

Davis (AL)	Langevin	Ross
Davis (CA)	Lantos	Rothman
Davis, Lincoln	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Lee	Rush
DeLauro	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Salazar
Dingell	Linder	Sánchez, Linda T.
Doggett	Lipinski	Sánchez, Loretta
Donnelly	LoBiondo	Sarbanes
Doyle	Loeb sack	Saxton
Drake	Lofgren, Zoe	Schakowsky
Edwards	Lowe y	Schiff
Ellison	Lynch	Schwartz
Ellsworth	Mahoney (FL)	Scott (GA)
Emanuel	Maloney (NY)	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	Markey	Serrano
Etheridge	Marshall	Sestak
Farr	Matheson	Shea-Porter
Filner	Matsui	Sherman
Forbes	McCarthy (NY)	Shuler
Fortenberry	McCollum (MN)	Skelton
Frank (MA)	McCrery	Slaughter
Giffords	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Gillibrand	McGovern	Snyder
Gillmor	McHugh	Solis
Gonzalez	McIntyre	Souder
Gordon	McNerney	Space
Green, Al	McNulty	Spratt
Green, Gene	Meehan	Stark
Grijalva	Meek (FL)	Stearns
Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)	Stupak
Hall (NY)	Melancon	Sutton
Hare	Michaud	Tanner
Harman	Miller (NC)	Tauscher
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Taylor
Herger	Mitchell	Terry
Herseth Sandlin	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)
Higgins	Moore (KS)	Thompson (MS)
Hill	Moore (WI)	Tiberi
Hinchey	Moran (KS)	Tierney
Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)	Turner
Hodes	Murphy, Patrick	Udall (CO)
Holden	Murphy, Tim	Udall (NM)
Holt	Murtha	Van Hollen
Honda	Musgrave	Velázquez
Hoyer	Napolitano	Visclosky
Hunter	Neal (MA)	Walden (OR)
Inslee	Oberstar	Walsh (NY)
Israel	Obey	Walz (MN)
Jackson (IL)	Oliver	Wasserman
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Schultz
(TX)	Pallone	Waters
Jefferson	Pascrell	Watt
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Waxman
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	Weiner
Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)	Welch (VT)
Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Kagen	Petri	Wexler
Kanjorski	Pickering	Wicker
Kaptur	Platts	Wilson (OH)
Keller	Poe	Woolsey
Kennedy	Pomeroy	Wu
Kildee	Price (NC)	Wynn
Kilpatrick	Rahall	Yarmuth
Kind	Ramstad	Young (FL)
Klein (FL)	Rangel	
Kucinich	Reyes	
Lampson	Rodriguez	

NOT VOTING—18

Abercrombie	Fattah	Sires
Carson	Hirono	Sullivan
Cubin	McMorris	Towns
Davis (IL)	Rodgers	Watson
Davis, Jo Ann	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Delahunt	Moran (VA)	
Engel	Nadler	

□ 1149

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Messrs. LANTOS, BOOZMAN, KELLER of Florida, WALSH of New York, TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, SXTON, SCHIFF, TIBERI, ANDREWS and CONYERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GILCHREST changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, as I stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: “On Rollcall vote 340, I was recorded as a ‘yes’ vote when I intended to cast a ‘no’ vote.” I wish to clarify on the RECORD my miscast vote and my strong support for the National Drug Intelligence Center located in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, right outside of the 18th Congressional District. I was pleased to support funding for the NDIC in the Intelligence authorization bills in both the 108th and 109th Congress.

I look forward to continuing my work in support of the critical intelligence work of this agency.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The time remaining in the debate on the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) controls 4 minutes, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) controls 9½ minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I'd ask my friend from Florida how many speakers she has on her side.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I have one remaining speaker before the close, so I'll reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak against this rule. There are two provisions in this bill regarding specialty metals that will make a bad situation worse. I offered two amendments to help correct this problem but, unfortunately, the majority did not allow either of the amendments. As a result, the Democrat majority will force high quality union jobs overseas.

My amendment would have also addressed the problems with the specialty metals and the country of origin specialty metals problem.

Can you believe that today we simply exempt foreign suppliers from the specialty metals provisions. If a product containing specialty metals comes from 18 other countries like France, Germany or Canada, they simply do not have to comply.

This provision is a competitive disadvantage for American industry and American workers. And here's how it works today. Caterpillar makes diesel engines for the Army. These are very common, commercially available engines that operate in civilian construction and trucking industry all over the world. This engine is manufactured by American workers in their Greenville, South Carolina plant.

But Caterpillar also manufactures the very same engine in Belgium. Because of the world demand, Belgium is also a qualifying country. That means that if Caterpillar makes an engine for the MRAP in South Carolina, they must go through the expensive process of documenting the nation of origin of the specialty metals content of every component in the engine. Or they could simply shift the production to Belgium and avoid the process and save money. This puts American jobs at risk because of this outdated legislation, and this rule denies us the ability to protect American workers in this bill.

It's simply unconscionable that we would legislate a competitive disadvantage upon American companies and American workers. And it's even more disheartening that Congress refuses to address the unintended consequences of this decade old problem.

DOD should be leveraging the industrial might of the United States to provide the best technology for our soldiers. But we're denied that ability in this rule.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying bill. I know Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member HUNTER have worked exceptionally hard on this bipartisan measure, and I thank them for their leadership.

Our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have put great strain on our military, and this bill will reverse the decline in readiness. It adds funds for force protection programs such as mine resistant combat vehicles, IED countermeasures and body armor and a much deserved pay raise for the troops.

I'm also pleased that the measure recognizes the importance of submarines to our national security by adding \$588 million to construct a second *Virginia*-class submarine as early as 2009, 3 years earlier than planned. This is welcome news to the men and woman at Electric Boat in Rhode Island, as well as Groton, Connecticut, as well as our entire submarine industrial base, which is threatened by an insufficient workload. The Navy's current shipbuilding plan would have our submarine fleet drop to dangerously low levels in future years, just as other nations are increasing their naval capabilities.

I've been working exceptionally hard for 6 years to address this important national security issue, and I thank Chairman SKELTON and Seapower Chairman TAYLOR for their commitment to a robust submarine force.

This is a good bill and a good rule and, Madam Speaker, I urge its passage. And I thank my colleague for the time.

The rule before us makes in order an amendment I am offering with the gentleman from Maine, Mr. MICHAUD, that would require military pharmacies to include emergency contraception in the basic core formulary. Access

to this contraception is important to our servicewomen—particularly those who have been the victims of sexual assault—and I urge my colleagues to support our amendment.

We can show our appreciation for all the men and women who keep our Nation safe by voting for this rule and the defense authorization act.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. COLE.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and having formerly served on the Rules Committee, I'm both disappointed and disturbed by the manner in which the rule has been reported to the floor.

Let's be forthright about this, Madam Speaker. The committee authorized an enormous number of amendments. But numbers alone do not translate into meaningful policy options and good debate on the floor of this body.

Let's look at a couple of things that the committee chose not to make in order. The committee did not make in order an amendment by Mr. AKIN that addresses important concerns, including the evisceration of the Army's only modernization effort and reducing by \$867 million the Future Combat System.

The committee did not make in order many of the amendments that were necessary to address the evisceration of our Missile Defense System and that, Madam Speaker, at a time when our intelligence tells us the North Koreans and the Iranians are continuing to develop dangerous missile capability.

With respect to the underlying legislation itself, Madam Speaker, Chairman SKELTON was given an incredibly difficult job. He was not given enough money, in my opinion, enough authorizing authority to address all the needs that he faced.

Nevertheless, he and Ranking Member HUNTER and their subcommittee chairmen accomplished some important things that we should not lose sight of. One good thing that was accomplished was the increase in the end strength of both the Army and the Marine Corps, something many of us have long advocated, something the President now agrees to and something I'm glad to see underway.

Additionally, the legislation included the Wounded Warriors Act, and also included my language to create a program for pre- and post-deployment neurocognitive assessments of our servicemen. I think that was a very good thing, and I appreciate the chairman for working with us on that.

The underlying legislation also addresses depot concerns and maintenance in a way that encourages me, that increased the amount of money in depot accounts.

And finally, I was happy to see that the majority continues to recognize, as

we do, the importance of developing the non-line-of-sight cannon and remains committed to the new field increase.

With that, I still remain disappointed the rule did not allow the options.

□ 1200

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

This is a very important bill. Amongst other things it is because for the first time the Department of Defense is required to consider the effects of global warming on Defense Department facilities, capabilities, and missions. It requires that the Department of Defense in three central defense planning documents, the National Security Strategy, the National Defense Strategy, and the Quadrennial Defense Review, look at the impacts of global warming on the facilities and capabilities of the United States military.

This is a central issue. I am the chairman of the Select Committee on Global Warming. We had testifying before us General Gordon Sullivan, representing 11 three- and four-star admirals and generals who are all very concerned that this issue of global warming has major national security implications for the United States.

By including this requirement in this bill, we are beginning to focus upon the long-term needs that we have to focus on in order to protect our country and give the resources to the Department of Defense.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule, and in strong support of a provision within the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 which requires, for the first time, the Department of Defense to consider the effect of global warming on Department facilities, capabilities, and missions.

I commend Chairman SKELTON for including this important language, which will allow our armed forces to begin preparing, in a strategic, Department-wide manner, for the impact that global warming could have on our national security.

This provision requires the threat of global warming to be assessed, and guidance for military planners to be issued, in the next versions of three central defense planning documents: The National Security Strategy, The National Defense Strategy, and the Quadrennial Defense Review.

The very first hearing of the new Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming focused on the geopolitical and security consequences of our dependence on foreign energy and the looming threat of global warming. We heard from former Chief of Staff of the Army General Gordon Sullivan, who presented a report by eleven retired three- and four-star generals and admirals arguing that global warming is a grave national security threat, and must be treated as such by our defense establishment and by this Congress.

Last month, Congressman BARTLETT and I introduced the Global Climate Change Secu-

rity Oversight Act, with the intention of jump-starting our government's analysis of and preparation for the national security consequences of global warming. Our bill would require a National Intelligence Estimate on the impact of global warming, and last week exactly such an NIE was mandated by the Intelligence Authorization bill. Our bill also encourages the Department of Defense to integrate into our defense planning the threats posed by global warming, and I am very pleased that this priority is being mandated in this year's Defense Authorization Act.

Thinking about global warming as a national security issue is new for many Members, but with the speed that the major provisions of the Global Climate Change Security Oversight Act have been adopted by this House, I feel confident that the Congress is making progress in broadening how we think about global warming. It is crucial for the national security of this country that the Congress continue along this path. We must push our defense and intelligence communities to address this threat, and we must offer, debate, and implement solutions to the underlying problem.

I am also pleased to support and cosponsor an amendment that will be offered during debate on this bill by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, which would require the use of high efficiency light bulb in Department of Defense buildings when new bulbs are installed or old bulbs are replaced. This amendment will help lower energy consumption in Defense Department facilities, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, help promote energy independence, and result in millions of dollars of savings for the American taxpayer—all without impeding the operations of the U.S. military.

I urge adoption of the Rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I rise today in strong opposition to this rule, and there is one very good reason. Partisanship has reached an unconscionable level in this House.

Just for the simple fact that I am in the minority party, the Rules Committee did not allow an amendment which would have given a 9-year-old child from my district access to the death gratuity that her mother wanted her to have when she was killed in Iraq, just for partisan reasons.

Susan Jaenke, the mother of Jaimie Jaenke, who was killed in Iraq, along with her granddaughter, Kayla, came to Washington at great expense and trouble and testified before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee. There was broad bipartisan support for an amendment that would simply allow access to the death gratuity of Jaimie Jaenke by her daughter.

This is outrageous, the fact that you would deny a 9-year-old child access. Her grandparents don't have the money to raise this child. She has no spouse. It would not cost a dime. It is the right thing to do. In the committee, on a bipartisan basis, people said they would do anything possible to help in this situation. I brought this before the Rules

Committee and explained what is going on, how this child is denied access to funding so that she can have a decent life; and it was denied simply for partisan reasons. I would think you would be ashamed.

And this is not just a single case. There are at least 143 cases exactly like this. And to deny a child access to this benefit is simply outrageous.

Vote against this outrageous rule.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule.

The authorizing committee saw fit to include some 680 earmarks that we got news of just yesterday in the bill. Yet I offered four amendments to debate these earmarks and wasn't allowed any of them.

If they can allow 680 earmarks at the last minute in a bill, you would think that the Rules Committee could have seen fit to at least allow debate on a few of them.

The earmarks include \$5 million for Diminishing Manufacturing Sources for Automation Alley in Troy, Michigan; \$2 million for the Physician Order Entry Initiative for Mission Hospitals, which is a private hospital in Asheville, North Carolina, and keep in mind this is a Defense authorization bill here; \$10 million for Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, a former naval shipyard being economically revitalized with taxpayer dollars, defense dollars, for the city of San Francisco; and \$500,000 for Rapid Identification of Technology Sources for the San Diego East County Economic Development Council.

Our role here should be to ensure that our Defense dollars are spent on defense, not economic revitalization, not nondefense private ventures. That is why these amendments were offered. Unfortunately, the only shot we might have at checking these amendments is in the appropriations process. By the time we get there, the Members will say these projects were authorized, implying that there was some sort of scrutiny given when there surely has not been.

So, unfortunately, we cannot support this rule. It doesn't allow debate on any of the 680 earmarks in the bill.

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

Madam Speaker, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so that I can amend section 2(c) of this rule after "shall not be subject to amendment" and insert "(except the amendment numbered 43 in the report, to be offered by Representative MICHAUD of Maine, or his designee)."

By defeating the previous question, Members will be able to offer amendments to the Michaud amendment, and

a full and wide range of views can be discussed. Those rules were denied because we were not allowed to offer secondary amendments, at least, to the Rules Committee.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

To my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, I thank you for your diligence and hard work. Great thanks also to the professional staff of the Armed Services Committee. And I think we all must salute the great leadership of Chairman IKE SKELTON, who produced a bipartisan product that passed that committee 58-0.

Madam Speaker, I urge this Congress to chart a new direction today for a stronger and safer America. We will improve the readiness of our Armed Forces, including the National Guard and Reserves. We will put a stop on the blank check given to the White House by previous Congresses for the war in Iraq and, instead, require greater accountability for operations and contracting in the region. We will drive more strategic decisions and investments to better protect our national security.

With that, Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 403 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

In section 2(c) after "shall not be subject to amendment" insert "(except the amendment numbered 43 in the report, to be offered by Representative Michaud of Maine, or his designee)".

(Pretty much the same as what Mr. Sessions offered last night)

(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 be-

fore the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from *Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary"*: "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 198, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

YEAS—225

Abercrombie Hall (NY)
Ackerman Hare
Allen Harman
Altmire Hastings (FL)
Andrews Herseth Sandlin
Arcuri Higgins
Baca Hill
Baird Hinchey
Baldwin Hinojosa
Bean Hirono
Becerra Hodes
Berkley Holden
Berman Holt
Berry Honda
Bishop (GA) Hooley
Bishop (NY) Hoyer
Blumenauer Inslee
Boren Israel
Boswell Jackson (IL)
Boucher Jackson-Lee
Boyd (FL) (TX)
Boyd (KS) Jefferson
Brady (PA) Johnson (GA)
Braley (IA) Johnson, E. B.
Brown, Corrine Jones (OH)
Butterfield Kagen
Capps Kanjorski
Capuano Kaptur
Cardoza Kennedy
Carnahan Kildee
Carney Kilpatrick
Carson Kind
Castor Klein (FL)
Chandler Kucinich
Clarke Lampson
Clay Langevin
Cleaver Lantos
Clyburn Larsen (WA)
Cohen Larson (CT)
Conyers Lee
Cooper Levin
Costa Lewis (GA)
Costello Lipinski
Courtney Loeb sack
Crowley Lofgren, Zoe
Cuellar Lowey
Cummings Lynch
Davis (AL) Mahoney (FL)
Davis (CA) Maloney (NY)
Davis (IL) Markey
Davis, Lincoln Marshall
DeFazio Matheson
DeGette Matsui
DeLauro McCarthy (NY)
Dicks McCollum (MN)
Dingell McDermott
Doggett McGovern
Donnelly McIntyre
Doyle McNerney
Edwards McNulty
Ellison Meehan
Ellsworth Meek (FL)
Emanuel Meeks (NY)
Eshoo Melancon
Etheridge Michaud
Farr Miller (NC)
Filner Miller, George
Frank (MA) Mitchell
Giffords Mollohan
Gillibrand Moore (KS)
Gonzalez Welch (VT)
Gordon Moore (WI)
Green, Al Moran (VA)
Green, Gene Murphy (CT)
Grijalva Murphy, Patrick
Gutierrez Murphy, Tim
Murtha

NAYS—198

Aderholt Bono
Akin Boozman
Alexander Boustany
Bachmann Brady (TX)
Bachus Brown (SC)
Baker Brown-Waite,
Barrett (SC) Ginny
Barrow Buchanan
Bartlett (MD) Burgess
Barton (TX) Burton (IN)
Biggart Buyer
Bilbray Calvert
Bilirakis Camp (MI)
Bishop (UT) Campbell (CA)
Blackburn Cannon
Blunt Cantor
Boehner Capito
Bonner Carter

Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
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
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk

Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Delahunt
Engel

Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg

NOT VOTING—9

Fattah
McMorris
Rodgers
Miller (FL)

□ 1232

Mr. McHENRY changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BAIRD changed his 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. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 194, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

YEAS—229

Abercrombie Berry
Ackerman Bishop (GA)
Allen Bishop (NY)
Altmire Blumenauer
Andrews Boren
Arcuri Boswell
Baca Boucher
Baird Boyd (FL)
Baldwin Boyd (KS)
Barrow Brady (PA)
Bean Braley (IA)
Becerra Brown, Corrine
Berkley Butterfield
Berman Capps

Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancred
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez

Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Napollitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)

NAYS—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor

Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

Kline (MN) Pearce
Knollenberg Pence
Kuhl (NY) Peterson (PA)
LaHood Petri
Lamborn Pickering
Latham Pitts
LaTourette Platts
Lewis (CA) Poe
Lewis (KY) Porter
Linder Price (GA)
LoBiondo Pryce (OH)
Lucas Putnam
Lungren, Daniel Radanovich
E. Ramstad
Mack Regula
Manzullo Rehberg
Marchant Reichert
McCarthy (CA) Renzi
McCaul (TX) Reynolds
McCotter Rogers (AL)
McCrery Rogers (KY)
McHenry Rogers (MI)
McHugh Rohrabacher
McKeon Ros-Lehtinen
Mica Roskam
Miller (MI) Royce
Miller, Gary Ryan (WI)
Moran (KS) Sali
Musgrave Saxton
Myrick Schmidt
Neugebauer Sensenbrenner
Nunes Sessions
Paul Shadegg

NOT VOTING—9

Cubin Fattah Nadler
Davis, Jo Ann McMorris Sires
Delahunt Rodgers
Engel Miller (FL)

□ 1241

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.

PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that votes in series be reduced to 2 minutes.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I object. The minority has not cleared this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, because the amendment to equalize benefits for wounded Guardsmen and Reservists with the regular Army was rejected by the Rules Committee yesterday, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 157, nays 245, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

YEAS—157

Aderholt Fossella
Akin Foxx
Alexander Franks (AZ)
Bachmann Frelinghuysen
Bachus Gallegly
Baker Garrett (NJ)
Barrett (SC) Gerlach
Bartlett (MD) Gingrey
Barton (TX) Gohmert
Biggart Goodlatte
Bibb Granger
Bilirakis Graves
Bishop (UT) Hastert
Blackburn Hastings (WA)
Blunt Hayes
Boehner Heller
Bonner Hensarling
Bono Hobson
Brady (TX) Hoekstra
Brown-Waite, Hulshof
Ginny Inglis (SC)
Buchanan Issa
Burgess Jindal
Burton (IN) Johnson (IL)
Buyer Johnson, Sam
Camp (MI) Jones (NC)
Campbell (CA) Jordan
Cannon King (IA)
Cantor King (NY)
Carter Kingston
Chabot Kirk
Cole (OK) Kline (MN)
Conaway Knollenberg
Crenshaw LaHood
Culberson Lamborn
Davis (KY) Latham
Davis, David LaTourette
Davis, Tom Lewis (CA)
Deal (GA) Lewis (KY)
Dent Linder
Diaz-Balart, L. Lucas
Diaz-Balart, M. Lungren, Daniel
Doolittle E.
Dreier Mack
Duncan Marchant
Ehlers McCarthy (CA)
Emerson McCaul (TX)
English (PA) McCotter
Everett McHenry
Fallin McKeon
Feeney Mica
Ferguson Miller (MI)
Flake Miller, Gary

NAYS—245

Abercrombie Doyle
Ackerman Drake
Allen Edwards
Altmiere Carson
Andrews Castle
Arcuri Castor
Baca Chandler
Baird Clarke
Baldwin Clay
Barrow Cleaver
Bean Clyburn
Becerra Cohen
Berkley Conyers
Berman Coopers
Berry Costa
Bishop (GA) Costello
Bishop (NY) Courtney
Blumenauer Cramer
Boozman Crowley
Boren Cuellar
Boswell Cummings
Boucher Davis (AL)
Boustany Davis (CA)
Boyd (FL) Davis (IL)
Boyd (KS) Davis, Lincoln
Brady (PA) DeFazio
Braley (IA) DeGette
Brown (SC) DeLauro
Brown, Corrine Dicks
Butterfield Dingell
Capps Doggett
Capuano Donnelly

Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebuck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—30

Calvert Hill
Capito Maloney (NY)
Coble Manzullo
Cubin Marshall
Davis, Jo Ann McMorris
Delahunt Rodgers
Engel Miller (FL)
Gilchrest Murphy, Patrick
Goode Nadler
Hall (NY) Pascrell
Hastings (FL) Paul

□ 1300

Mr. RANGEL and Mr. McNERNEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 353, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 21, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. SPRATT submitted the following conference report and statement on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008,