

for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1020

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2272, AMERICA COMPETES ACT

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 602 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 602

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2272) to invest in innovation through research and development, and to improve the competitiveness of the United States. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SUTTON. For the purpose 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. SUTTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 602 provides for the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2272, the 21st Century Competitiveness Act. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration and considers the conference report as read.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 602 and the underlying conference report on the 21st Century Competitiveness Act. Too often, we hear that our Nation is struggling to properly educate our students in math and science, and as a result we are falling behind in this world. This is unacceptable to me, and it should be unacceptable to this Congress.

But today we have the chance to change this. Today we make a true commitment to our future. Today we can make it clear that we support American innovation and understand the vital need for our Nation to remain competitive in the global economy.

The 21st Century Competitiveness Act will help ensure that our students, teachers, businesses and workers are prepared to continue to keep this country at the forefront of research and development. Our bill increases funding and makes improvements for the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, and at the Department of Energy Office of Science. The bill increases funding for science, technology, engineering and math, also known as STEM research and education programs.

This bill also allocates funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. These MEP programs leverage Federal, State, local and private investments to stimulate new manufacturing processes and technologies. It's through these new processes and technologies that we can ensure American manufacturers have the tools to compete effectively and efficiently against overseas manufacturers.

The MEP program has proven to be remarkably effective in my home State of Ohio where small and midsize manufacturers face limited budgets, lack of in-house expertise and lack of access to the newest technologies. MEP assistance provided training, expertise and services tailored to the critical needs of Ohio's small and midsize manufacturers.

Through this assistance, many manufacturers in Ohio have increased productivity, achieved higher profits, and remain competitive by providing the latest and most efficient technologies, processes and business practices. In 2006, in fact, as a direct result of MEP assistance, my State enjoyed over \$150 million of new investment and over \$500 million in increased or retained sales. Companies in Ohio participating in the MEP reported cost savings of over \$100 million.

Through the continued funding of this vital program, we can bring these vast benefits to even more small manufacturers across the country. Our efforts here today are vital to stopping the offshoring and outsourcing as well that may have hurt many communities in my home State of Ohio and all across this Nation.

This Congress can send a strong message today that we want to ensure that our Nation is prepared for the future.

Let's pass this rule and the 21st Century Competitiveness Act.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow the House to consider a conference report that incorporates several similar measures that have passed the House and Senate authorizing funding for scientific research and increasing the number of students majoring in math, science, engineering and foreign languages.

The several bills that passed both Houses were approved by overwhelming bipartisan votes. The authorization level for all of these bipartisan bills combined a total \$24 billion in the House. I am concerned, however, that the conference report today contains over \$43 billion in overall authorizations, nearly double.

It is vital that the United States continue to grow more globally competitive in the areas of scientific research and technology. Federal and private investment in supporting research and development is essential to the health of our economy and our competitiveness as a Nation.

We must plan for the future by areas of basic research and science today.

However, there is also something we must do today, and that is update our Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act laws. This body has missed several important opportunities to consider changing our laws to account for technological advances, and now we are faced with a limited time remaining before Congress recesses for the August district work period.

You can all agree or disagree that our FISA laws need to be updated. All I will be asking my colleagues to do is to vote "no" on the previous question so that Members will have the opportunity to debate and consider fixing our outdated FISA law that currently requires our intelligence community to ask a judge permission before listening to telephone conversations of foreign terrorists in foreign countries who threaten our Nation's security.

Let me be clear also. If the previous question is defeated, the America COMPETES conference report will still be on the floor today. This is not an attempt whatsoever to delay this conference report. It is only an attempt to bring this issue to the floor as soon as possible, but, more importantly, before the Congress recesses.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, before I yield, I just want to make it clear, as has been stated on this House floor

many times in recent days, that the FISA legislation will be on the floor of this House before the August recess. We're happy that we are here today to pass this rule and this legislation, and we are also able to deal with FISA.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee from Ohio.

First of all, I want to congratulate the outstanding work of the Science Committee under the leadership of Mr. GORDON and Mr. HALL. That committee has produced more bipartisan useful legislation, maybe, than any other committee so far in this body. They are to be commended.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is yet another nail in the ladder of creating opportunity and making this country competitive in the 21st century global economy.

I want to talk a little bit about what can happen if you have companies, large and small, that make a difference and commit themselves to training the workforce, commit themselves to participating in a local community to advance science and math.

We have small companies in Vermont that have done this. We also have a big company, IBM. It is celebrating its 50th anniversary in Vermont, and that will be later this summer. IBM is a major employer. It is a company that transformed itself from computers to services in a whole array of activities that has been beneficial and relied on having the best training for new employees, the best science and math.

That company has not only helped provide good jobs to Vermonters as well as people around the world, it has participated very actively in our State efforts to improve science and math training. This legislation is going to focus resources on that effort in Vermont and across the country.

My congratulations to the Science Committee for the good work that it's done and to the companies large and small across this State that have helped be a partner on these policies that are essential for the future.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to a real doctor from Georgia, a member of the Science and Technology Committee, and a former member of the Rules Committee, Dr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. I want to thank Doc for yielding, the gentleman from Washington, I thank him very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern over the process, really, with which we are proceeding today on such an important matter.

I recognize, as a member of the Science Committee, all the hard work that has gone into the America COMPETES Act to maintain and enhance our Nation's investment in the core STEM field, science, technology, engineering and mathematics. I believe that every member of our committee understands well that the future of our

competitive economic edge rests in energizing our students at every level so they can pursue these fields of study.

I want to commend my chairman, Mr. GORDON, and Ranking Member HALL. The bills that came before us in committee, all four bills, which we combined to be part of this conference report, I wholeheartedly support every step of the way. But I am very concerned with this conference report and the process, this lightning speed quickness that it has been brought to the floor of this House is absurd.

I want to ask what is the rush. As ranking member of the Technology and Innovation Subcommittee, I was very pleased to be picked as a conferee. I don't get that opportunity often in the 5 years that I have been a Member of this Congress. However, I was only made aware of the appointment Tuesday at 3:30 and, immediately, that the full conference committee would be holding the one and only formal meeting at 5 o'clock, an hour and a half later.

This is a 470-page document that was not even available to conferees until 4:30 yesterday. I can't speak for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but I don't want to go back home to Georgia next week and explain to my constituents that I spent, as Representative HASTINGS just said, \$43 billion of their tax money on this measure that neither I nor most of the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle even had an opportunity to read, much less think about, before casting that vote. Further, I am extremely concerned with the cavalier attitude with which the majority appears bent on bringing this report to the floor today.

The rules require, and I noticed that earlier the chairman of the Rules Committee was on the floor. She knows the rules require that it shall not be in order to consider a conference report that has not been available to Members, Delegates and Resident Commissioner in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for at least 3 calendar days. This report was filed yesterday, yet here we are today preparing to vote on a negotiated deal that is incorrectly being labeled as bipartisan. It was bipartisan in the House. It's not bipartisan in this conference report.

It was only bipartisan to the extent we were invited to the party, but we were told to please just observe the dancing, and, by the way, don't eat any of the refreshments.

The House did not use proxy votes, and yet that rule was also waived yesterday for the purpose of the formal conference.

In addition, by a vote of 258-167, this House passed a motion to instruct conferees Tuesday to insist on the House authorization levels and to restore language on coal-to-liquids technology that had previously been accepted in this House by a vote of 264-154. Both instructions were ignored in conference. The coal-to-liquids technology provi-

sion was offered as an amendment in the conference yesterday and was voted down, despite the wishes of this whole House.

What's the point of having rules if we're not going to follow them, and what's the use of holding votes if we are not going to adhere to their outcome and insist on a conference committee report? It's extremely unfortunate that again this week we are faced with the regrettable fruits of the Democratic leadership's rush to adjourn.

My point is, this rush to get things done so you can go home and say that you accomplished this, and that's fine, but we've got to get it right and we have got to follow the rules. I mean, whether this side, we were in the majority, if we are guilty of doing the same thing on occasion, and maybe that was done on appropriations bills, but when you are dealing with something like this, and this is the policy in science education and trying to stimulate our young people and make this country more competitive in the global economy, we have got to get it right.

When we have a bill coming out of the House that very generously authorizes almost \$23 billion, \$24 billion, \$25 billion, and all of a sudden it's \$43 billion, I have some real concerns about that. So it's extremely unfortunate that we are rushing this through, and it is the American public who is being left with an ever-increasing bill for this attitude.

I asked my colleagues on the policy, or on the process. I am not talking about the issues that others have raised, but I am saying vote "no" to this rule and the underlying report.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my great pleasure to yield 20 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, Mr. GORDON, whose leadership brought us here to this great day.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Thank you, Lady SUTTON. I will grace you by not taking that full 20 minutes.

I want to thank Mr. WELCH for his kind words. I want to thank Mr. HASTINGS for not being too ugly about this bill, and I want to make my friend on the Science Committee, Mr. GINGREY, feel better about this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in the last few hours of every session, it doesn't matter who is in the majority or who is in the minority, things get a little bit tense. Folks want to get going for their district work period, and so this is an opportunity for us all to come together.

This is a bill that was based on a suspension that passed out of this House unanimously, based on a bill out of the Senate that passed 88-8. This is a bipartisan, bicameral bill.

The National Chamber of Commerce supports this bill. The National Association of Manufacturers supports this bill. The Business Roundtable supports this bill. Every university that is represented in this body supports this bill

because it is a good bill. It's going to help American workers, businesses. It's going to help students and teachers be able to compete in the world. It's going to help us regain and maintain a leadership in research, innovation and technology.

Let me just take a moment and tell you a little bit about the bill.

Well, it's also based on, of course, Sherry Boehlert, the former, very good Republican chairman of our Science Committee, myself when I was ranking member, LAMAR ALEXANDER, who has done Herculean work in the Senate, as well as JEFF BINGAMAN asked the National Academy of Science to do a report on the competitiveness of America in the 21st century. Norm Augustine, the former head of Lockheed Martin, Craig Barrett at Intel, many other scholars, as well as academic and business individuals, came together and they told us in a very sobering way that America was heading in the wrong direction in terms of competitiveness in the 21st century.

Now, this is not just an idle thought for the ones of us that have kids and grandkids, because I am very concerned that the next generation of Americans could be the first generation of Americans that inherit a national standard of living less than our parents if we don't do something. This bill will help change the corner, turn that corner.

Let me tell you about it; it deals really with three main areas. First of all, following the recommendations of the rising above the gathering storm, we are going to increase our expenditures and research in this country, in the National Science Foundation that does such a good job, the National Institute of Standards and Technology. And, again, for my friend from Georgia, these are just authorizations.

If they can't justify what they are doing, then the appropriations will not appropriate those funds. This is just authorization. It doesn't spend any money, but it does give us a great blueprint.

The next thing we are going to do, we have to recognize that there are about 7 billion people in the world, half of which make less than \$2 a day. We can't compete with that. We don't want to compete with that. We don't want our kids and grandkids to have to be in that situation.

What do we do? We have to compete at a higher level. If they are going to make one widget in China or India or elsewhere, we have got to make 50 in this country at the same time. We need to be inventing the widget maker and we need to be manufacturing the widget maker. That's what this bill is going to help us do. But to do that, our workers have to perform at a higher skill level. We have to help them do that.

When you look, and it's a sad situation right now, but only Cyprus and South Africa have lower overall math and science scores than we have in this country right now. What is the reason

for that? Is it that we are not as smart as other countries? No, that's not the case.

The problem is we have very good and talented teachers in this country, but unfortunately, when it comes to math and science, about 63 percent of the math teachers at the middle school have neither a major or a certification to teach math.

The science teachers in this country are trying to do a good job, but 87 percent of them have neither a major or certification to teach the physical sciences. It's hard to inspire. It's hard to really convey information when you don't have a good background. I want to give you an example of that.

My father was a farmer. He went to World War II, and he came back, and because of the GI Bill, he was able to go to college. He got a degree in agriculture. I come along, and my mother had to give up her job at the cafeteria, so my father needed a second job.

So he applied to teach, and he got the last teaching job at Smyrna High School in my home county. So since he was the last person to get a job, they assigned him to teach high school science and to coach girls basketball.

I am not sure which one my father knew the least about. He was a bright, able fellow, but they put him in a difficult situation. And it was tough for his students, I am sure.

□ 1040

Well, we have got to do better than that. And so what this bill is going to do is really two things in that area. We are going to take those good teachers like my father, bring them back into school. We will do it in the summer, so they can get their certification, hopefully go ahead and get a master's, get an AP certification so they can do a better job.

We are also going to provide scholarships for approximately 10,000 students each year on a competitive basis that want to go into math, science, and education and agree to teach for 5 years in high-need areas. This is going to go a long way to helping our skills.

And so, finally, we are going to look at one other area, one other area that Rising Above the Gathering Storm mentioned, was we have to become energy independent in this country. We have been talking about a lot of energy bills and are going to hopefully pass an energy bill at least in the House. The Senate has done. It is a long way to getting something completed.

But, today, this is a conference report. This is not just a bill that then goes to the other body and goes to conference. This is a conference report that was passed out of that conference on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, and it does something about energy independence today. And let me tell you about that, and this is a recommendation that came from the National Academies of Science.

We are going to set up an agency within the Department of Energy mod-

eled after DARPA, which is in the Defense Department, a high-risk, high-reward group. It is going to look at the seven or eight most cutting-edge types of new technologies. And we are going to bring our private sector, the public sector, the national labs, the universities all together with a very narrow bit of management that is only going to be like project directors to bring all these folks together. And, just like in the Department of Defense, the Internet was developed, stealth and technology was developed, but there were a lot of things that didn't work out, because they weren't afraid to try. High risk, high reward. That is what we are going to do.

We are going to get in there, and we are going to find those areas that are new technologies that are going to bump our ability to create renewable energy in this country, which is going to help us become energy independent, it is going to create jobs, and it is going to create exports.

This is a very good bipartisan, bicameral bill that is endorsed by the Chamber of Commerce, by the National Association of Manufacturers, by the Business Roundtable, universities. And this afternoon we will talk about this some more. I am going to bring you a list of businesses and organizations that support this that is going to go on and on.

So, my friends, let's put aside I guess just the natural bit of tenseness that goes with ending a session. Let's work together and get something good today and pass this bipartisan, bicameral bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Dr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You heard one speaker say this was a bad bill and should not be passed. You heard another one say it is a good bill and should be passed. There are good points on both sides of that argument. But I would point out that I have never seen a perfect bill reach the floor of this House; and, on balance, I believe this bill is good and should be passed, and I will be supporting the bill and presumably the rule that is presenting it to us.

I do this in spite of the fact that Dr. GINGREY and Ranking Member HALL, whom I have great respect for, have serious doubts about the bill.

Let me explain why I am supporting this. America is in trouble. It is in trouble in several areas. It is in trouble in science, and it is in trouble in education, manufacturing, outsourcing. Let me examine some of those.

Just an example, science education. Had I the time I could give you chart after chart after chart showing you where American students stand on the international scale compared to other high school graduate students:

In physics, dead last of all developed nations.

High school mathematics graduates, second from the bottom of all developed countries.

General science, about fifth from the bottom.

In the PITA studies, United States last of 21 nations in mathematics.

We think we are the leading nation. We think we are doing a good job of educating our students. We are not, and we must face that. This bill addresses much of that problem by improving the education and training for teachers, both incoming teachers and existing teachers. It will improve the curricula, it will help students achieve better, and we must achieve higher levels again.

China and India recognized this issue 20 years ago, that the future belonged to the nations that educated their children in mathematics and science. China did it the dictator's way: You will learn math and science. India did it through inducements. But, as a result, they are now ahead of us, and we are now losing jobs to those nations because we have neglected our math and science education.

In our research efforts, we have always been the leader in scientific research for half a century, ever since World War II. We are losing ground. Believe it or not, South Korea is starting to put more than we are, as a percent of GDP, into basic research efforts, and that is being joined by other countries as well.

Manufacturing is a tremendous problem. We are losing jobs to other countries. And it is not just the wage base. I come from a manufacturing district. I have many conversations with manufacturers. It is not just the wage base. They are getting better quality, more highly educated workers abroad for lower pay. That is a hard combination to beat. And we really have to work hard in this Nation to improve education and improve manufacturing.

Now, how does that affect this bill? This bill is designed to affect and improve all of those areas. It does not do it ideally. I disagree with a number of things in the bill. I join my Republican colleagues in doing that. But, on balance, it is a start. If this were an appropriations bill, I might have some reservations, but it is an authorization bill. We get another bite of the apple each time we decide which programs we are actually going to fund.

I could mention ARPA-E in here. I am less than enthusiastic about it. If it works, I am delighted. I am skeptical. But why not authorize it, let the appropriators work with us, and decide whether or not we should fund it.

America as a Nation is based on competition. We are not afraid of competition, and this bill will engender competition. It will give us the opportunity to compete face-to-face at level-to-level with other countries and give us an opportunity to restore our manufacturing base, improve our science education, improve our manufacturing facilities and really do a better job.

You have heard before, this is endorsed by many major organizations in this country, all of whom have a deep

interest in improving manufacturing and improving our competitiveness. This bill was suggested by President Bush in his American Competitiveness Initiative in his State of the Union speech last year. This is not a fly-by-night idea. This is something that I have been working on for almost every year since I came here 14 years ago and particularly the last 10 years. It is coming to fruition.

I have worked with the White House on it. I have worked with many scientific societies, and much of the genesis of this comes from the National Academy of Sciences and The Gathering Storm Report, which is headed very ably by Norman Augustine, one of our leading industrialists and scientists.

It is not a perfect bill. I wish it were, but it is not. But in this process this is the best we can get, and it gives us a base to build on. And through appropriate use of this authorization and the appropriations bills, we will strengthen our Nation, we will strengthen our manufacturing base, we will strengthen our schools, we will strengthen our math and science education, and we will have a better Nation and a stronger Nation as a result.

One last comment. We spend a tremendous amount of money on defense, a tremendous amount of money on defense. We have always managed to succeed in situations like Iraq because of our superior knowledge, our superior research, and our superior resources. We are in danger of losing that edge. And I have met with people from the Pentagon suggesting scientific ideas to them that they can use to improve the situation in Iraq. We need that kind of interaction between the scientific community and the military community, and I hope that will also result from this and give us a stronger Nation.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio, and I thank her for her leadership not only on the Rules Committee but on the Judiciary Committee. It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to work with her.

Mr. Speaker, let me acknowledge the chairman of the Science Committee, Mr. GORDON, and the ranking member of the Science Committee. As an alumnus of this committee, let me applaud this effort and indicate that this is not the end but it is the beginning. It has been a long journey, but it is premised on very important challenges.

We begin to look around the world, and we notice that nations who in years past were looking to the United States for the cutting edge of technology now are graduating more mathematicians and engineers in 1 month, such as China, than we might be graduating in 1 year. We understand the premise of this competitive legislation.

H.R. 2272 is long overdue, and it is reaching to answer a crisis.

Earlier this morning, we heard reference to President John F. Kennedy about his pronouncement that America was going into space. It was said at that time that the President didn't know how we were going into space, did not have a grasp of the possible technology, but yet by his pronouncement it opened the doors of America's inventiveness to be able to create this pathway to space.

Well, now that we have statistics behind us of Leave No Child Behind, a bill that we hope we will truly reform, we do have numbers suggesting that America's children are shortchanged in math and science. We do know that America's schools are failing with respect to equipment in science laboratories; and we do know America's schools need the kind of trained teachers, master teachers who can emphasize math and science. So I am very grateful that this particular legislation allows for 25,000 new teachers over the next 3 years through Professional Development Summer Training Institute's graduate education focusing on math and science.

Today, in my own district, I am working with private-to-public sector to help fund one of the failing school districts to give them what you call master teachers in math and science to build up their laboratories. But we are using private dollars because we can't get the public dollars. This maintains the importance of qualified teachers in mathematics and science. It does something that is key, that many of us have been working on who have been advocating for NASA for many years, and that is a partnership between the public and private.

I hope that NASA will be one of those who can be utilized to engage more heavily in the community on the issues of math, science, and engineering.

And something that we have worked on and I have worked on all my years on the Science Committee, working with historically black colleges and Hispanic-serving colleges, we now have a focus on minorities and women in the science area.

When I first came to this Congress, I passed legislation that would allow excess equipment from the Nation's laboratories to be used in our secondary and primary schools, anything to put a nexus between research and science and development to the Nation's education system. This puts it squarely on the front burner. And I think what also happens is that we have revitalized the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Department of Energy's Office of Science.

The key element of this legislation is that, without ideas, we are not competitive. That is why it is so named. And I hope that as this bill moves forward the President and Presidents to come will make this a cornerstone of their administration; that is, that

America fails when her inventiveness, when her scientists and engineers are stifled and America fails when its people, are, in essence, divided and some go forward and some do not. So the idea that we must see again the emphasis on math and science for girls as we do boys is crucial.

Let me just simply say, as a partner to this effort, we recently passed my NASA Coin Bill. Interestingly enough, in that legislation there are opportunities to embrace children-focused programs that would encourage the research or the science at a primary school level so that children grow up saying, "I want to be." And I know they want to be basketball players and they want to be maybe astronauts because they look great, but I want them to grow up and say, "I want to be a math teacher or mathematician. I want to be a biologist or a chemist or a nuclear physicist or an engineer of many different types." As we reflect on the tragedy of the Minnesota bridge collapse, we need engineers and technicians to help build America and to create jobs.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by simply saying science is the work of the 21st century. This is what this bill is about.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in my opening remarks that I will urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can address the very, very important issue of reform of FISA.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from New Mexico, a member of the Intelligence Committee, Mrs. WILSON.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, we now have 2 days left before the August break, and I would ask my colleagues to oppose the previous question on this conference report so that we may immediately address the problems in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

We have now reached a point where the majority is committed to bring legislation to the floor, and that is a very big step forward, and I regret that it has taken so much public pressure to get us to this point. I am actually a believer that intelligence matters are best dealt with quietly, but when quiet encouragement does not work and national security is at stake, we have an obligation to increase the public pressure in order to get a political decision to move and get things done when it is important to this country.

Now that that political decision has been made and the majority has said they will bring legislation to the floor, we need to make sure that that legislation fixes the problem. In other words, we have to get this right. It is critical to get this right. Several Democrat leaders have put forward some ideas, but there are two of them that don't make any sense to me.

□ 1100

They want, first, only temporary authority to listen to foreigners in foreign countries. And, second, they want

to still be in a situation where you have to get a court order to approve eavesdropping on foreigners in foreign countries.

Let's look at that for a second. My colleagues want two things. They want only temporary authority to listen to foreigners in foreign countries. The war on terrorism is not a temporary thing, and spying is not new. As early as the invention of the telegraph and reading people's mail during World War I that was going back and forth to Europe, in World War II much of the war was won because we broke codes that the Germans and Japanese were using and listened to their communications. During the Cold War we listened to our enemies. We have a foreign intelligence apparatus, and we spy on our enemies. Foreign intelligence collection is not new, and it is not temporary. We need to fix this law and get it right now.

Secondly, several of my Democrat colleagues have put forward the idea that you should still need court approval to eavesdrop on foreigners in foreign countries. It takes about 200 man-hours to develop a probable cause statement, a packet to go to the court, it's about that thick, to get approval from a court to do a wiretap.

Now, these people who have to put these together are not clerks or even lawyers. They are experts in counter-terrorism, and their time is much better spent tracking these people than putting together paperwork.

More importantly, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act was never intended to put a U.S. judge in charge of deciding whether we can listen to foreigners in foreign countries. That is why we spy and what we do. We don't need judges to be considering those kinds of things. And the only reason they are is because technology has changed faster than the law.

FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, was never intended to require warrants to listen to foreigners in foreign countries. In 1978, when the law was written, almost all long-haul communications were over the air. That's where international calls were. Almost all local calls were on a wire. When they wrote the act, they froze the law in time. They required a warrant for anything on a wire. And over-the-air communications didn't require a warrant at all because that's where we collect foreign intelligence.

In a bill that comes to this floor, we need to do two things. First, no warrant or court intervention should be required to listen to foreign terrorists in foreign countries. Speed matters. And, second, we must continue to require warrants to listen to people in the United States. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance law was intended to protect the civil liberties of Americans. It was intended, and has done actually a very good job at rolling back the abuses that the intelligence community was involved in in the 1950s and 1960s.

Let's get this court back to focusing what it was intended to do, which is to

protect the civil liberties of Americans, and allow our intelligence community to do what they are intended to do, which is to keep this country safe and prevent the next terrorist attack.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time it's my honor to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, a member of both the Rules Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my good friend from Ohio for yielding.

If it is that we must say that my friend from New Mexico, Mr. Speaker, is to receive credit for a discussion of FISA, it should also attend the facts that for over a year the Intelligence Committees of this Congress have been in negotiations with the administration regarding matters having to do with FISA.

Just so we assure everybody that the matter of FISA is on the agenda, it will be taken up before we leave. And I can only say that there are many of us in this body who do not feel that it is inappropriate to establish an appropriate entity for oversight, no matter where information may be coming from.

The thing that I wish to dispel is that there is no reason for us to be fearful of us not having information that is needed. It is true that the Director of National Intelligence has said that there are matters that we may be missing. But there may be matters that we may be missing even if we fix FISA if we hurry to judgment and not do it correctly.

So civil liberties are important to Americans. Civil liberties are paramount when it comes to our consideration of gathering information. We don't want to troll and catch some American citizens and have their information poorly used.

Now, I don't know about anybody else, but there is one provision that considers giving the Attorney General this power and not courts. If it was this Attorney General, then I'm awfully glad that we're in the present posture that we're in, because I would not want this Attorney General making those decisions.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Director of National Intelligence has said that there are things we should be listening to which we are not getting.

All of us remember where we were on the morning of 9/11, remember who we were with, what we were wearing, what we had for breakfast.

I would guess that nobody listening to me here today, or very few, remember where they were the day that the British Government arrested 16 people who were within 48 hours of walking on to airliners at Heathrow and blowing them up over the Atlantic. It was successful intelligence cooperation between the British, Pakistani and American Governments that prevented that

attack. And you don't remember it because it didn't happen.

Intelligence is the first line of defense in the war on terror, and we must fix this law and get it right.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman if he has any remaining speakers. I'm the last speaker on this side, and I'll reserve my time until the gentleman has closed for his side.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentlelady is prepared to close, I am prepared to close on my side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question. By defeating the previous question we will give Members the ability to vote today on the merits of changing current law to ensure our intelligence community has the tools they need to protect our Nation from potentially imminent terrorist attack.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, it is time that we make a commitment to our students who want to succeed in the fields of math and science. It's time that we help our manufacturers and promote innovation and industrial competitiveness. With this legislation, we are setting our course.

While there are many things that must be done on many different issues to see real improvements, passing the 21st Century Competitiveness Act today is one very positive and enormous step in the right direction. We are saying we want to invest in our teachers. We want to invest in our students, invest in science and research and development and innovation. We are developing our workforce for the jobs of today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, we are preparing our Nation for a bright future. 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. 602 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sec. 2. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider the bill (H.R. 3138) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to update the definition of electronic surveillance. All points of order against the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of

debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

Mr. 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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 602, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 601; and adoption of House Resolution 601, if ordered.

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

[Roll No. 791]	YEAS—225	
Abercrombie	Engel	Markey
Ackerman	Eshoo	Marshall
Allen	Etheridge	Matheson
Altman	Farr	Matsui
Andrews	Fattah	McCarthy (NY)
Arcuri	Filner	McCormick (MN)
Baca	Frank (MA)	McDermott
Baird	Giffords	McGovern
Baldwin	Gillibrand	McIntyre
Bean	Gonzalez	McNerney
Becerra	Gordon	McNulty
Berkley	Green, Al	Meek (FL)
Berman	Green, Gene	Meeks (NY)
Berry	Grijalva	Melancon
Bishop (GA)	Gutierrez	Michaud
Bishop (NY)	Hall (NY)	Miller (NC)
Blumenauer	Hare	Miller, George
Boren	Harman	Mitchell
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Boucher	Herseth Sandlin	Moore (KS)
Boyd (FL)	Higgins	Moore (WI)
Boysd (KS)	Hill	Moran (VA)
Brady (PA)	Hinchey	Murphy (CT)
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Murphy, Patrick
Brown, Corrine	Hirono	Murtha
Butterfield	Hodes	Nadler
Capps	Holden	Napolitano
Capuano	Holt	Neal (MA)
Cardoza	Honda	Oberstar
Carnahan	Hooley	Obey
Carney	Hoyer	Ortiz
Carson	Insllee	Pallone
Castor	Israel	Pascarella
Chandler	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Clay	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Cleaver	(TX)	Perlmuter
Clyburn	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pomeroy
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Cooper	Jones (OH)	Rahall
Costa	Kagen	Rangel
Costello	Kanjorski	Reyes
Courtney	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Cramer	Kennedy	Ross
Crowley	Kildee	Rothman
Cuellar	Kilpatrick	Royal-Allard
Cummings	Kind	Ruppertsberger
Davis (AL)	Klein (FL)	Rush
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Davis (IL)	Lampson	Salazar
Davis, Lincoln	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
DeFazio	Lantos	T.
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Delahunt	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Levin	Schakowsky
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Dingell	Lipinski	Schwartz
Doggett	Loeb	Scott (GA)
Donnelly	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott (VA)
Doyle	Lowey	Serrano
Edwards	Lynch	Sestak
Ellsworth	Mahoney (FL)	Shea-Porter
Emanuel	Maloney (NY)	Sherman

Shuler	Taylor	Watson
Sires	Thompson (CA)	Watt
Skelton	Thompson (MS)	Waxman
Slaughter	Tierney	Weiner
Smith (WA)	Towns	Welch (VT)
Snyder	Udall (CO)	Wexler
Solis	Udall (NM)	Wilson (OH)
Space	Van Hollen	Woolsey
Spratt	Velázquez	Wu
Stark	Visclosky	Wynn
Stupak	Walz (MN)	Yarmuth
Sutton	Wasserman	
Tanner	Schultz	
Tauscher	Waters	

NAYS—198

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

NOT VOTING—9

Clarke	Davis, Jo Ann	Lee
Crenshaw	Ellison	Olver
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Paul

□ 1132

Messrs. COLE of Oklahoma, TERRY, and HUNTER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COOPER and Mr. SERRANO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 792]

YEAS—229

Abercrombie	Gordon	Murphy, Patrick
Ackerman	Green, Al	Murtha
Allen	Green, Gene	Nadler
Altire	Grijalva	Napolitano
Andrews	Gutierrez	Neal (MA)
Arcuri	Hall (NY)	Oberstar
Baca	Hare	Brown-Waite,
Baird	Harman	Ginny
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Johnson (IL)
Barrow	Herseth Sandlin	Jones (NC)
Bean	Higgins	Rohrabacher
Becerra	Hill	Ros-Lehtinen
Berkley	Hinchey	Saxton
Berman	Hinojosa	Schmidt
Berry	Hirono	Sensenbrenner
Bishop (GA)	Hodes	Shay
Bishop (NY)	Holden	Shimkus
Blumenauer	Holt	Shuster
Boren	Honda	Tancredo
Boswell	Hooley	Terry
Boucher	Hoyer	Thornberry
Boyd (FL)	Inslee	Walberg
Boyd (KS)	Boyd (KS)	Walsh (OR)
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Walsh (NY)
Braley (IA)	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Warden (OR)
Brown, Corrine	Ruppertsberger	Wheeler
Butterfield	Jefferson	Wise
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Wise (PA)
Johnson, E. B.	Johnson, E. B.	Wise (VA)
Cardoza	Jones (OH)	Wise (WA)
Carnahan	Kagen	Wise (WI)
Carney	Kanjorski	Wise (WA)
Carson	Kaptur	Wise (WI)
Castor	Kennedy	Wise (WI)
Chandler	Kildee	Wise (WI)
Souder	Kilpatrick	Wise (WI)
Clay	Kilpatrick	Wise (WI)
Cleaver	Kind	Young (AK)
Cohen	Kucinich	Young (AK)
Conyers	Lampson	Young (AK)
Cooper	Langevin	Young (AK)
Costa	Lantos	Young (AK)
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Young (AK)
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Young (AK)
Cramer	Lee	Young (AK)
Crowley	Levin	Young (AK)
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Young (AK)
Cummings	Lipinski	Young (AK)
Davis (AL)	Loebssack	Young (AK)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Young (AK)
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Young (AK)
Davis, Lincoln	Lynch	Young (AK)
Defazio	Maloney (NY)	Young (AK)
DeGette	Markey	Young (AK)
Delahunt	Marshall	Young (AK)
DeLauro	Matheson	Young (AK)
Dicks	Matsui	Young (AK)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Young (AK)
Doggett	McCormick (MN)	Young (AK)
Donnelly	McDermott	Young (AK)
Doyle	McGovern	Young (AK)
Edwards	McIntyre	Young (AK)
Ehlers	McNerny	Young (AK)
Ellsworth	McNulty	Young (AK)
Emanuel	Meek (FL)	Young (AK)
Engel	Melancon	Young (AK)
Eshoo	Michaud	Young (AK)
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Young (AK)
Farr	Miller, George	Young (AK)
Fattah	Mitchell	Young (AK)
Filner	Mollohan	Young (AK)
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Young (AK)
Giffords	Moore (WI)	Young (AK)
Gillibrand	Moran (VA)	Young (AK)
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	Young (AK)
		Young (AK)

Wexler	Wilson (OH)
Wu	Wynn

Woolsey	

Yarmuth	
---------	--

NAYS—194

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)
Akin	Gerlach
Alexander	Gilchrest
Bachmann	Gillmor
Bachus	Gingrey
Baker	Gohmert
Barrett (SC)	Goode
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte
Barton (TX)	Granger
Biggert	Graves
Bilbray	Hall (TX)
Bilirakis	Hastert
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)
Blackburn	Hayes
Blunt	Heller
Boehner	Hensarling
Bonner	Herger
Bono	Hobson
Boozman	Rehberg
Boustany	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Ramstad
Brown (GA)	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Ryan (AL)
Brown-Waite,	Ryan (KY)
Ginny	Jindal
Buchanan	Johnson (IL)
Burgess	Jones (NC)
Burton (IN)	Jordan
Buyer	Keller
Calvert	King (IA)
Camp (MI)	King (NY)
Campbell (CA)	Kingston
Cannon	Kirk
Cantor	Kline (MN)
Capito	Knollenberg
Carter	Kuhl (NY)
Castle	LaHood
Chabot	Lamborn
Coble	Latham
Cole (OK)	LaTourette
Conaway	Lewis (CA)
Culberson	Lewis (KY)
Davis (KY)	Linder
Davis, David	LoBiondo
Davis, Tom	Lucas
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel
Dent	E.
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo
Doolittle	Tiahrt
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)
Drake	McCaull (TX)
Duncan	McCotter
Ehlers	McCrery
Emerson	McHenry
English (PA)	McHugh
Everett	McKeon
Fallin	McMorris
Feeney	Rodgers
Ferguson	Mica
Flake	Whitfield
Forbes	Miller (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)
Fossella	Miller, Gary
Foxx	Moran (KS)
Franks (AZ)	Murphy, Tim
	Young (AK)
	Young (FL)

Boozman	Hoekstra
Boustany	Hulshof
Brady (TX)	Hunter
Bilirakis	Reynolds
Bishop (UT)	Price (OH)
Blackburn	Putnam
Blunt	Radanovich
Boehner	Ramstad
Bonner	Regula
Bono	Rehberg
Boozman	Reichert
Burton	Renzi
Biggert	Renzi
Bilbray	Renzi
Bilirakis	Renzi
Bishop (UT)	Renzi
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop (UT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Ros-Lehtinen
Bono	Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Ros-Lehtinen
Biggert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	RosLehtinen
Bishop (UT)	RosLehtinen
Blackburn	RosLehtinen
Blunt	RosLehtinen
Boehner	RosLehtinen
Bonner	RosLehtinen
Bono	RosLehtinen
Boozman	RosLehtinen
Burton	RosLehtinen
Biggert	RosLehtinen
Bilbray	RosLehtinen
Bilirakis	RosLehtinen
Bishop (UT)	RosLehtinen
Blackburn	RosLehtinen
Blunt	RosLehtinen
Boehner	RosLehtinen
Bonner	RosLehtinen
Bono	RosLehtinen
Boozman	RosLehtinen
Burton	RosLehtinen
Biggert	RosLehtinen
Bilbray	RosLehtinen
Bilirakis	RosLehtinen
Bishop (UT)	RosLehtinen
Blackburn	RosLehtinen
Blunt	RosLehtinen
Boehner	RosLehtinen
Bonner	RosLehtinen
Bono	RosLehtinen
Boozman	RosLehtinen
Burton	RosLehtinen
Biggert	RosLehtinen
Bilbray	RosLehtinen
Bilirakis	RosLehtinen
Bishop (UT)	RosLehtinen
Blackburn	RosLehtinen
Blunt	RosLehtinen
Boehner	RosLehtinen
Bonner	RosLehtinen
Bono	RosLehtinen
Boozman	RosLehtinen
Burton	RosLehtinen
Biggert	RosLehtinen
Bilbray	RosLehtinen
Bilirakis	RosLehtinen
Bishop (UT)	RosLehtinen
Blackburn	RosLehtinen
Blunt	RosLehtinen
Boehner	RosLehtinen
Bonner	RosLehtinen
Bono	RosLehtinen
Boozman	RosLehtinen
Burton	RosLehtinen
Biggert	RosLehtinen
Bilbray	RosLehtinen
Bilirakis	RosLehtinen
Bishop (UT)	RosLehtinen
Blackburn	RosLehtinen
Blunt	RosLehtinen
Boehner	RosLehtinen
Bonner	RosLehtinen
Bono	RosLehtinen
Boozman	RosLehtinen
Burton	RosLehtinen
Biggert	RosLehtinen
Bilbray	RosLehtinen
Bilirakis	RosLehtinen
Bishop (UT)	RosLehtinen
Blackburn	RosLehtinen
Blunt	RosLehtinen
Boehner	RosLehtinen
Bonner	RosLehtinen
Bono	RosLehtinen
Boozman	RosLehtinen
Burton	RosLehtinen
Biggert	RosLehtinen
Bilbray	RosLehtinen</td

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 3159, ENSURING MILI-
TARY READINESS THROUGH
STABILITY AND PREDICTABILITY
DEPLOYMENT POLICY ACT OF
2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 601, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 201, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 793]

YEAS—225

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

Van Hollen	Waters	Wexler
Velázquez	Watson	Wilson (OP)
Visclosky	Watt	Woolsey
Walz (MN)	Waxman	Wu
Wasserman	Weiner	Wynn
Schultz	Welch (VT)	Yarmuth

NAYS—201

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 200, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 794]

[Roll No. 794]

YEAS—224

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Napolitano
Ackerman	Hall (NY)	Neal (MA)
Allen	Hare	Oberstar
Altmire	Harman	Obey
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Oliver
Arcuri	Herseth Sandlin	Ortiz
Baca	Higgins	Pallone
Baldwin	Hill	Pascrrell
Barrow	Hinchey	Pastor
Bean	Hinojosa	Payne
Becerra	Hirono	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Hodes	Pomeroy
Berman	Holden	Price (NC)
Berry	Holt	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Honda	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Hooley	Reyes
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Rodriguez
Boren	Inslee	Ross
Boswell	Israel	Rothman
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Royal-Allard
Boyd (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Ruppersberger
Boysd (KS)	(TX)	Rush
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Ryan (OH)
Braley (IA)	Johnson (GA)	Salazar
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Butterfield	Jones (NC)	T.
Capps	Jones (OH)	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Kagen	Sarbanes
Cardoza	Kanjorski	Schakowsky
Carnahan	Kaptur	Schiff
Carson	Kennedy	Schwartz
Castor	Kildee	Scott (GA)
Chandler	Kilpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kind	Serrano
Cleaver	Klein (FL)	Sestak
Clyburn	Kucinich	Shea-Porter
Cohen	Lampson	Sherman
Conyers	Langevin	Shuler
Cooper	Lantos	Sires
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Skelton
Costello	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Courtney	Lee	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Levin	Snyder
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Solis
Cuellar	Lipinski	Space
Cummings	Loebssack	Spratt
Davis (AL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Stupak
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Sutton
Davis, Lincoln	Mahoney (FL)	Tanner
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
DeGette	Markey	Taylor
Delahunt	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
Ellsworth	McNulty	Viscosky
Emanuel	Meek (FL)	Walz (MN)
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Wasserman
Eshoo	Melancion	Schultz
Etheridge	Michaud	Watson
Farr	Miller (NC)	Wat
Fattah	Miller, George	Wat
Filner	Mitchell	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Weiner
Giffords	Moore (KS)	Welch (VT)
Gillibrand	Moore (WI)	Wexler
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Wilson (OH)
Gordon	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Green, Al	Murphy, Patrick	Wu
Green, Gene	Murtha	Wynn
Grijalva	Nadler	Yarmuth
NAYS—200		
Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Boehner
Akin	Barton (TX)	Bonner
Alexander	Biggert	Bono
Bachmann	Bilbray	Boozman
Bachus	Bilirakis	Boustany
Baird	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Baker	Blackburn	Broun (GA)
Barrett (SC)	Blunt	Brown (SC)

□ 1147

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.