, is a product of the same obsolete thinking which produced our existing energy policy, which has kept this country funneling petrodollars to countries that fund terrorism.

The people of my home State of New Hampshire are pressed by soaring gas prices; they're facing a cold winter. But they understand that energy independence, our economy and our national security are inseparable.

With this bill we take a firm stand for real security, for healthy families, for a thriving economy, and for a sustainable future for our planet. I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and for the bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With regard to the protests, really the outrage that is being heard from this side of the aisle, the origin of that is because of the unfairness of the process, the fact that the minority has been, as was very, I think, clearly explained by the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee when he just spoke, Mr. BARTON, the minority has been shut out. And this is an extremely important issue for the Nation. And if there is going to be a new energy policy, the new energy policy must be developed by the representatives of the American people in a way that represents, not only a strict numerical majority that controls the process of the House by virtue of the existence of the Rules Committee, et cetera, the ability to close out debate, but that it has to reflect genuine majority opinion. And that is reflected in the United States of America when there is dialogue, discussion, and agreement in a bipartisan fashion. So

that's where the complaining, the outrage is coming from.

And I would remind our friends on the other side of the aisle that this is too important an issue to have such an exclusivist process being used to develop it. Apparently, there is no genuine interest in passing a law, in having a law passed, become law, legislation become law; but, rather, there is interest in the exercise of press releases, of passage by the House, perhaps like we've seen with much of the appropriations process where, certainly in the 15 years that I've been here, I don't recall one bill having been sent and signed at this stage of the session.

But anyway, I wanted to remind my colleagues as to the origin of the outrage, of the discontent felt by the minority side of the aisle.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I reserve.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota, a woman who has been a leader on this issue for years, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and this historic bill's commitment to clean, renewable energy and its positive impact on strengthening our national security and our economic prosperity.

One of the most important aspects of this bill is the appropriately aggressive renewable fuels standard it contains, which builds upon the first renewable fuel standard passed in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which I supported. And it recognizes the contributions that rural America is ready, willing and able to make toward meeting our Nation's energy needs.

Like many of my fellow South Dakotans, like so many Americans, I strongly support expanding our commitment to the production and use of renewable fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel. This legislation will mandate that we produce at least 36 billion gallons of renewable fuels in this country by the year 2022, and 1 billion gallons of biodiesel by 2012.

For the past 2½ years we have seen how the first renewable fuel standard, an initial step forward reforming our Nation's approach to energy production, has resulted in tremendous technological change and tremendous opportunities. The new RFS will continue to drive the development of new and efficient processes to turn rural America's natural abundance into energy.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and this bill, in large measure because of this renewable fuel standard which reflects a compromise with the Senate that improves the structure of the standard, while retaining the overall volume and schedule of the Senate bill. The RFS contained in the provisions we consider now include a 9 billion gallon requirement of conventional biofuels in 2008 to address the serious circumstances faced by the industry today. It accelerates to 2009 and 2010 the start dates for advanced and cellulosic biofuels and their significant

greenhouse gas reductions. It increases the total overall mandates in the intervening years, through 2016; and, importantly, it includes specific targets for biodiesel.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and to support this historic legislation.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I’m proud to rise today in support of this rule because last November the American people sent a new majority to Congress with a clear mission, to reduce our energy dependence on foreign oil, fight skyrocketing energy prices, and to protect our environment. The landmark legislation before the House today makes good on that goal.

You know, in my district, we’re able to buy wind power on the back of our electric bill. My wife and I burn 20 percent soy biodiesel in our home heating oil in our furnace. We’re driving an American-made hybrid car which today gets 33 miles per gallon, although one can get 35 if one drives a little slower with a gentle foot on the accelerator. These things are attainable now. The technologies, many of them are available now.

We had a woman call our office and say, I’m all excited; I just got a flex fuel vehicle. Where can I get some flex fuel? And my staff had to tell her that there were two pumps in New York State for E-85.

There’s plenty of supply. We’ve heard in front of the select committee that there’s a surplus right now of both biodiesel and ethanol, but not the infrastructure to get them to market. And so we need to put the supply and the demand together, and that will produce more incentive for people to develop these biofuels. I believe that they can be produced, and they are being produced, in fact, by several producers in my district.

This sweeping array of provisions on this bill includes two historic measures. First of all, the first CAFE standard fuel economy increase in three decades, which will save drivers \$1,000 at the pump and cut Persian Gulf oil imports in half. And for the first time we will adopt a renewable energy standard so we can replace the polluting electric generation plants we rely on today with domestically produced power that helps us fight climate change.

With energy prices burdening our working families, dependence on foreign oil continuing to undermine our sovereignty, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and this bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I spent two good decades working profes-

sionally in renewable energy, and I know the great potential that new energy technology offers. The steps we’re taking today will improve the world for future generations.

We should all feel proud as we pass this bill that will benefit our economy, our security, our children, and our planet. When future generations look back on the actions we’re taking today, they will see it as a monumental first step away from centuries of consumption and exploitation and towards a bright and clean future.

I’m very pleased that this bill includes incentives for renewable energy, higher fuel economy standards for vehicles, a 15 percent renewable energy standard, and my bill, which will encourage groundbreaking research and geothermal energy. States like California have blazed the trail on these issues, and now everyone else can follow.

I support this bill, this rule, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, most folks think of “CAFE” as a place to eat. Well, our cars and our trucks have been eating too much energy and emitting too much pollution for far too long, while our planet and our pocketbooks take a beating. Fuel efficiency standards have not been increased since 1975 when Paul Simon began singing “Still Crazy After All These Years.”

□ 1215

Well, it is still crazy that 32 years later fuel economy standards have not been increased and we cannot get more miles per gallon despite both our dangerous overdependence on foreign oil and the growing threat of global warming. We need 21st-century fuel economy standards for 21st-century vehicles. And thanks to this bill, many of those vehicles will be fuel-efficient, plug-in hybrids, following the lead that we have taken with the Plug-in Partners campaign in Austin, Texas.

Texans alone will save \$2 billion at the pump when these standards become fully effective. And consumers across America will save billions more from the requirement in this bill that utilities generate at least 15 percent of their energy from renewable energy. Keep in mind that even Governor Bush signed a renewable energy portfolio in Texas, and Texas is currently ahead of the country on this issue.

A green light for green energy encourages a new generation of job-creating innovation that we can export to the world—reducing our reliance on fossil fuels and, maybe even more importantly, fossilized thinking that we have heard so much of here this morning.

This bill will reduce the threat of both global war and global warming.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, while the process has been difficult, this rule is worthy of support, and the underlying bill is a test of our will to solve the cataclysmic challenge of our time: global warming.

This rule and this bill give us many tools, from fuel efficiency to alternative fuels to renewable energy standards. They also incorporate thoughtful, thorough appliance efficiency standards reported on a bipartisan basis by the Commerce Committee and previously enacted by this House.

As co-author with Fred Upton of the light bulb provisions, let me underscore how important they are. In this bill, we ban, by 2012, the famously inefficient 100-watt incandescent bulb, which emits 10 percent of its energy as light and wastes the remaining 90 percent. Sounds like this House. We phase out remaining inefficient bulbs by 2014, and by 2020 light bulbs will be three times more efficient, paving the way for the use of superefficient LEDs manufactured in the U.S. by 2020.

Mr. Speaker, it takes 18 seconds to change a light bulb and even less time to vote “aye.”

Importantly, the bill gives the Department of Energy the authority to craft a rule to give the lighting industry the flexibility to sell a range of bulbs, but there are protections. The rule must save as much energy as a flat requirement that all bulbs be 3 times more efficient than today’s bulbs. And if DOE doesn’t get its act together, the flat requirement will automatically become law.

Though I believe that Compact Fluorescent Lightbulbs (CFLs) are an important technology, the intent of these standards is that at no time will CFLs be the only lighting choice available to American consumers. The bill also requires that DOE find ways to minimize the amount of mercury in CFLs and provides incentives for high-efficiency lighting to be manufactured in the United States.

I would like to thank Senators BINGAMAN, BOXER and Congressman UPTON (who has been my partner in all things light bulbs) for their tireless work on these provisions.

Finally, I’d like to thank Jay Hulings, my Legislative Director and Committee staff—notably John Jimison on the House side, and Deborah Estes on the Senate side—for their long hours and dedication to getting this job done.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend again for yielding and all of those who participated in this debate on this rule that is so critical in the sense that it is bringing forth legislation of extraordinary importance to the Nation. Unfortunately, it has been brought forth in a process that has been most unfair and ultimately exclusivist, and that does not lead to good policy.

I have a friend who always remarks that in government, personnel is policy. I have realized now how process becomes policy when it is so exclusivist, not allowing the genuine will of the House to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and move toward passing an AMT patch for the millions of American taxpayers who face the unintended consequences of that tax.

The AMT was enacted in 1969 to prevent a small number of wealthy taxpayers from using legitimate deductions and credits to avoid paying taxes altogether. Back then, the tax affected only 155 people, the "super rich." The AMT was never adjusted to match inflation; therefore, the AMT is affecting more and more taxpayers. Without fixing the AMT problem, 25 million taxpayers will be hit by the AMT, costing the average taxpayer an additional \$2,000. In Florida alone, it will affect over 1 million taxpayers, 6.5 times more than in 2005.

The longer we wait to fix the AMT, the longer it will take for the IRS to make the necessary changes to tax forms and to process tax returns under any changes to the law. As of now, the majority's failure to pass an AMT fix will force the IRS to delay processing tax refunds until mid March at the earliest. This is likely to delay returns for 21 million taxpayers who currently will be subject to the AMT but who, with the patch, would not have to pay the AMT. That comes out to about a \$75 billion interest-free loan to the Federal Government paid for by the American taxpayer.

We urgently need to fix the AMT so that American taxpayers will not have to wait to get their hard-earned money back from the Federal Government. I urge my colleagues to help move this important legislation and oppose the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), appreciate his arguments, and will close on behalf of our side.

There are two arguments that I heard in the course of this debate. One was about process and procedure. I happen to believe that process and procedure is important. It's important not in its own right; it's important for what it can do to help us in this body create better legislation. But process can be abused. It can be abused when the goal is not to make a better bill; it's to obstruct the passage of any bill. And the

choice that had to be made by leadership on this side, particularly in view of the decision in the other body to refuse to go to conference, was whether to accept that use of process that obstructed consideration of energy legislation this country needs or to move ahead. They made the right choice.

Second, this legislation, a thousand pages, as Mr. DIAZ-BALART and others mentioned, they had some fun holding up the bill. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of that 1,000 pages contains provisions that have been considered in many cases passed by this House of Representatives. What this bill is is a compilation of the work that many people in this body have been doing for years. What's different is that it is actually coming to the House floor for a vote.

Substantively, this legislation does turn the page on energy policy. I showed a picture in the beginning. It's a metaphor really for the energy policy that we have had in this country for generations. It's the American administration hand in hand with OPEC leadership, OPEC countries, pursuing a policy of drill-and-drill, consume-and-consume, export our dollars and import their oil.

If we turn the page, we are going to have a new picture. We are going to have a picture of the American Congress and the American administration hand in hand with American farmers who are driving their tractors, creating energy alternatives. It is going to be a picture of the American Congress with young engineers who are creating better, more efficient appliances. It is going to be a picture of the American Congress and American families who are driving to and from their soccer games, to and from work, to and from day care in safe vehicles, manufactured by American workers, that get 40 percent higher mileage, saving that family \$1,000.

We know, we know that this is a hat trick. If we change our energy policy and we act like a confident Nation, not a dependent Nation, we can protect the planet, reverse global warming. We can create good jobs and keep American dollars at home, and we can increase our national security by reducing our dependence on regimes that have no particular interest in the security of the United States but whose primary interest is in the dollars from American consumers and American businesses.

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

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 846 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

"That upon adoption of this resolution, 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, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table. A single motion that the House concur in each of the Senate amendments with the respective amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as pending in the House without intervention of any point of order. 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. The amendments referred to in section I are as follows:

"In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted for the text of the bill, H.R. 6, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the 'Stealth Tax Relief Extension Act of 2007'.

SECTION 2. EXTENSION OF ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX RELIEF FOR NONREFUNDABLE PERSONAL CREDITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 26(a) (relating to special rule for taxable years 2000 through 2006) is amended—

(1) by striking "or 2006" and inserting "2006, or 2007"; and

(2) by striking "2006" in the heading thereof and inserting "2007".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SECTION 3. EXTENSION OF INCREASED ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX EXEMPTION AMOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 55(d) (relating to exemption amount) is amended—

(1) by striking "(\$62,550 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2006)" in subparagraph (A) and inserting "(\$66,250 in the case of taxable year's beginning in 2007)", and

(2) by striking "(\$42,500 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2006)" in subparagraph (B) and inserting: "(\$44,350 in the case of taxable years beginning in 2007)".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006."

"In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted for the title of the bill, H.R. 6, insert the following: "To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide individuals relief from the alternative minimum tax."."

(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. WELCH of Vermont. 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. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 846, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4253.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 192, not voting 23, as follows:

	[Roll No. 1136]	Franks (AZ)	Linder	Rogers (KY)
	YEAS—216	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Obey	Garrett (NJ)	Rohrabacher
Ackerman	Hall (NY)	Olver	Gerlach	Ros-Lehtinen
Allen	Hare	Pallone	Manzullo	Roskam
Altman	Harmar	Pascrill	Gingrey	Royce
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pastor	Gohmert	Ryan (WI)
Arcuri	Herseth Sandlin	Payne	Goodlatte	Saxton
Baca	Higgins	Perlmuter	Graves	McCotter
Baldwin	Hinchey	Peterson (MN)	Green, Gene	Schmidt
Barrow	Hirono	Pomeroy	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Becerra	Hodes	Price (NC)	Hall (TX)	Sessions
Berkley	Holden	Rahall	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre
Berman	Holt	Rangel	Hayes	McKeon
Berry	Honda	Reyes	Heller	McMorris
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Richardson	Hensarling	Rodgers
Bishop (NY)	Inslee	Rodriguez	Herger	Mica
Blumenauer	Israel	Ross	Hill	Smith (NE)
Boren	Jackson (IL)	Rothman	Hobson	Smith (NJ)
Boswell	Jackson-Lee	Royer-Allard	Hoekstra	Miller (FL)
Boucher	(TX)	Ruppertsberger	Hulshof	Miller (MI)
Boyd (FL)	Jefferson	Rush	Murphy, Tim	Souder
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)	Inglis (SC)	Stearns
Braley (IA)	Jones (OH)	Salazar	Issa	Stupak
Brown, Corrine	Kagen	Sánchez, Linda T.	Johnson (IL)	Sullivan
Butterfield	Kanjorski	Sanchez, Loretta	Johnson, Sam	Tancredo
Capps	Kaptur	Sarbanes	Jones (NC)	Terry
Capuano	Kennedy	Schakowsky	Jordan	Thornberry
Cardoza	Kildee	Schiff	Keller	Tiabrt
Carnahan	Kilpatrick	Schwartz	King (IA)	Tiberi
Carney	Kind	Scott (VA)	King (NY)	Pitts
Castor	Klein (FL)	Serrano	Kingston	Turner
Chandler	Kucinich	Sestak	Kirk	Upton
Clarke	Langevin	Shea-Porter	Kline (MN)	Walberg
Clay	Lantos	Sherman	Knollenberg	Walden (OR)
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Shuler	Kuhl (NY)	Walsh (NY)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sires	LaHood	Westmoreland
Cohen	Lee	Skelton	Lamborn	Regula
Conyers	Levin	Slaughter	Lampson	Rehberg
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)	Latham	Wicker
Costa	Lipinski	Snyder	LaTourette	Wilson (NM)
Costello	Loebback	Soilis	Lewis (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Space	Reynolds	Wolf
Cramer	Lowy	Spratt	Lewis (KY)	Young (FL)
Crowley	Lynch	Stark	Baird	NOT VOTING—23
Cuellar	Mahoney (FL)	Sutton	Feehey	
Cummings	Maloney (NY)	Tanner	Bean	
Davis (AL)	Markey	Tauscher	Boyd (KS)	
Davis (CA)	Marshall	Taylor	Cantor	
Davis, Lincoln	Matheson	Thompson (CA)	Carson	
DeFazio	Matsui	Thompson (MS)	Cole (OK)	
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney	Cubin	
Delahunt	McCullom (MN)	Towns	Davis (IL)	
DeLauro	McDermott	Tsangas	Baird	
Dicks	McGovern	Udall (CO)	Feehey	
Dingell	McNerny	Udall (NM)	Bean	
Doggett	McNulty	Van Hollen	Boyd (KS)	
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Velázquez	Granger	
Edwards	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky	Hinojosa	
Ellison	Melancon	Walz (MN)	Ortiz	
Ellsworth	Michaud	Wasserman	Hooley	
Emanuel	Miller (NC)	Schultz	Jindal	
Engel	Miller, George	Waters	Johnson (GA)	
Eshoo	Mitchell	Watson	Lucas	
Etheridge	Mollohan	Watt		
Farr	Moore (KS)	Waxman		
Fattah	Moore (WI)	Weiner		
Filner	Moran (VA)	Welch (VT)		
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Wexler		
Giffords	Gillibrand	Wilson (OH)		
Gonzalez	Nadal	Woolsey		
Gordon	Napolitano	Wu		
Green, Al	Neal (MA)	Wynn		
Grijalva	Oberstar	Yarmuth		
	NAYS—192			
Aderholt	Brown (GA)	Davis, David		
Akin	Brown (SC)	Davis, Tom		
Alexander	Brown-Waite,	Deal (GA)		
Bachmann	Ginny	Dent		
Bachus	Buchanan	Diaz-Balart, L.		
Baker	Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.		
Barrett (SC)	Burton (IN)	Donnelly		
Bartlett (MD)	Buyer	Doolittle		
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Drake		
Biggert	Camp (MI)	Dreier		
Bilbray	Campbell (CA)	Duncan		
Bilirakis	Cannon	Ehlers		
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Emerson		
Blackburn	Carter	English (PA)		
Blunt	Castle	Everett		
Boehner	Chabot	Fallin		
Bonner	Coble	Ferguson		
Bono	Conaway	Flake		
Boozman	Crenshaw	Forbes		
Boustany	Culberson	Fossella		
Brady (TX)	Davis (KY)	Foxx		
	YEAS—216			
Abercrombie		Becerra	Brown, Corrine	
Ackerman		Berkley	Butterfield	
Allen		Berman	Capps	
Altman		Berry	Capuano	
Andrews		Bishop (NY)	Cardoza	
Arcuri		Blumenauer	Carnahan	
Baca		Baca	Carney	
Baldwin		Boswell	Castor	
Barrow		Boucher	Chandler	
Brady (PA)		Brady (IA)	Clarke	

□ 1248

Messrs. BARRETT of South Carolina and BACHUS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PAYNE and Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 195, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 1137]

YEAS—218

Abercrombie	Becerra	Brown, Corrine
Ackerman	Berkley	Butterfield
Allen	Berman	Capps
Altman	Berry	Capuano
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Cardoza
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Baca	Baca	Carney
Baldwin	Boswell	Castor
Barrow	Boucher	Chandler
Brady (PA)	Brady (IA)	Clarke

Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel	Kirk	Musgrave	Sessions	Altmine	Drake	LaHood
Cleaver	Jones (OH)	Reyes	Kline (MN)	Neugebauer	Shadegg	Andrews	Dreier	Lamborn
Clyburn	Kagen	Richardson	Knollenberg	Pearce	Shays	Arcuri	Duncan	Lampson
Cohen	Kanjorski	Rodriguez	Kuhl (NY)	Pence	Shimkus	Baca	Edwards	Langevin
Conyers	Kaptur	Ross	LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Shuster	Bachmann	Ehlers	Lantos
Cooper	Kennedy	Rothman	Lamborn	Petri	Simpson	Bachus	Ellison	Larsen (WA)
Costa	Kildee	Royal-Allard	Lampson	Pickering	Smith (NE)	Baker	Ellsworth	Larsen (CT)
Costello	Kilpatrick	Ruppersberger	Latham	Pitts	Smith (NJ)	Baldwin	Emanuel	Latham
Courtney	Kind	Rush	LaTourette	Platts	Smith (TX)	Barrett (SC)	Emerson	LaTourette
Cramer	Klein (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Lewis (CA)	Poe	Souder	Barrow	Engel	Lee
Crowley	Kucinich	Salazar	Lewis (KY)	Porter	Stearns	Bartlett (MD)	English (PA)	Levin
Cuellar	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda	Linder	Price (GA)	Stupak	Barton (TX)	Eshoo	Lewis (CA)
Cummings	Lantos	T.	LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Sullivan	Bean	Etheridge	Lewis (GA)
Davis (AL)	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Lungren, Daniel	Putnam	Tancredo	Becerra	Everett	Lewis (KY)
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes	E.	Radanovich	Terry	Berkley	Fallin	Linder
Davis (IL)	Lee	Schakowsky	Mack	Ramstad	Thornberry	Berman	Farr	Lipinski
Davis, Lincoln	Levin	Schiff	Manzullo	Regula	Tiahrt	Berry	Fattah	LoBiondo
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Schwartz	Marchant	Rehberg	Tiberi	Biggert	Ferguson	Loebsack
DeGette	Lipinski	McCarthy (CA)	McCarthy (CA)	Reichert	Turner	Bilbrey	Filner	Lofgren, Zoe
Delahunt	Loebsack	Scott (GA)	McCaul (TX)	Renzi	Upton	Bilirakis	Forbes	Lowey
DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott (VA)	McCotter	Reynolds	Walberg	Bishop (GA)	Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel
Dicks	Lowey	Serrano	McCrery	Rogers (AL)	Walden (OR)	Bishop (NY)	Fossella	E.
Dingell	Lynch	Sestak	McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Walsh (NY)	Bishop (UT)	Fox	Lynch
Doggett	Mahoney (FL)	Shea-Porter	McHugh	Rogers (MI)	Wamp	Blackburn	Frank (MA)	Mack
Donnelly	Maloney (NY)	Sherman	McKeon	Rohrabacher	Weldon (FL)	Blumenauer	Franks (AZ)	Mahoney (FL)
Doyle	Markey	Shuler	McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiler	Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)
Edwards	Marshall	Sires	Rodgers	Roskam	Westmoreland	Boehner	Gallegly	Manzullo
Ellison	Matheson	Skelton	Mica	Royce	Whitfield	Bonner	Garrett (NJ)	Marchant
Ellsworth	Matsui	Slaughter	Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Wicker	Bono	Gerlach	Markey
Emanuel	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)	Miller (MI)	Sali	Wilson (NM)	Boozman	Giffords	Marshall
Engel	McCollum (MN)	Snyder	Mitchell	Saxton	Wilson (SC)	Boren	Gilchrest	Matheson
Eshoo	McDermott	Solis	Moran (KS)	Schmidt	Wolf	Boswell	Gillibrand	Matsui
Etheridge	McGovern	Space	Murphy, Tim	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)	Boucher	Gingrey	McCarthy (CA)
Farr	McIntyre	Spratt				Boustany	Gohmert	McCarthy (NY)
Fattah	McNerney	Stark				Boyd (FL)	Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)
Filner	McNulty	Sutton	Baird	Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Brady (PA)	Goode	McCotter
Frank (MA)	Meek (FL)	Tanner	Boyda (KS)	Granger	Myrick	Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McCrery
Giffords	Meeks (NY)	Tauscher	Carson	Hinojosa	Nunes	Braley (IA)	Gordon	McDermott
Gillibrand	Melancon	Taylor	Cole (OK)	Hooley	Ortiz	Brown (SC)	Graves	McGovern
Gonzalez	Michaud	Thompson (CA)	Cubin	Jindal	Paul	Brown, Corrine	Green, Al	McHenry
Gordon	Miller (NC)	Thompson (MS)	Feeney	Lucas	Young (AK)	Brown-Waite,	Green, Gene	Grijalva
Green, Al	Miller, George	Tierney				Ginny	Grijalva	McHugh
Grijalva	Mollohan	Towns				Buchanan	Gutierrez	McIntyre
Gutierrez	Moore (KS)	Tsangas				Burgess	Hall (NY)	McKeon
Hall (NY)	Moore (WI)	Udall (CO)				Burton (IN)	Hall (TX)	McMorris
Hare	Moran (VA)	Udall (NM)				Butterfield	Hare	Rodgers
Harman	Murphy (CT)	Van Hollen				Buyer	Harman	McNerney
Hastings (FL)	Murphy, Patrick	Velázquez				Calvert	Hastings (FL)	McNulty
Herseth Sandlin	Murtha	Visclosky				Camp (MI)	Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)
Higgins	Nadler	Walz (MN)				Campbell (CA)	Hayes	Melancon
Hinchey	Napolitano	Wasserman				Cannon	Heller	Mica
Hirono	Neal (MA)	Schultz				Cantor	Hensarling	Michaud
Hodes	Oberstar	Waters				Capito	Herger	Miller (FL)
Holden	Obey	Watson				Capps	Herseth Sandlin	Miller (MI)
Holt	Olver	Watt				Capuano	Higgins	Miller (NC)
Honda	Pallone	Waxman				Cardoza	Hill	Miller, George
Hoyer	Pascrill	Weiner				Carney	Hinchey	Mitchell
Inslee	Pastor	Welch (VT)				Carter	Hirono	Mollohan
Israel	Payne	Wexler				Castle	Hobson	Moore (KS)
Jackson (IL)	Perlmutter	Wilson (OH)				Castor	Hodes	Moore (WI)
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Peterson (MN)	Woolsey				Chabot	Hoekstra	Moran (KS)
Jefferson	Pomeroy	Wu				Chandler	Holden	Moran (VA)
Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)	Wynn				Clarke	Holt	Murphy (CT)
	Rahall	Yarmuth				Clay	Honda	Murphy, Patrick
						Cleaver	Hoyer	Murphy, Tim
						Clyburn	Hulshof	Murtha
						Coble	Hunter	Musgrave
						Cohen	Ingilis (SC)	Nadler
						Conaway	Inslee	Napolitano
						Conyers	Israel	Neal (MA)
						Cooper	Issa	Neugebauer
						Costa	Jackson (IL)	Oberstar
						Costello	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Obey
						Courtney	Olver	Pallone
						Cramer	Pascrill	Pastor
						Crenshaw	Johnson (GA)	Payne
						Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Price (MN)
						Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Price (PA)
						Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Pearce
						Cummings	Jones (NC)	Pence
						Davis (AL)	Jones (OH)	Perlmutter
						Davis (CA)	Jordan	Peterson (MN)
						Davis (IL)	Kagen	Peterson (PA)
						Davis (KY)	Kanjorski	Petri
						Davis, David	Kaptur	Pickering
						Davis, Lincoln	Keller	Pitts
						Deal (GA)	Kennedy	Platts
						DeFazio	Kildee	Poe
						DeGette	Kilpatrick	Pomeroy
						Delahunt	Kind	Porter
						DeLauro	King (IA)	Price (GA)
						Dent	King (NY)	Price (NC)
						Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Pryce (OH)
						Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Putnam
						Dicks	Klein (FL)	Radanovich
						Dingell	Kline (MN)	Rahall
						Donnelly	Knollenberg	Regula
						Abercrombie	Kucinich	Rehberg
						Ackerman	Kuhl (NY)	

NOT VOTING—18

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on the vote.

□ 1255

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, December 6, 2007, I was inadvertently detained and thus I missed rollcall votes Nos. 1136 and 1137. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on both votes.

MILITARY RESERVIST AND VETERAN SMALL BUSINESS REAUTHORIZATION AND OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4253, 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 gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4253.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 2, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 1138]

YEAS—407

Aderholt	Akin	Alexander	Altmine	Drake	LaHood
Camp (MI)	Campbell (CA)	Frelinghuysen	Dreier	Lamborn	Lampson
Cannon	Galllegly	Garrett (NJ)	Duncan	Lipinski	Langevin
Bachmann	Cantor	Gerlach	Edwards	LoBiondo	Lantos
Bachus	Capito	Gilchrest	Ehlers	Lowey	Larsen (WA)
Baker	Carter	Gingrey	Everett	Lewis (KY)	Larsen (CT)
Barrett (SC)	Castle	Goodlatte	Fallin	Linder	Lathan
Bartlett (MD)	Chabot	Goodlatte	Farr	LoBiondo	LoTourette
Barton (TX)	Coble	Goodlatte	Fattah	Loebsack	Lipinski
Biggert	Conaway	Goodlatte	Ferguson	Lobiondo	Lofgren, Zoe
Bilbrey	Crenshaw	Graves	Engel	Lowey	Lungren, Daniel
Bilirakis	Culberson	Green, Gene	Lee	Maloney, Daniel	Maloney (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	McCollum (MN)
Bishop (UT)	Davis, David	Hastings (WA)	McCotter	McCotter	McCrae
Blackburn	Davis, Tom	Hayes	McCrery	McCrery	McKeon
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Heller	McDermott	McDermott	McMorris
Boehner	Dent	Hensarling	McGovern	McGovern	McNerney
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger	McHenry	McHenry	McHugh
Bono	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hill	McHugh	McHugh	McIntyre
Boozman	Doolittle	Hobson	McKeon	McKeon	McKeon
Boren	Drake	Hoekstra	McNerney	McNerney	McNerney
Boustany	Dreier	Hulshof	McCotter	McCotter	McCotter
Boyd (FL)	Duncan	Hunter	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Inglis (SC)	McCrery	McCrery	McCrery
Brown (GA)	Emerson	Issa	McDermott	McDermott	McDermott
Brown (SC)	English (PA)	Johnson (IL)	McGovern	McGovern	McGovern
Brown-Waite,	Everett	Johnson, Sam	McHenry	McHenry	McHenry
Ginny	Fallin	Jones (NC)	McHugh	McHugh	McHugh
Buchanan	Ferguson	Jordan	McKeon	McKeon	McKeon
Burgess	Flake	Keller	McCotter	McCotter	McCotter
Burton (IN)	Forbes	King (IA)	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Buyer	Fossella	King (NY)	McCrery	McCrery	McCrery
Calvert	Foxx	Kingston	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick

Aderholt	Akin	Alexander	Altmine	Drake	LaHood
Camp (MI)	Campbell (CA)	Frelinghuysen	Dreier	Lamborn	Lampson
Cannon	Galllegly	Garrett (NJ)	Duncan	Lipinski	Langevin
Bachmann	Cantor	Gerlach	Edwards	LoBiondo	Lantos
Bachus	Capito	Gilchrest	Ehlers	Lowey	Larsen (WA)
Baker	Carter	Gingrey	Everett	Linder	Lathan
Barrett (SC)	Castle	Goodlatte	Fallin	LoBiondo	LoTourette
Bartlett (MD)	Chabot	Goodlatte	Farr	Loebsack	Lipinski
Barton (TX)	Coble	Goodlatte	Fattah	Lobiondo	Lofgren, Zoe
Biggert	Conaway	Goodlatte	Ferguson	Lowey	Lungren, Daniel
Bilbrey	Crenshaw	Graves	Engel	Maloney, Daniel	Maloney (NY)
Bilirakis	Culberson	Green, Gene	Lee	McCarthy (CA)	McCollum (MN)
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Hall (TX)	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Bishop (UT)	Davis, David	Hastings (WA)	McCotter	McCotter	McCotter
Blackburn	Davis, Tom	Hayes	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Heller	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Boehner	Dent	Hensarling	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Bono	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hill	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Boozman	Doolittle	Hobson	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Boren	Drake	Hoekstra	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Boustany	Dreier	Hulshof	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Boyd (FL)	Duncan	Hunter	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Inglis (SC)	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Brown (GA)	Emerson	Issa	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Brown (SC)	English (PA)	Johnson (IL)	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Brown-Waite,	Everett	Johnson, Sam	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Ginny	Fallin	Jones (NC)	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Buchanan	Ferguson	Jordan	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Burgess	Flake	Keller	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Burton (IN)	Forbes	King (IA)	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Buyer	Fossella	King (NY)	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Calvert	Foxx	Kingston	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick

Aderholt	Akin	Alexander	Altmine	Drake	LaHood
Camp (MI)	Campbell (CA)	Frelinghuysen	Dreier	Lamborn	Lampson
Cannon	Galllegly	Garrett (NJ)	Duncan	Lipinski	Langevin
Bachmann	Cantor	Gerlach	Edwards	LoBiondo	Lantos
Bachus	Capito	Gilchrest	Ehlers	Lowey	Larsen (WA)
Baker	Carter	Gingrey	Everett	LoBiondo	LoTourette
Barrett (SC)	Castle	Goodlatte	Fallin	Loebsack	Lipinski
Bartlett (MD)	Chabot	Goodlatte	Farr	Lobiondo	Lofgren, Zoe
Barton (TX)	Coble	Goodlatte	Fattah	Lobiondo	Lofgren, Zoe
Biggert	Conaway	Goodlatte	Ferguson	Lowey	Lungren, Daniel
Bilbrey	Crenshaw	Graves	Engel	Maloney, Daniel	Maloney (NY)
Bilirakis	Culberson	Green, Gene	Lee	McCarthy (CA)	McCollum (MN)
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Hall (TX)	McCormick	McCormick	McCormick
Bishop (UT)	Davis, David	H			