

why we went into Iraq, and here we are, years later, we are still in Iraq, and enormous pressure is being put on the Iraqi Government to privatize their oil.

I am here to say that there is another path that can be taken, and that path is part of H.R. 1234, a bill that I have written that would enable the war to end by Congress determining that no more money will go for this war, telling the administration that it must open up diplomatic relations with Syria and Iran, and moving in a direction where we put together an international peacekeeping and security force that would move in as our troops leave. And then we set the stage for real reconciliation that cannot come with the U.S. serving as an occupying army.

We have a moral responsibility to the Iraqi people whose country we have ravaged with war to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars of damage, whose people may have experienced the loss of perhaps as many as a million Iraqis during this conflict, innocent people, whose social bonds have been torn asunder. We have a moral responsibility to work to bring about a program of reconciliation between the Sunnis, Shiites and the Kurds which can only come when we end the occupation. We have a moral responsibility to bring about an honest reconstruction program, absent the U.S. contractors who have been gouging the Iraqi people, and gouging the American taxpayers as well, but we have to make sure that the Iraqi people have control of their oil.

I would like to believe that this war has not been about oil. I would like to believe that there was some kind of a righteous cause connected to what we did; but I know better, and the proof is in this Hydrocarbon Act.

This Congress has an opportunity to finally take a stand and reject this Hydrocarbon Act. We can strip out this provision forcing Iraq to privatize its oil. We can strip that out of the legislation. Or we can simply defeat the legislation because that is in there, and then go back to the boards and tell the President, look, Mr. President, we are not going to give you any more money for this war, which is what I believe we should do. Tell the President, this war is over, Mr. President, and use the money that is in the pipeline to bring the troops home. Let's go and reach out to the international community. With the end of the occupation and the closing of bases, we will have people who will start listening to us internationally, and we will have some credibility.

But the morality which this country rests on, our heart and soul of who we are as Americans, is not reflected by this obscene attempt to steal the oil resources of Iraq. That is why I have chosen to take this time to come before the Congress, to lay these facts out for Members of Congress and for the American people so that you can

see without question the relationship between war and this oil and the relationship between the pressure that is being put on the Iraq Government right now and privatization and the continuation of the war.

Let's end this war. Let's end the attempt to control Iraq's oil. Let's challenge the oil companies in this country as this House has done this morning. Let's take a stand for truth and justice. Let's take a stand for what is right. Let us not be seduced by this idea that somehow we have the military might, and we can, therefore, grab other people's resources. That is not what America is about.

America has a higher calling in the world. It is time we began a process of truth and reconciliation in our own country, in reaching out and creating the healing of America. But we must first begin with the truth, and the truth is what I have told this Congress today.

Madam Speaker, thank you.

Members of Congress, thank you.

—

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1100, CARL SANDBURG HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY REVISION ACT OF 2007

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 429 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 429

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1100) to revise the boundary of the Carl Sandburg Home National Historic Site in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided

and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 1100 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 429.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 429 provides for consideration of H.R. 1100, the Carl Sandburg Home National Historic Site Boundary Revision Act of 2007, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources and makes in order the substitute reported by the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule also allows for consideration of all three amendments that were submitted to the Rules Committee on H.R. 1100.

Madam Speaker, let me begin by congratulating my good friend and freshman class colleague Mr. SHULER for working this thoughtful legislation through the legislative process. H.R. 1100 will further preserve the legacy and communicate the stories of internationally recognized author, Pulitzer Prize-winner, and great American historian, Carl Sandburg.

Located in the pristine wilderness of North Carolina is the 248-acre Carl Sandburg Home National Historic Site. Each year, over 150,000 people visit for the purpose of learning about Carl Sandburg's positive influences on writing, or to hike and just enjoy the splendor of this beautiful, pristine site.

In recent years it was determined by interested parties at all levels, local, State and Federal, including the National Park Service, that increasing

the size would be desirable to carry out the purposes of this historic site.

H.R. 1100 addresses the need for more space by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire up to 115 acres of land from willing sellers by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

Now, for some unknown reason, some my colleagues have labeled this legislation an "egregious example of landgrabbing" by the Federal Government. Nothing could be further from the truth. The key point to this legislation is that the land would have to be acquired from "willing sellers."

Of the 115 acres, 5 acres would be used to construct a new visitor center and parking lot, and the remaining 110 acres would be used to enhance the overall experience when visiting the site. Visitors will now have an opportunity to sit on the same ridge Carl Sandburg sat to pen some of his greatest works and explore the same beautiful mountainside Carl Sandburg would frequent with his family for picnics.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1100 has strong bipartisan support here in the House, and bicameral support from North Carolina's two Senators, who have introduced companion legislation.

Further, H.R. 1100 has the support of the administration, as well as the State of North Carolina and Henderson County, where the site is located.

All of that said, with such broad support, one might ask why are we here debating a rule for consideration of this legislation? The reason is that during a subcommittee and later full committee markup, it was discovered that there are a few Members of this body who object to the legislation in its current form. Those Members made several attempts to alter the existing legislation by amendment during the committee process. In addition, those same Members submitted amendments to the Rules Committee which we will consider later today, again seeking to alter this legislation.

While one might argue that our debate today is unnecessary, I contend it is yet another example of the majority's efforts to provide our colleagues with opportunities to offer their amendments, voice their views, and make their objections known here in the House Chamber. I look forward to a fruitful discussion of this bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 429 allows for consideration of H.R. 1100, the Carl Sandburg Home National Historic Site Boundary Revision Act, which would

increase our Federal inventory of land by up to 115 acres. Rarely does the Rules Committee consider rules for bills making changes to historic sites because they are typically brought to the floor under suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, coming from an area in central Washington that is 40 percent federally owned land mass, I believe we ought to be encouraging land exchanges where possible rather than more land purchases. The Federal land management agencies simply have too much land to manage effectively with their current level of funding. We all know there is a serious backlog of road, trail and facility maintenance on Federal lands. In many cases, Federal land agencies are struggling to manage invasive species, plant pests, and unnaturally high fuel loads that lead to catastrophic wildfires. Yet, year after year, we are spending precious tax dollars to buy up more private property and take it off the local tax rolls.

We need to make land exchanges and the orderly restructuring of Federal land holdings easier. The Federal Government owns and must maintain many small, isolated parcels of land that have no special resource value. We should make it easier for the Federal agencies to dispose of these properties and retain the proceeds to acquire lands that are high in resource value.

□ 1245

This is a practical solution that allows us to protect special places without having to spend limited tax dollars.

I would also add that there are many other issues, in my view more pressing matters, affecting public lands management that we could be considering today. For example, the extension of payments to forested counties for rural schools and roads. As many of my colleagues are aware, the Congress long ago promised rural communities that they would get a fair share of the revenue produced from Federal forestlands as compensation for the tax-exempt status of Federal forestlands.

However, unfortunately, special interest groups successfully used litigation under the Endangered Species Act to bring harvest to a standstill in many places like the Pacific Northwest. This left many counties struggling to pay for basic services while saddled with large areas of nontaxable Federal land. Although the House has passed legislation providing for a 1-year fix on this issue, we need a longer-term solution, and we need to get this legislation to the President's desk as soon as possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will soon have an opportunity to consider these and other issues impacting Federal land management.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond by saying that it's important to note on this bill that all this bill really does is to create an environment for people to donate the

land or for funds to be donated to actually purchase the land, and we're not talking about a vast tract of land. We're talking about a very small amount of land, 115 acres, 22 acres of which have already been pledged, and basically are waiting for this legislation to be passed so that the conservatory could be created so that the acreage can be donated to it.

So I would say in response to my good friend and colleague from Washington that this is not any type of huge land grab. This is really just a very small amount of acreage that is being set up and being donated just to enhance the whole, again, experience of the Carl Sandburg site.

So I think it is a very good bill. It is a good rule, and I would urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I just point out that this is an increase of 44 percent over the current land value, and I know we're talking about acres and we're not talking about square miles. But to paraphrase former Senator Edward Dirksen, in another sense, you know, a billion here, a billion there, pretty soon you're talking about real dollars. Well, we're talking about Federal land ownership, and I'm very sensitive to that because I come from the western part of the United States.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, 40 percent of my district is owned by the Federal Government, and I have some counties in which 75 percent of the counties' land mass is owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule today and it goes back to the experience we had on the floor and in committee.

Mr. BISHOP had offered an amendment in the National Parks Subcommittee that would have improved this bill, in my opinion, because his amendment would have reduced the number of acres that are being added to this so-called park. This was not Carl Sandburg's original home. The acreage being added or sought to be added is not even available for view from the Sandburg home. It was not part of the original home. So it made sense that an amendment like this ought to have a vote and it did.

When it came time for a recorded vote, the subcommittee chairman promised to hold the vote open for 15 minutes. About 8 to 9 minutes later, though, for some time the vote on the amendment was passing, once there was one more vote "nay" than in the affirmative, between 8 and 9 minutes later, the chairman closed the vote, even though he said he would leave it open for 15 minutes. He closed it as I walked into the door and others alerted him, and actually he never said that

the vote was closed. He simply asked the clerk for a count at that point, and when it was pointed out to him that the vote had not been closed but simply a count asked for, and that I was there when he did that, he still refused to allow my vote, and my vote as reflected would have been "aye." That would have tied the vote. We all know there were others on the way, though we knew not how they would vote. But I was promised that my vote would also be counted in the record but it, in fact, did not.

And we went through a series of parliamentary inquiries to make sure that the chairman had every opportunity to do the right thing, and so that it was not quite as clear as it became, that there was only one reason that vote was held open, and that was to foreclose the opportunity to pass this amendment.

Now, the House rules say that a record vote shall not be held open on the floor for the purpose of changing the outcome of a vote. Clearly, that's what happened here. Clearly, it would have changed the outcome of the vote, at least as I came in, to a tie with other people coming if the vote had been held open as long as the chairman said he was going to.

But the promises of bipartisanship in this Chamber, as we saw it yesterday, as we saw in this subcommittee hearing, are about as hollow as some of the other things around this floor.

Now, as far as the rule, it should have been open to this amendment. The amendment should have been part of the original bill, but through this procedural folly, it was not. And so I object to the rule. I rise in opposition to the rule, and I would encourage our colleagues across the aisle to remember their promises.

I know it's been clear back to November and all those campaign promises leading up to November, and that's a long time, even though the Attorney General is being condemned for forgetting things further back than that. Nonetheless, we won't get into questions of hypocrisy. I just ask you to remember your promises about bipartisanship and open government, because this rule forecloses the openness that we were promised we would have, especially when it pertains to a good amendment that deserves consideration before this floor.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I must say I'm a bit confused because the gentleman from Texas is opposing the rule, the rule which is allowing the amendment that he is speaking of. So the Rules Committee has put the amendment in, the Bishop amendment, that he's talking about. It will entitle a full and fair debate on it this afternoon, and we are giving the gentleman everything that he has asked for. And he stands up here and talks about some type of hypocrisy, and frankly, I just don't understand why he is mentioning that, why he is talking about that when, in fact, we are giving the rule

that allows for debate on that particular amendment.

So we are, in fact, giving the gentleman exactly what he is asking for, and he is opposing the rule. So I guess I just don't understand what his point is, but I would say that we are supporting the rule that, in fact, does allow for full and fair debate on this particular amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. There were three amendments made in order on this bill, and what I have a problem with is the process and how ridiculously partisan it was there, and there should have been more made in order here, but I do appreciate what has been made in order.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just simply want to say that the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee, was apparently told something by the subcommittee chairman and that wasn't carried out, and I think that's the point that he made. I am pleased that the committee has made these three amendments in order. They were debated, and I think the full House deserves that consideration.

I think the rule could have been, obviously, better if it were an open rule on a bill here that certainly is not that controversial.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1100 will further preserve the legacy and communicate the stories of internationally recognized author, Pulitzer Prize winner and great American historian, Carl Sandburg.

Again, I congratulate my good friend and freshman class colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER) for his efforts to bring this thoughtful legislation to the floor.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting "yes" on the previous question and on the rule so that future generations can also enjoy the beauty and splendor of the Carl Sandburg Home National Historic Site.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAS-TOR). 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. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-

minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1252 and H.R. 2429.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 198, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—198

Aderholt	Barton (TX)	Bonner
Akin	Biggert	Bono
Alexander	Bilbray	Boozman
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Boustany
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Baker	Blackburn	Brown (SC)
Barrett (SC)	Blunt	Brown-Waite,
Bartlett (MD)	Boehner	Ginny

Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Jo Ann  
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  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Hall (TX)  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)

NOT VOTING—6

DeGette  
Hulshof  
Hunter

□ 1319

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”  
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.

FEDERAL PRICE GOUGING PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1252, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1252, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 284, nays 141, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]  
YEAS—284  
Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Billirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Butterfield  
Capito  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castle  
Castor  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Frank (MA)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gonzalez

NAYS—141  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baker  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggart  
Billbray  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Carter  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Granger  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hoeckstra  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Jindal  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Lamborn  
Latham  
Lewis (CA)  
Linder  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marshall  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Poe  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Saxton  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
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)

NOT VOTING—7

DeGette  
Hulshof  
Hunter

□ 1330

Messrs. BACHUS, EVERETT, ROGERS of Alabama, MILLER of Florida, and HOBSON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING EXCEPTION TO LIMIT ON MEDICARE RECIPROCAL BILLING ARRANGEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2429, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2429.