

□ 1310

I do want to apologize to my ranking member, Mr. BARTON, about the process. Perhaps there should have been notice. But the truth is, there is a consensus on reproductive cloning.

This is a simple bill, and we have tried, over the years in Congress, to ban reproductive cloning. The reason we haven't been able to do it is because the other side gets up and makes all of these false arguments, which then complicate the situation, and we have not been able to ban reproductive cloning. We felt that under a suspension calendar, with a clean vote and a simple bill, it would work.

For people who try to say, well, somehow this is going to cause more problems, I can't believe that they would support reproductive cloning. I can't believe that the opponents of this bill would actually vote against a bill that bans reproductive cloning. I can't believe that they would say they think that we would encourage reproductive cloning in this country.

I would tell my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, this vote will be a clear vote today. The vote will be, do you oppose human reproductive cloning and think that it should be a Federal crime in this country, or are you in the pocket of the special interests who will make any argument because they don't think this bill goes far enough to ban other types of research, which are legal right now in this country and for which the results which they fear have not happened to date.

I will say, let's make the clear statement in Congress. Let's stand up for our constituents. Let's ban reproductive cloning today. There is no Member of Congress who supports human reproductive cloning, which is exactly what this bill prohibits.

Vote "yes" on H.R. 2560, and then we can have the rest of this debate tomorrow on S. 5.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2560, the "Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2007."

This legislation, offered by my colleague, Representative DEGETTE, specifies that it is illegal to utilize cloning technology for unethical purposes.

The bill text defines human cloning as the implantation of the product of human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology into a uterus.

In my view, H.R. 2560 would allow important stem cell research to be done in an ethical manner.

However, it specifies criminal penalties for individuals who do attempt to clone humans.

Mr. Speaker, as a nurse and long-time member of the Committee on Science and Technology, I have long advocated for federal resources to be used to support stem cell research.

After careful review of the bill text, I feel that this is a sound piece of legislation that does what it says it will do—prohibit stem cell technology from being used unethically to "clone" human beings.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2560.

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2560.

Mr. Speaker, I am a fervent supporter of the promise and optimism of embryonic stem cell research. As the father of a child who suffers from juvenile diabetes, I know full well the importance of stem cell research in developing a cure for life threatening diseases. For millions of Americans like my son, stem cell research represents promising hope of a cure within their lifetime.

Unfortunately, many Americans confuse embryonic stem cell research as human cloning, a practice which I adamantly oppose.

While technological advances continue to give scientists opportunities to explore beyond our horizons, we have an obligation to pursue our goals responsibly. The pursuit of science cannot go unchecked; occasionally, Congress must intervene.

The artificial creation of human life through cloning challenges the ethical foundations of this Nation. The development of human life is a natural process that cannot be replaced by scientists in a laboratory. I cannot in good conscience support a world where the chance and wonder of the birth of a child is eliminated in favor of a cold, sterile process.

Embryonic stem cell research differs from cloning by developing embryos that might otherwise be destroyed for specific functions. The goal of this practice is not to create new human life, but rather to sustain existing human life by replacing failing parts of the human anatomy.

I will always support saving an American life. I cannot support artificially engineering one.

The importance of this distinction is critical. I hope that my colleagues in the House will join me in educating the public on the differences between these practices.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2560. The purpose of government in free societies is to protect basic human rights, the most important of which is the right to life. It is because of the need to protect that right to life that I oppose this bill. Misnamed "The Human Cloning and Prohibition Act," H.R. 2560 purports to ban human cloning.

I wholeheartedly agree that human cloning should be outlawed. Yet the term "cloning" in this bill does not refer, as it normally does, to the simple act of creating a viable human embryo. Here the word cloning refers only to the implanting of a cloned embryo in a uterus and not to anything that precedes implantation. This bill is silent about and so condones the experimentation upon and destruction of human embryos prior to implantation. Even prior to implantation a human embryo has the entire genetic makeup of a new human being and is worthy of protection.

Those of us who seek to defend life at all stages have long argued that embryonic research would initiate a downward spiral for the sanctity of human life in this country. The government of the greatest nation in the world cannot treat human life as an expendable resource and allow taking the life of its most vulnerable citizens. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to support Representative WELDON's ethical and moral alternative, H.R. 2564, of which I am a cosponsor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms.

DEGETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2560.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PITTS. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2446, AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM AND SECURITY SUPPORT ACT OF 2007

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 453 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 453

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. 2446) to reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, 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 Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill 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. 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. 2446 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 453.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 453 provides for consideration of H.R. 2446, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007 under a structured rule that makes in order all of the amendments that were submitted to the Rules Committee, except for those withdrawn by their sponsors.

I want to acknowledge and express my respect for the work of Chairman LANTOS and Ranking Member ROSLEHTINEN for bringing such a fine example of bipartisan cooperation and collaboration before the House for consideration.

Following the ouster of the Taliban regime in late 2001, the United States, the United Nations and the international community embarked on what they hoped would be a comprehensive assistance program to help the new Afghan president, of President Hamid Karzai, establish a new democracy, rebuild the Afghan economy and provide for the general well-being of the Afghan people.

Regrettably, after a most promising start, progress has slowed in most parts of the country. Remnants of the Taliban continue to resist the new government and are reorganizing and strengthening their networks from neighboring countries. Instability has increased, including the introduction of suicide bombings against U.S. soldiers, NATO troops, Afghan officials, and civilians and international and Afghan humanitarian aid workers.

Narcotics production threatens to overwhelm the country. According to UN studies, a large percentage of Afghans, including farmers, laborers, traffickers, war lords, insurgents, and officials participate in and benefit from illegal poppy trade.

Congress first addressed the issue aiding Afghanistan by passing the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002, which established a reconstruction program, mandated a relief coordinator, provided support to the NATO-led international security forces, and gave new security assistance authority to our President.

In addition to food aid, refugee relief and other forms of emergency disaster assistance, the United States implemented a wide-ranging assistance program for Afghanistan, including aid for schools, hospitals and farms, and support to reestablish the participation of

women and girls in society, education and the workplace.

The legislation the House will take up today, H.R. 2446, reauthorizes programs created by the original Afghanistan Freedom Support Act, creates a new focus on counternarcotics efforts, and provides for stronger and more enhanced oversight of U.S. strategic goals and performance in Afghanistan.

Overall, H.R. 2446 provides modest increases in authorized levels for humanitarian, development, democracy building and security assistance. I cannot stress enough how important it is that Afghanistan succeed in establishing and consolidating a representative government and rebuilding the country's economy and civil society.

When we overthrew the Taliban regime, we made promises to the Afghan people with the full backing of the international community. We cannot renege on those promises. We cannot fail the people of Afghanistan who came together in support of a common vision for the future.

I am very, very concerned that many of the difficulties confronting Afghanistan today, especially in the areas of security, are due in large part to taking our eye off the ball in Afghanistan and exhausting our economic and military resources in Iraq. We had the chance to make Afghanistan secure. We failed to do so because we chose not to invest the necessary resources in Afghanistan, but, rather, to transfer our attention and our resources to Iraq. We are now playing catch up in Afghanistan as the situation there is deteriorating.

I applaud the chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for this timely reauthorization.

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

□ 1320

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the time; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, after the defeat of the Soviet Army in Afghanistan, the brutal Taliban took over the country. The Taliban ruled that country through terror, through systematic assassination, torture, intimidation. They denied Afghans all personal freedoms and made women fifth-class citizens. They also provided safe harbor to Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda. It is from that safe harbor that al Qaeda was able to plan and train for the horrendous attack of September 11, 2001, against the United States of America.

Following the fall of the Taliban, due in large part to the heroic assistance of the United States Armed Forces and coalition forces from many, many countries throughout the world, the international community worked together under the auspices of the Bonn Compact to make possible what was

really a wonderful, historic accomplishment, a democratically elected government in Afghanistan.

In 2004, Afghanistan adopted a new constitution and held successful presidential elections. Parliamentary elections followed in 2005. Factions that once fought on the battlefield now, after decades of violence, debate and resolve their differences in parliament with ballots instead of bullets.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are remnants of the former Taliban regime, along with al Qaeda, that are intent on overthrowing the democratically elected government of Afghanistan. The Taliban is using suicide bombings against U.S. and NATO troops, against Afghan officials, against civilians, both international and Afghan humanitarian workers, assistance workers.

Opium poppy cultivation and drug trafficking have become significant negative factors in Afghanistan's fragile political and economic order. Afghanistan currently accounts, unfortunately, for a majority of the world's illicit opium production.

As the democratically elected government faces grave challenges, we must not turn our backs on that young democracy. We must continue our support as that country moves from a brutal dictatorship to a consolidated democracy.

In 2002, this Congress passed the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act. That law provided both economic and military aid to the young Afghan democracy.

This legislation will reauthorize the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act through the year 2010. The programs reauthorized in this bill focus on countering narcotics production and boost security efforts to protect United States and NATO forces as well as Afghan officials and international assistance workers. This legislation calls for the President to set out a detailed strategy for Afghanistan and provide reports on progress there.

The Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act of 2007, this legislation that we bring to the floor today, builds on congressional initiatives enacted in 2002 and 2004; and I again congratulate the leaders, who in those Congresses back in 2002 and 2004, worked so hard to ensure that these initiatives that are being reauthorized today were passed. And these initiatives now are, as I say, reauthorized in this legislation, H.R. 2446, that will be before the House today.

Among those initiatives passed in 2002, 2004 are the creation of multiple programs, but this legislation calls for the creation of a coordinator role for the development of a coherent, consistent counter-narcotics strategy, and to strengthen the fight against the drug trade's links to totalitarian Islamic terrorism.

We also insured in this legislation that initiatives passed in 2002 and 2004 continued, such as prohibition on assistance to Afghan officials who are

found to be supporting criminal activities such as narcotics trafficking.

This bill, good legislation, Mr. Speaker. This bill reaffirms the commitment of the United States to support Afghanistan in its transition to a stable, representative democracy.

This bill, good legislation, Mr. Speaker, that we bring to the floor today, authorizes the appropriation of \$1.7 billion annually for humanitarian and economic assistance and \$320 million annually for military assistance during fiscal 2008 to 2010.

This is important legislation. It's important legislation for the fight against the international drug trade and totalitarian Islamists, dangerous remnants of the defeated Taliban, the Taliban who were overthrown, thank God.

Remnants of the Taliban are festering, and they use deadly tactics against United States and NATO forces, as well as Afghans and humanitarian workers. Those people have no scruples, and we only have to remember, Mr. Speaker what they did to the Afghan people when they were in power. So they use horrendous tactics, brutal tactics without limits against our troops and other international forces that are in Afghanistan pursuant to the request of the democratically elected government to secure the peace.

And, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, poppy cultivation and opium production continue to directly support insurgents, militias and terrorist groups. In the face of these very difficult challenges, we cannot allow that fledgling democracy, that budding democracy striving to be a stable society, to fail.

With regard to process, our friends on the other side of the aisle, again, the majority had another opportunity yesterday in the Rules Committee to open the process and comfort with an open rule. They voted down an amendment by our ranking member of the Committee on Rules to bring this legislation forth under an open rule. Yes, they made in order all of the amendments that were presented before the committee, and that's commendable. But why not come forth with an open rule? I think that was disappointing.

Let's not fail to see, however, Mr. Speaker, that this is, this underlying legislation that's being brought forward is extremely important. It's a very important piece of legislation.

And by the way, with regard, again, to process, precisely since it's such an important project that as a Nation we're working on and there's great national consensus on the need to do everything we can to consolidate, to help consolidate the representative democracy and the peace in Afghanistan, precisely I think there would have been no harm in allowing, as this debate proceeds, to allow any Member who's hearing the debate who has an idea for an amendment to bring it forth. That's why an open rule is appropriate.

I'd like to thank, Mr. Speaker, the chairman, the distinguished chairman

of the International Relations Committee, Mr. LANTOS, for his hard work on this important facet of our foreign policy and the legislation that's being brought forth today, as also the distinguished ranking member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, who's also worked very hard on this legislation, and other members of the International Relations Committee. I want to thank them for their hard work on this important issue, which constitutes, as I said, a project where the American people, in consensus fashion, are moving forward and doing everything possible so that our friends and allies in Afghanistan can survive and defeat the brutal Taliban and al Qaeda.

□ 1330

This legislation brought forward today is an important bill. It is of the utmost importance to our national security and obviously to the region where Afghanistan is and, of course, to the people, to the noble people of Afghanistan, as they continue their efforts to consolidate their representative democracy and achieve peace and prosperity in their great country.

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

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

Let me just say that, again, the underlying legislation is incredibly important. We do have an obligation, a moral obligation, to the people of Afghanistan. And, quite frankly, from a national security perspective, that is where our attention should be and where our attention should have been. It is regrettable, it is regrettable that the President of the United States and his administration and many in this Chamber have chosen to take their eye off what our responsibility is in Afghanistan over these last several years, and instead, we find ourselves bogged down in a quagmire in Iraq.

Those who are responsible for September 11, those who are responsible for the murder of so many of our citizens, they were in Afghanistan. That is where al Qaeda was. And instead of holding al Qaeda accountable in Afghanistan, instead of making sure that our resources go to promoting democracy and stability in Afghanistan, instead of focusing on this ever-growing drug problem in Afghanistan, we have spent over half a trillion dollars in Iraq. And that is regrettable. And, quite frankly, when history looks back on how these last few years were conducted, they are going to take note of the fact that we missed important opportunities to better protect our country by taking our eye off of what our responsibility was in Afghanistan.

And let me just say about the rule, I will apologize to my colleague from Florida for a rule that we bring to the floor today that makes every single amendment that was offered in the Rules Committee and not withdrawn by its author in order. Every Republican amendment, every Democratic

amendment. And I know that that is different from the way things used to be when the Republicans were in charge of the Rules Committee. They had a tendency to just shut us all out routinely. But things are different now, and under the Democratic administration here in the Congress, we are trying to make sure that all points of view have an opportunity to be heard on the floor.

So I am happy that we have this rule, and, again, I apologize to the gentleman that it is not like what they used to do.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont, a member of the Rules Committee (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in April, I had the opportunity to join five of my colleagues on a delegation trip to Afghanistan. And our six-member delegation, three Democrats and three Republicans, spent 2 days in Iraq, 2 days in Afghanistan. And we had an opportunity to speak with American, Iraqi, Afghani soldiers; military leaders; security forces; government leaders; and civil servants. And at every turn in our trip, we encountered these extraordinary men and women from our country that are doing incredible work in very dangerous and trying circumstances. And I had the opportunity to meet troops from my State as my colleagues met troops from their States, and all of us were incredibly proud at the selflessness of these troops who are performing the missions that we have assigned to them.

But the circumstances in each country and each war are very different. Iraq is in a full-blown civil war. The British, our last remaining significant ally in Iraq, will soon withdraw, and American forces are now viewed as occupiers. The situation is much different in Afghanistan. And I came away, as did my colleagues, with the clear impression that there is will on the part of Afghani leaders to step up and to take control of their future.

In Afghanistan, we have 37 allied nations joining with us to help the Afghans drive out the Taliban and to restore order and to create a future for that country.

In fact, the differences between these two situations in Iraq and Afghanistan was best summed up by three soldiers I spoke to who had completed full tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I asked, What is the difference in your experience? And the soldiers said, In Iraq it seems as though everyone is interested in fighting each other and us. In Afghanistan everyone is interested in fighting for their future.

What this legislation recognizes is that we have partners, 37 other nations, working with us in Afghanistan, and we have a partner, the government and people of Afghanistan, in our effort to restore order and to create a future for that country.

H.R. 2446, the Afghanistan Freedom and Security Support Act, reinforces the United States' long-term commitment to support Afghanistan in its efforts to confront its challenges and to complete its transformation into a secure and prosperous future.

This bill enhances the narcotics operations. More importantly, it provides incentives to encourage greater participation from our NATO allies in the International Security and Assistance Force. If we have learned anything, it is that we have got to work together and not alone.

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

I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' kind words. What I had been referring to before with regard to the process is that I don't believe that any harm would have been done if the majority would have kept its promise of open rules. It is the majority that promised during the campaign that they were going to bring a significant amount, as many as possible, of bills to the floor under open rules. And this is a noncontroversial bill, and, yes, they made the amendments in order by the Members who went to the Rules Committee, and that is appreciated.

So what harm would it have caused if this legislation would have been brought forth under an open rule, as was proposed, in amendment form, by the ranking member of Rules? That is what my point was. No harm would have been done.

And, simply, I would like to remind the majority of the promises that the majority made during the campaign of bringing forth legislation under open rules. So I don't believe that any harm would have accrued if they would have kept their promise. That's all.

But with regard to the apology, I certainly appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' kind words, Mr. Speaker.

And, again, with regard to this underlying legislation, which is of extreme importance, there is a national consensus in the United States that we not only have an obligation, but we must do everything in our power so that the democratically elected government in Afghanistan survives, and that is what this legislation is about. We will have other continuing debates on nearby countries and what our obligations are or what is, rather, in our national interest with regard to the stability in neighboring countries of Afghanistan as well and in trying to prevent neighboring countries from becoming basically safe harbors for international terrorism.

□ 1340

Those are legitimate debates.

Today, the legislation being brought forth, Mr. Speaker, is one where there is a national consensus in the United States, thank God, fortunately, and that is that with regard to that country that was for so long oppressed by

the brutal Taliban and that had given sanctuary to the terrorists that carried out the mass murders of September 11, 2001, against the United States of America, that we certainly have an obligation to do everything we can to make certain that the people of Afghanistan have as much ability, that they have the wherewithal to proceed along a path towards a consolidated, representative democracy in peace and with prosperity.

That is why we agree that this legislation is very important; and it reauthorizes critical programs, programs of critical importance with regard to our assistance to Afghanistan that were authorized initially and appropriated by the Congress of the United States in 2002 and 2004.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, I regret that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not pleased with the rule that makes all of the amendments that were offered in order, but I think that that is the way we should do business around here. It is in sharp contrast to the way they used to do business when the Republicans were in the majority, where there was a tendency to shut everything down, to close everything up, to not allow Members of the minority to be able to have amendments. But we're different, and I'm glad we are different.

On the underlying legislation, there should be unanimity in this House about the importance of passing this legislation. It is important that we keep our commitment to the people of Afghanistan. It is important that we keep our commitment to the people of the United States, who after September 11 we said, in the Congress and in the White House, that we are going to do everything we can do bring to justice, to hold to account those who are responsible for September 11.

Unfortunately, today, we are not anywhere near where we should be in Afghanistan; and the reason for that is because we have diverted our resources, we have diverted our soldiers and our political capital to a never-ending war in Iraq. We have put our soldiers in the middle of a civil war in Iraq. We have spent over half a trillion dollars in Iraq; and, as a result, those resources have not been sent to Afghanistan; and I think that is regrettable.

But we need to pass this bill today. I hope it passes with a unanimous vote. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

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. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 453 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1716, the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 632, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 964.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 195, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

YEAS—220

Abercrombie	Green, Gene	Neal (MA)
Ackerman	Grijalva	Oberstar
Allen	Gutierrez	Obey
Altmire	Hall (NY)	Olver
Andrews	Hare	Ortiz
Arcuri	Harman	Pascarell
Baird	Herseth Sandlin	Pastor
Baldwin	Higgins	Payne
Barrow	Hill	Perlmutter
Bean	Hinchey	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Hinojosa	Pomeroy
Berman	Hirono	Price (NC)
Berry	Hodes	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Holt	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Honda	Reyes
Blumenauer	Hooley	Rodriguez
Boren	Hoyer	Ross
Boswell	Inslee	Rothman
Boucher	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Boyd (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Boyda (KS)	Jackson-Lee	Rush
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Braley (IA)	Johnson (GA)	Salazar
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Butterfield	Jones (OH)	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
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Skelton
Costa	Lee	Slaughter
Costello	Levin	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Cramer	Lipinski	Solis
Crowley	Loeb sack	Space
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Spratt
Cummings	Lowey	Stark
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Stupak
Davis (CA)	Mahoney (FL)	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)	Tanner
Davis, Lincoln	Markey	Tauscher
DeFazio	Marshall	Taylor
DeGette	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Dingell	McCollum (MN)	Towns
Doggett	McDermott	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McGovern	Udall (NM)
Doyle	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Edwards	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellison	McNulty	Visclosky
Ellsworth	Meehan	Walz (MN)
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Wasserman
Engel	Melancon	Schultz
Eshoo	Michaud	
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	
Farr	Miller, George	
Fattah	Mitchell	
Filner	Mollohan	
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	
Giffords	Moore (WI)	
Gillibrand	Moran (VA)	
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	
Gordon	Murphy, Patrick	
Green, Al	Murtha	
	Napolitano	

NAYS—195

Aderholt Frelinghuysen Musgrave
Akin Gallegly Myrick
Alexander Garrett (NJ) Neugebauer
Bachmann Gerlach Nunes
Bachus Gilchrest Paul
Baker Gillmor Pearce
Barrett (SC) Gingrey Pence
Bartlett (MD) Gohmert Peterson (PA)
Barton (TX) Goode Petri
Biggart Goodlatte Pitts
Bilbray Granger Platts
Bilirakis Graves Poe
Bishop (UT) Hall (TX) Porter
Blackburn Hastert Price (GA)
Blunt Hastings (WA) Pryce (OH)
Boehner Hayes Putnam
Bonner Heller Radanovich
Bono Hensarling Ramstad
Boozman Hergert Regula
Boustany Hobson Rehberg
Brady (TX) Hoekstra Reichert
Brown (SC) Hulshof Renzi
Brown-Waite, Inglis (SC) Reynolds
Ginny Issa Rogers (AL)
Buchanan Jindal Rogers (KY)
Burgess Johnson (IL) Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN) Johnson, Sam Rohrabacher
Buyer Jones (NC) Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert Jordan Roskam
Camp (MI) Keller Royce
Campbell (CA) King (IA) Ryan (WI)
Cannon King (NY) Sali
Capito Kingston Saxton
Carter Kirk Schmidt
Castle Kline (MN) Sensenbrenner
Chabot Knollenberg Sessions
Coble Kuhl (NY) Shadegg
Cole (OK) LaHood Shays
Conaway Lamborn Shimkus
Crenshaw Latham Simpson
Cubin LaTourette Smith (NE)
Culberson Lewis (CA) Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY) Lewis (KY) Smith (TX)
Davis, David Linder Souder
Davis, Tom LoBiondo Stearns
Deal (GA) Lucas Sullivan
Dent Lungren, Daniel Terry
Diaz-Balart, L. E. Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M. Mack Tiahrt
Doolittle Manzullo Tiberi
Drake Marchant Turner
Dreier McCarthy (CA) Upton
Duncan McCaul (TX) Walberg
Ehlers McCotter Walden (OR)
Emerson McCrery Walsh (NY)
English (PA) McHenry Wamp
Everett McHugh Weldon (FL)
Fallin McKeon Weller
Feeney McMorris Westmoreland
Ferguson Rodgers Whitfield
Flake Mica Wicker
Forbes Miller (FL) Wilson (NM)
Fortenberry Miller (MI) Wilson (SC)
Fossella Miller, Gary Wolf
Foxy Moran (KS) Young (AK)
Franks (AZ) Murphy, Tim Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Baca Holden Pickering
Becerra Hunter Shuster
Cantor Jefferson Tancredo
Conyers Meek (FL) Waxman
Davis, Jo Ann Nadler Welch (VT)
Hastings (FL) Pallone

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1408

Messrs. HASTERT, LINDER, TERRY, GOODLATTE, DENT, KIRK, SAXTON, GINGREY and ROYCE changed their 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.

GREEN ENERGY EDUCATION 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. 1716, 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. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1716, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie Clyburn Gingrey
Ackerman Coble Gohmert
Aderholt Cohen Gonzalez
Akin Cole (OK) Goode
Alexander Conaway Goodlatte
Allen Cooper Gordon
Altmire Costa Granger
Andrews Costello Graves
Arcuri Courtney Green, Al
Bachmann Cramer Green, Gene
Bachus Crenshaw Grijalva
Baird Crowley Gutierrez
Baker Cubin Hall (NY)
Baldwin Cuellar Hall (TX)
Barrett (SC) Culberson Hare
Barrow Cummings Harman
Bartlett (MD) Davis (AL) Hastert
Barton (TX) Davis (CA) Hastings (WA)
Bean Davis (IL) Hayes
Berkley Davis (KY) Heller
Berman Davis, David Hensarling
Berry Davis, Lincoln Hergert
Biggart Davis, Tom Herseht Sandlin
Bilbray Deal (GA) Higgins
Bilirakis DeFazio Hill
Bishop (GA) DeGette Hinchey
Bishop (NY) Delahunt Hinojosa
Bishop (UT) DeLauro Hirono
Blackburn Dent Hobson
Blumenauer Diaz-Balart, L. Hodes
Blunt Diaz-Balart, M. Hoekstra
Boehner Dicks Holt
Bonner Dingell Honda
Boozman Bono Hooley
Boren Donnelly Hoyer
Bowen Doolittle Hulshof
Bowell Doyle Inglis (SC)
Boucher Drake Inslee
Boustany Dreier Israel
Boyd (FL) Duncan Issa
Boyda (KS) Edwards Jackson (IL)
Brady (PA) Ehlers Jackson-Lee
Brady (TX) Ellison (TX)
Braley (IA) Ellsworth Jindal
Brown (SC) Emanuel Johnson (GA)
Brown, Corrine Emerson Johnson (IL)
Brown-Waite, Engel Johnson, E. B.
Ginny English (PA) Johnson, Sam
Buchanan Eshoo Jones (NC)
Burgess Etheridge Jones (OH)
Burton (IN) Everett Jordan
Butterfield Fallin Kagen
Buyer Farr Kanjorski
Calvert Fattah Kaptur
Camp (MI) Feeney Keller
Campbell (CA) Ferguson Kennedy
Cannon Filner Kildee
Capito Flake Kilpatrick
Capps Forbes Kind
Capuano Fortenberry King (IA)
Cardoza Fossella King (NY)
Carnahan Foxx Kingston
Carney Frank (MA) Kirk
Carson Franks (AZ) Klein (FL)
Carter Frelinghuysen Kline (MN)
Castle Gallegly Knollenberg
Castor Garrett (NJ) Kucinich
Chabot Gerlach Kuhl (NY)
Chandler Giffords LaHood
Clarke Gilchrest Lamborn
Clay Gillibrand Lampson
Cleaver Gillmor Langevin

Lantos
Larsen (WA) Neugebauer
Larson (CT) Nunes
Latham Oberstar
LaTourette Obey
Lee Oliver
Levin Ortiz
Lewis (CA) Pascrell
Lewis (GA) Pastor
Lewis (KY) Paul
Linder Payne
Lipinski Pearce
LoBiondo Pence
Loeb sack Perlmutter
Lofgren, Zoe Peterson (MN)
Lowey Peterson (PA)
Lucas Petri
Lungren, Daniel Pitts
E. Platts
Lynch Poe
Mack Pomeroy
Mahoney (FL) Porter
Maloney (NY) Price (GA)
Manzullo Price (NC)
Marchant Pryce (OH)
Markey Putnam
Marshall Radanovich
Matheson Rahall
Matsui Ramstad
McCarthy (CA) Rangel
McCarthy (NY) Regula
McCaul (TX) Rehberg
McCollum (MN) Reichert
McCotter Renzi
McCrery Reyes
McDermott Reynolds
McGovern Rodriguez
McHenry Rogers (AL)
McHugh Rogers (KY)
McIntyre Rogers (MI)
McKeon Rohrabacher
McMorris Ros-Lehtinen
Rodgers Roskam
McNerney Ross
McNulty Rothman
Meehan Roybal-Allard
Meek (FL) Royce
Meeks (NY) Ruppertsberger
Melancon Rush
Mica Ryan (WI)
Michaud Salazar
Miller (FL) Sali
Miller (MI) Sanchez, Linda
Miller (NC) T.
Miller, Gary Sanchez, Loretta
Miller, George Sarbanes
Mitchell Saxton
Mollohan Schakowsky
Moore (KS) Schiff
Moore (WI) Schmidt
Moran (KS) Schwartz
Moran (VA) Scott (GA)
Murphy (CT) Scott (VA)
Murphy, Patrick Sensenbrenner
Murphy, Tim Serrano
Murtha Sessions
Musgrave Sestak
Myrick Shadegg
Napolitano Shays

NOT VOTING—16

Baca Holden Ryan (OH)
Becerra Hunter Shuster
Cantor Jefferson Tancredo
Conyers Nadler Welch (VT)
Davis, Jo Ann Pallone
Hastings (FL) Pickering

□ 1417

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 431 and 432 I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”