

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1382.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 415, noes 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 650]

AYES—415

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

Kline (MN)	Musgrave	Shays
Knollenberg	Myrick	Shea-Porter
Kucinich	Nadler	Sherman
Kuhl (NY)	Neal (MA)	Shuler
LaHood	Neugebauer	Shuster
Lamborn	Nunes	Simpson
Lampson	Oberstar	Sires
Langevin	Obey	Skelton
Larsen (WA)	Olver	Slaughter
Larson (CT)	Ortiz	Smith (NE)
Latham	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
LaTourette	Pascarella	Smith (TX)
Latta	Pastor	Smith (WA)
Lee	Pearce	Snyder
Levin	Pence	Solis
Lewis (CA)	Perlmutter	Souder
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Space
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Speier
Linder	Pitts	Spratt
Lipinski	Platts	Stark
LoBiondo	Poe	Stearns
Loeb	Pomeroy	Stupak
Lofgren, Zoe	Porter	Sullivan
Lowey	Price (GA)	Sutton
Lucas	Price (NC)	Tancredo
Lungren, Daniel	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
E.	Putnam	Tauscher
Lynch	Radanovich	Taylor
Mack	Rahall	Terry
Mahoney (FL)	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
Maloney (NY)	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
Manzullo	Regula	Thornberry
Marchant	Rehberg	Tiahrt
Markey	Reichert	Tiberi
Marshall	Renzi	Towns
Matheson	Reyes	Tsongas
Matsui	Reynolds	Turner
McCarthy (CA)	Richardson	Udall (CO)
McCaul (TX)	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)
McCotter	Rogers (AL)	Upton
McCrery	Rogers (KY)	Van Hollen
McDermott	Rogers (MI)	Velázquez
McGovern	Rohrabacher	Visclosky
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
McHugh	Ross	Walden (OR)
McIntyre	Rothman	Walsh (NY)
McKeon	Roybal-Allard	Walz (MN)
McMorris	Royce	Wamp
Rodgers	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
McNerney	Rush	Schultz
McNulty	Ryan (OH)	Watson
Meek (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Watt
Meeks (NY)	Salazar	Waxman
Melancon	Sali	Weiner
Mica	Sánchez, Linda	Welch (VT)
T.	T.	Weldon (FL)
Michaud	Sanchez, Loretta	Westmoreland
Miller (FL)	Sarbanes	Wexler
Miller (MI)	Saxton	Whitfield (KY)
Miller (NC)	Scalise	Wilson (NM)
Miller, Gary	Schakowsky	Wilson (OH)
Miller, George	Schiff	Wilson (SC)
Mollohan	Schmidt	Wittman (VA)
Moore (KS)	Schwartz	Wolf
Moore (WI)	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Moran (KS)	Scott (VA)	Wu
Moran (VA)	Sensenbrenner	Yarmuth
Murphy (CT)	Serrano	Young (AK)
Murphy, Patrick	Sessions	Young (FL)
Murphy, Tim	Sestak	
Murtha	Shadegg	

NOES—2

Flake Paul

NOT VOTING—16

Barton (TX)	Mitchell	Shimkus
Calvert	Napolitano	Tierney
Costa	Payne	Waters
Cubin	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Kagen	Pickering	
McCarthy (NY)	Roskam	

□ 1202

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1500 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1500

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of September 28, 2008, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution.

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

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

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 1500.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1500 authorizes the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules at any time through the calendar day of Sunday, September 28, 2008. The rule is necessary because under clause 1(a), rule XV, the Speaker may entertain motions to suspend the rules, as you know, only on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of each week. In order for suspensions to be considered on other days, the Rules Committee must authorize such consideration.

This is not an unusual procedure, particularly at the end of the legislative session. In the 109th Congress, for instance, my friends on the other side of the aisle reported at least six rules that provided for additional suspension days. We are doing the same.

This rule will help us move important bipartisan legislation before we adjourn. Of course, all bills considered under suspension of the rules must receive strong bipartisan support in order to pass the House.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule, which will simply help us move important, noncontroversial legislation before we adjourn.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend, Mr. WELCH, the gentleman from Vermont, for the time,

and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, which is a framework under which legislation is brought to the floor, if passed, will allow the House to consider legislation under suspension of the rules until Sunday.

Suspension of the rules is a procedure by which the House of Representatives generally acts to approve legislation promptly. Legislation considered under suspension of the rules is usually non-controversial. It usually has bipartisan support, by virtue of the fact that in order for bills to pass under that procedure known as suspension of the rules bills have to pass with at least two-thirds of the votes of the House.

Yesterday I came to the floor to manage for the minority a similar rule. I did not ask for a vote in opposition regarding that rule yesterday. But today I must rise and oppose this rule, because unlike yesterday's rule, today's rule does not specify which bills the House of Representatives will consider. Instead, this rule, this framework that we are going to vote on now, in a few minutes, this rule provides blanket or blind authority to the majority.

Now, yesterday we received a list of 44 bills that the House was being authorized to consider. But today we received nothing, just a request in effect for absolute power to bring legislation to the floor. So this will allow the majority to bring legislation to the floor that most Members haven't even heard about, much less read, not to mention that we will have absolutely no chance to amend any of the bills.

According to a senior member of the majority on the Rules Committee, such a procedure is "outside the normal parameters of the way the House should conduct its business. It effectively curtails our rights and responsibilities as serious legislators."

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is quite unfortunate that the majority has opted to pursue this path. In reality, this is the sixth time that the majority is bringing forth a rule like this during this Congress. I know the majority will claim that is the same number, the same amount of times that the 109th Congress used this procedure, but I would remind our friends on the other side of the aisle that in every other record for limiting debate in the House, they have far exceeded the 109th Congress, and that is so even though on the opening day of the 110th Congress the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, came to the floor and said that the new majority would "begin to return this Chamber to its rightful place as the home of democracy and deliberation in our great Nation."

So, let us take a look at their record-breaking performance, Mr. Speaker. First let us begin with closed rules.

There can be few, if any, parliamentary procedures that are more offensive to the spirit of representative democ-

racy than the closed rule. Those rules, closed rules, block Members from both sides of the aisle from offering amendments to legislation, no matter their party affiliation. When the House of Representatives is operating under a closed rule, all Members are shut out from the legislative process on the floor. Even though the majority promised a more open Congress, they silenced the voice of every Member and of all the constituents of every Member a record 64 times, Mr. Speaker. Sixty-four times.

No other Congress in the history of the Republic has ever brought forth so many closed rules. No other Congress in the history of the Republic has brought forth 64 pieces of legislation during one Congress under the parliamentary procedure known as the closed rule, that shuts out all amendments, all possibility of Members, from both sides of the aisle from introducing amendments.

The consistent use of closed rules by the majority is most unfortunate. It is really, I believe, quite offensive to the democratic spirit, and really obviously a contradiction with regard to the promises made by the majority.

They have also systematically bypassed the conference process, the process by which the House and Senate reconcile differences on legislation before voting on a final version, an identical, final version of legislation before sending it to the President. They have systematically bypassed this conference process, effectively shutting out the minority from having a say on legislation that makes its way to the President's desk.

They also have used a technique known as ping-pong 14 times to subvert the rights of the minority to offer motions to recommit and amendments. Now, in comparison, in the 108th and 109th Congresses combined, that technique, ping-pong, that the majority has used 14 times during this Congress, that technique was used a total of three times in the prior two Congresses.

So, again, the tendency can be seen time and time again, in contradiction, direct contradiction to the promises to go in the other direction, to go in the direction of transparency and fairness and openness. So with ping-pong we also see the tendency of the majority not fail.

□ 1215

They also considered 45 bills outside the regular order. They blocked minority substitute amendments, allowing only 10 minority substitute amendments, again, even though they promised a procedure that, "grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute." Again, the majority contradicted its own promise, directly, directly contradicted its own promise again.

Now, these records that I have alluded to, do not etch them in stone yet. We still have a few days left in the

110th Congress. I would bet that the majority will break their own records yet again and, once again, their promises for a fair and open Congress.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I want to respond to some of the points made by my friend from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, this process of allowing for suspensions on days late in the week, particularly towards the end of the session, is something that we have done quite a bit, generally on a cooperative basis, and there is a self-policing mechanism that applies.

The self-policing mechanism, of course, is the fact that to pass a suspension bill requires two-thirds vote, and the majority party does not have a two-thirds majority, so anything that's going to pass is going to require a substantial positive vote, a "yes" vote, from Members on both sides of the aisle.

It also is kind of a practical thing to do. Our session is getting extended a bit because we are trying to come to some resolution to ease the credit crisis that is afflicting our economy, and that's incredibly serious, requires us to stay as long as it takes to address that issue.

But many of us are not involved in the minute-to-minute negotiations, as our committee chairs are, as our leadership is. We are still on the clock, working for the American taxpayer. So if there is an opportunity to use our time productively by bringing up suspension bills that meet the two-thirds test, advances concerns of importance, if not as grave importance as the issue about Wall Street, why not take the opportunity together to move ahead on things that will be helpful to our country.

Also, just a little bit of history here, the Republicans, of course, were in the majority from 1994 until 2006. In the last session of Congress, the 109th session of Congress, they found themselves in similar circumstances at the end of the session. They had time that could be utilized and did, by bringing up some suspension bills. Then, as now, it did require a two-thirds vote before any suspension bill could pass.

I will just go through a few things. My friend probably knows all this, but I will remind him, anyway, a little education here. He was here. I wasn't.

I am told that on June 30, 2005, H. Res. 345 provided for a blanket suspension day on June 30, and that was pending the July adjournment of that year. The House took up a number of bills under that suspension authority.

Similarly, on July 28, 2005, there was a blanket suspension for suspension day. Again, the House took advantage of that. September 8, 2005, provided another day for a blanket suspension.

There are others. H. Res. 623 provided for suspension day on December 17. That applied to a number of pending House bills, H.R. 4519, H.R. 2520, H.R. 4568, H.R. 3402, H.R. 4579, H.R. 4525; a

Senate bill, S. 1281. There was a conference on Senate 467. It was a joint resolution providing for a fiscal year 2006 continuing resolution.

That was all pretty important business. It all passed with that two-thirds majority. It took advantage of the fact that many people from both sides of the aisle, who were not involved in what was the end of the session, intense negotiations on other legislation, they could use their time productively.

There were a couple of combination rules with suspension day authority. H. Res. 1096 waived the two-thirds requirement on December 7 on any rule, providing for a blanket suspension day. It tabled H. Res. 810, 939, 951 and 1047.

There was another such action on December 8, 2006, H. Res. 1102, and that waived the two-thirds rule on the December 8 proceedings on any rule and that provided for a blanket suspension on that date. There is a strong precedent here for allowing suspension authority to occur at the end of the week, rather than just the beginning of the week. Again, it's grounded in the practicality, using the time that we have, that we didn't expect to have, to advance the legislative calendar.

The gentleman from Florida mentioned the ping-pong procedure that has allowed this House and the Congress to pass critical legislation for working and middle class Americans. The fact is that we have utilized the ping-pong approach because of some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the Senate that have blocked motions to go to conference.

Incidentally, I think I probably agree with my friend that going into conference is the better way for us to try to resolve differences between the two bodies. It takes two to conference, just like it takes two to do that famous south Miami dance, the tango. I know on our side, Republicans and Democrats would prefer to be able to use the tried-and-true method of a conference committee to resolve our differences.

It certainly allows our body to be fully represented on both sides of the aisle, members of the conference would come from the Democrat and Republican Parties. It would allow for more vigorous debate about the differences between the legislation that's passed by the House and passed by the Senate. In fact, I think it's a little sad, and, frankly, dangerous a bit, that we don't have a conferencing process, because it really does allow the focus on the issues and allows for a fuller debate from which, in the ideal circumstances, a better solution emerges.

I think I am in agreement, maybe I can hear from the Member from Florida, but I think I am in agreement with him about the preference for a conference procedure. It's just not something that's unilaterally within the control of this body. That's true, whether there is a Republican majority or a Democratic majority. There certainly has to be a level of cooperation in the other body in order for the

House to be able to participate in a conference.

So what we find ourselves, often-times, is confronted with a situation where the negotiating gets done at leadership level or at the chair of committee level. It leaves a good number of Members out of those final and often very critical negotiations about the final points of legislation that's in contention.

So maybe the Member from Florida and I can work together to try to persuade our friends in the other body to return to the tradition of House-Senate conferences.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my friend for his presentation.

Mr. Speaker, it's important to point out, that we make distinct and analyze a number of the matters that we have brought forth.

With regard to the ability of the House to consider suspension bills, it's evident that that is a process that has much tradition. My objection, and I know that in the last Congress it was done six times, and it's done six times in this Congress, but I think it's unfair, really, in an exceptional way to the membership, for them, for Members not to know even the title of legislation that is being brought forth so that, along with their staffs, they can study bills that are expected to be non-controversial because of the two-thirds requirement, but there is a great difference. We all accept that suspension bills are a part of the process towards the end of the session, but there is a great difference between authorizing suspensions that are identified, legislation bills that are identified, like we did yesterday, and, you know, in a blanket way authorizing the majority to bring forth any bills on suspension without even identifying them, which is what we are doing today.

There is a difference. Yes, it was done six times in the last Congress, and it has been done six times in this Congress.

What I pointed out was that the tendency toward unfairness becomes evident when one analyzes the entire spectrum of activity by the majority, procedurally, six and six on what I consider to be inappropriate formats for presenting suspension bills.

But when we leave that particular aspect of the suspension bills unidentified, and we analyze, for example, the closed rules, there the majority broke the record in a significant way, 64 closed rules. That's extraordinary, that's unprecedented.

I would remind you that the closed rule is most undemocratic. Then my friend referred to the ping-pong process, the process by which conference is avoided. In the last Congress, there was a similar situation of one party in control of both Houses as there is in this Congress. Yet the times in this Congress that conference has been avoided

just went through the ceiling, went through the roof, in comparison to the past. I think it was three versus 14 times. It's extraordinary, the difference. And when we analyze all of this in conjunction with and in the context of the promises made by the majority to improve instead of to worsen significantly. In other words, the promise was, with regard to these questionable procedural processes, or manners of acting, rather, the promise was, we are going to improve, we are going to have transparency, we are going to have openness, we are going to have fairness. That was the promise.

Then when you see that promise and you juxtapose it to the reality of performance, and the reality of performance is much worse, is much more unfair, it really becomes dramatic, the contrast between promise and performance. That's what I was alluding to.

With regard to some points made by my friend, it's almost inevitable for my friend from Vermont not to make appropriate and quite defensible statements, because he is one of the most respected Members of this House, and in the short period of time that he has been here, he has earned that respect on both sides of the aisle.

But I think it's appropriate to analyze, without passion, the points that I brought forth with regard to the great contrast between promise and performance of this majority. It's a dramatic contrast and an unfortunate contrast.

I would ask at this time, my friend, if he has any other speakers.

□ 1230

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, "man is man plus his circumstances." That is one, I think, of the wisest sayings I have ever heard by one of the great philosophers of the 20th century, Jose Ortega y Gasset, who led a fascinating life. He was a professor in various universities in Spain, actually dabbled in politics, was a member of the parliament during the Second Republic in the 1930s in Spain, and then was a long-time exile.

Toward the end of his life, I think he returned to Spain but just for a short period of time because he did not outlive the Franco dictatorship and Ortega y Gasset never wanted to live nor, quite frankly, visit his country under dictatorship.

But that phrase, "man is man plus his circumstances," I think, summarizes so much of life. And so we today, while not engaged, because this is a procedural debate and I would expect my friend on the other side of the aisle to agree that perhaps it is not one of the most popular to watch if a guest were here in the galleries because it is procedural, this debate. And yet process really is key to the functioning of representative democracy, Mr. Speaker.

Why do I say that: because the rights of the minority are just as important

as the right of the majority to rule. You can't have a functioning, a genuine, representative democracy unless, along with the right of the majority to rule, the minority has the right to be heard. And the opposition, the minority, has the right to play a significant role. And so process is what makes that possible. Without process, guaranteeing the rights of the majority to rule and the minority to be heard and to have all of the procedural rights followed by the majority, without that process, there can be no representative democracy. And so even though this debate may seem somewhat technical, process is important.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to some of the comments made by my friend from Florida. But first of all, I thank my friend. He is very generous in his comments about me. The feelings are mutual. I have enjoyed working with you on the Rules Committee, and love hearing you speak and argue, and I know the affection people have for you here in this body. And for you to be here with your brother, what a wonderful family story, to have brothers serving together keeping an eye on each other. And you need to have an eye kept on you.

I missed the name of the philosopher from Spain.

I yield.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Ortega y Gasset. In Spain, you often have compound names or long names. Ortega y Gasset. An extraordinary philosopher, really a liberal in the best sense of the word and an open man, a man open to realize, my distinguished friends, that good ideas often come from not only both but all political viewpoints. And Ortega y Gasset was one such thinker. I highly recommend him to such an erudite, studious not only here Member of the House but generally a man of the law as my friend.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Well, thank you. I am going to take you up on that because you are probably more familiar with that history of Spain during the preceding Franco years and the internal revolution and during the period of the republic.

That phrase you used, man and his circumstances, is very, very powerful.

I yield.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my friend.

"Man is man plus his circumstances."

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. And he had to contend with that, as did all Spaniards during the period of the republic in the revolution with just this wrenching upheaval in their own society where brothers were fighting brothers and the worst of all things were happening, as they were here during our Civil War and countrymen were pitted one against another, and people were forced to deal with circumstances that were just beyond what they ever

could have imagined. And then the struggle in those circumstances for people of conscience to make a decision about what was right to do when the implication of following through and doing that right could be frightening, physically dangerous to themselves, the person who was making the decision to act, but it was equally frightening about a decision not to act and what the consequences would be for other people. So I look forward to reading that.

I am just going to make a suggestion to you. That phrase "man is man plus his circumstances," and I have to write that down.

But Graham Greene is one of my favorite authors. And the reason I like Graham Greene, he writes articles about flawed human beings. The protagonists in his novels are all deeply flawed people, like all of us. They have real limitations. Some of them are alcoholics. They can't control certain parts of their behavior. But what he writes about is individuals who find themselves in circumstances where they have to make decisions that require them to act in ways that ultimately may be physically dangerous to them, but where they have a capacity to respond, to see, what the moral imperative is. And then they are able, despite their flaws and weaknesses, to summon the internal courage to do the right thing. They don't do it to be a hero. They are reluctant heroes. They end up being heroes. And in some cases they sacrifice their lives. It is not that they wanted to do it or anything that they thought about as an image of themselves. In fact, they oftentimes took refuge in their weakness, by alcohol, frequently, in the Graham Greene novels.

But when they were confronted with a situation where they had an opportunity, by circumstance beyond their control, accidental almost, where their action could save a fellow human being or turn the tide of events in a way where more people would be spared suffering, despite their weakness, despite not wanting to do it, despite their resistance, there was something deeply moral embedded in who they were where the decision they made was for others, not for themselves.

Your comments about the Spanish philosopher brought to mind the reactions I have had from reading so many Graham Greene novels.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Repeat the name of the author.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Graham Greene. I just really appreciate your remarks.

And I want to talk about a second topic you mentioned, the importance in a democracy about procedure. The gentleman is right. One of the things that I have admired about our majority leader, Mr. HOYER, is that I believe he does his best, it is always debatable, but I think he does his best to scrupulously abide by the procedural rights.

We have battles about the rule we are bringing forward and whether it is the right thing to do or not, but I agree, procedure is important. Procedure is often substance. How you design it and allow something to be taken up really affects the outcome of what will occur.

One of the constant decisions that we have to make, you had to make when you were in the majority and we have to make while we are in the majority, is how to get a specific question to this body for an up-or-down vote. And it requires the Rules Committee, and you know better than I do, you are much more experienced on the Rules Committee than I am, it requires the Rules Committee to decide what the question will be, to decide what amendments will be allowed. There is always an ongoing tension between the majority and the minority, and that flips as the voters decide to change the majority here.

So your aggression, and that is not the right word, your defense of procedure is well taken by me.

Before I came here I served for a period of time in the State Senate in Vermont. It is a much different situation. We had 30 members, very small, very intimate. No staff. Literally no staff. The one member of the Senate who had one staff person was the President pro tempore, and I served in that job for the 4 years before I came here. But nobody else had a staff. I have gotten to like staff, don't get me wrong, but there was something quite wonderful about the fact that the members had to do all of their own work. What it meant is that we were talking to one another constantly. And the problems that were being developed couldn't be mitigated or muted by having staff talk to staff for another member.

That very intense, immediate interaction I actually thought was very helpful. I know there are a number of Members on both sides of the aisle who talk, and we have this opportunity when we are on the floor voting to try to hear where each of us are coming from and what ways we may be able to find a path to getting "yes."

But as Senate President, I had a lot of responsibility about procedures. So I did two things that were kind of unusual, and we can't do them around here, but in the small circumstances of the Vermont Senate we could. We had 21-9 majority, and I had the cooperative power of appointment. And I appointed three members of the Republican Party to serve as chairs of important committees.

The reason that I did that, two reasons, it just so happened that the three people who got appointed were the best people for the job. They were terrific. The second reason was it allowed us to find ways to work together because we all had a stake in the future.

So any time that we can work together, I want to do it. I appreciate your openness and willingness to do that as well.

But getting back to the question before us, mainly this question of the

suspension authority and your concern about it being “blanket,” I understand that. But the self-correcting mechanism here is the requirement under suspension that there be a two-thirds vote. That by definition means that there has to be a good deal of support on the Republican side as well as on the Democratic side for this suspension authority to allow consideration and for a bill considered to be passed.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my distinguished colleague for his remarks, and for this opportunity of being able to bring forward the points that we both brought forward today.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at this point that Americans are really upset with regard to spending more and more of their paycheck for energy needs. For months they have been calling on Congress to consider legislation to help lower the price of gasoline.

Just like the American people, the minority has been calling for legislation that will help the American consumer with the skyrocketing price of energy. Yet every time the minority has tried to debate comprehensive energy legislation, the majority has blocked and stymied our efforts.

□ 1245

In August, the majority decided to close shop, head back to their districts, instead of really seeking to solve, in a comprehensive manner, this extraordinary issue facing our constituents, which is the rising price of gasoline.

So I would imagine the majority heard quite a bit from their constituents in August, because when they returned in September they decided that they would finally, at least, debate energy legislation.

Last week the majority brought to the floor their so-called Comprehensive American Energy Security and Consumer Protection Act, which really, ironically, did nothing to produce energy or provide Americans with energy security since really it only, that legislation, increased our dependence on unstable foreign sources of energy. So that bill is most unfortunate. Also, it won't be enacted into law, and it was only put together to provide the majority with a kind of political cover to say that they actually passed energy legislation, when, in reality, they did nothing.

Now, the majority is set to end this Congress and, really, any chance to actually pass a comprehensive energy bill, comprehensive energy legislation will also end with this Congress for now. Our point is that this is not appropriate. We think that the energy issue is of extraordinary importance, and that we should not leave without comprehensive energy legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I will be urging my colleagues to vote “no” to vote with me to defeat the previous question so that the House can finally consider comprehensive solutions to rising energy

costs. If the previous question is defeated, I will move to amend this rule to prohibit the consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment until comprehensive energy legislation has been enacted into law.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. By voting “no” on the previous question, Members can assure their constituents that they are committed to enacting legislation to help their constituents with rising energy prices.

I also remind Members that the previous question in no way would prevent consideration of any of the suspension bills.

I urge a “no” vote on the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I am about to yield back, but I just want to thank the gentleman. I enjoyed this conversation. What a privilege it was to spend a little time with you talking about philosophy and literature, as well as the business of the House.

I am the last speaker on this side. Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1500 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 2. It shall not be in order in the House to consider a concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of either House of Congress until comprehensive energy legislation has been enacted into law that includes provisions designed to—

(A) allow states to expand the exploration and extraction of natural resources along the Outer Continental Shelf;

(B) open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and oil shale reserves to environmentally prudent exploration and extraction;

(C) extend expiring renewable energy incentives;

(D) encourage the streamlined approval of new refining capacity and nuclear power facilities;

(E) encourage advanced research and development of clean coal, coal-to-liquid, and carbon sequestration technologies; and

(F) minimize drawn out legal challenges that unreasonably delay or prevent actual domestic energy production.

(The information contained herein was provided by the 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 or-

dering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered, and the motion to suspend with regard to S. 2932, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 192, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 651]

YEAS—225

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

NAYS—192

Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (UT)
Akin	Barton (TX)	Blackburn
Alexander	Biggart	Blunt
Bachmann	Bilbray	Boehner
Barrett (SC)	Bilirakis	Bonner

Bono Mack	Granger	Paul
Boozman	Graves	Pearce
Boustany	Hall (TX)	Pence
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Broun (GA)	Hayes	Pitts
Brown (SC)	Heller	Platts
Brown-Waite,	Hensarling	Poe
Ginny	Herger	Porter
Buchanan	Hobson	Price (GA)
Burgess	Hoekstra	Przyce (OH)
Burton (IN)	Hulshof	Putnam
Buyer	Hunter	Radanovich
Calvert	Inglis (SC)	Ramstad
Camp (MI)	Issa	Regula
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Rehberg
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Renzi
Cantor	Jordan	Reynolds
Capito	Keller	Rogers (AL)
Carter	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Castle	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Cazayoux	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Kirk	Roskam
Childers	Kline (MN)	Royce
Coble	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Cole (OK)	Kuhl (NY)	Sali
Conaway	LaHood	Saxton
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Scalise
Culberson	Lampson	Schmidt
Davis (KY)	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Davis, David	LaTourette	Sessions
Davis, Tom	Latta	Shadegg
Deal (GA)	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Dent	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Diaz-Balart, L.	Linder	Simpson
Diaz-Balart, M.	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Doolittle	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Drake	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Dreier	E.	Souder
Duncan	Mack	Stearns
Ehlers	Manzullo	Sullivan
Emerson	Marchant	Tancred
Everett	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Fallin	McCaul (TX)	Thornberry
Feeney	McCotter	Tiahrt
Ferguson	McCrery	Tiberi
Flake	McHenry	Turner
Forbes	McHugh	Upton
Fortenberry	McKeon	Walberg
Fossella	McMorris	Walden (OR)
Fox	Rodgers	Walsh (NY)
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Wamp
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Gallely	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Garrett (NJ)	Miller, Gary	Whitfield (KY)
Gerlach	Moran (KS)	Wilson (NM)
Gilchrest	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (SC)
Gingrey	Musgrave	Wittman (VA)
Gohmert	Myrick	Wolf
Goode	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Nunes	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Bachus	Payne	Waters
Conyers	Peterson (PA)	Watson
Costa	Pickering	Weller
Cubin	Rangel	Wexler
English (PA)	Tierney	
Lofgren, Zoe	Udall (CO)	

□ 1313

Messrs. REHBERG, HALL of Texas, PRICE of Georgia, and CHILDERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). 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. 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 222, nays 196, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 652]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—196

Aderholt	Brown (GA)	Coble
Akin	Brown (SC)	Cole (OK)
Alexander	Brown-Waite,	Conaway
Bachmann	Ginny	Crenshaw
Barrett (SC)	Buchanan	Culberson
Bartlett (MD)	Burgess	Davis (KY)
Barton (TX)	Burton (IN)	Davis, David
Biggart	Buyer	Davis, Tom
Bilbray	Calvert	Deal (GA)
Bilirakis	Camp (MI)	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Campbell (CA)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Blackburn	Cannon	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blunt	Cantor	Doolittle
Boehner	Capito	Drake
Bonner	Carter	Dreier
Bono Mack	Castle	Duncan
Boozman	Cazayoux	Ehlers
Boustany	Chabot	Emerson
Brady (TX)	Childers	Everett

Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrist
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette

NOT VOTING—15

Bachus
Conyers
Costa
Cubin
English (PA)

Frank (MA)
Lowey
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Pickering

Tierney
Udall (CO)
Waters
Weller
Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1325

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.

POISON CENTER SUPPORT, ENHANCEMENT, AND AWARENESS ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 2932.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2932. The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 6, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 653]

AYES—403

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Caputo
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)

Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrist
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee

Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

NOES—6

Campbell (CA)
Duncan

NOT VOTING—24

Bachus
Berman
Blunt
Broun (GA)
Capps
Conyers
Costa
Cubin

DeFazio
English (PA)
Hooley
Kind
Miller, George
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Pickering

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1332

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 653, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, on September 26, 2008, I missed rollcall votes 651, 652, and 653 while attending a meeting to discuss the Nation's financial crisis. Had I been present I would have voted “nay” on rollcall 651, “nay” on rollcall 652, and “aye” on rollcall 653.

Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark