

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. 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. SESSIONS. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3195, ADA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1299 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1299

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3195) to restore the intent and protections of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 3195 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). 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 be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1299.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1299 provides for consideration of H.R. 3195, the ADA Amendments Act of 2008. The rule makes in order as base text the bill as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor that was identical to the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill provides for 1 hour of debate, with 40 minutes controlled by the Committee on Education and Labor and 20 minutes by the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. Lastly, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 1299 and

the underlying bill, H.R. 3195, the ADA Amendments Act. It was nearly 18 years ago that the Americans with Disabilities Act was signed into law. It sent a resounding message that discrimination against individuals with disabilities would not be tolerated, not in employment, not in transportation, not in housing, not in services, or in any other area of our daily lives. It was a law intended to tear down the barriers, preventing individuals with disabilities from reaching their full potential. It was a commitment from Congress that discrimination in any form would not be tolerated.

The Americans with Disabilities Act was an historic civil rights law, the most sweeping since the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Yet, despite the broad application of other civil rights statutes, a series of court decisions has dramatically narrowed the scope of the ADA. Unfortunately, this has denied millions of disabled Americans the protections Congress had originally intended for them.

Mr. Speaker, the intent of Congress was to allow individuals with disabilities to fully participate in society, free from the fear of discrimination. Yet Supreme Court interpretations have shifted the focus from whether an individual has experienced discrimination to whether an individual could even be considered "disabled enough" to qualify for the protections of the law.

In making this determination, the Court has implemented a standard that excludes many individuals originally intended to be covered by the ADA. They have held that the definition of "disability" must be applied "strictly to create a demanding standard for qualifying as disabled." In addition, the Court has found that mitigating measures that help address an impairment, such as medication, hearing aids or other treatments, must be considered in determining whether an impairment is disabling enough to qualify under the ADA.

□ 1200

And so millions of Americans with disabilities have found themselves in a Catch-22. They face employment discrimination because of their disabilities, yet they may be denied relief under the ADA because they are considered "too functional" to qualify for its protections. Mr. Speaker, this is completely at odds with the original intent of Congress and the original focus of the ADA.

Due to these narrow interpretations, individuals with serious conditions such as epilepsy, diabetes, cancer, cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, and developmental disabilities have found themselves excluded from the protections afforded by the ADA.

Basic equality under the law has been denied to millions of disabled Americans for too long. But today, after months of hard work on all sides of this issue, we seek to fulfill the

promise we made to Americans with disabilities nearly two decades ago.

And let me be clear. The ADA Amendments Act does not expand the original scope of the ADA. Rather, it restores the promise that Congress made to every single American, a promise that everyone will have an equal opportunity to succeed; that we will tear down the barriers that prevent individuals from reaching their full potential; and that we will be judged on our abilities rather than on our disabilities.

The ADA Amendments Act clarifies that the ADA's protections are intended to be broad. It also restores the focus to wrongful discrimination. Our bill clarifies that anyone who is discriminated against because of an impairment, whether or not this impairment limits the performance of any major life activities, is entitled to the ADA protection.

And, finally, it states that mitigating measures will not disqualify people with disabilities from the protections afforded by the ADA.

I am proud to join with over half of the Members of this body as a cosponsor of this important bill. Today we are demonstrating our commitment to every American that discrimination will not be tolerated. This should be the case whether based on race, national origin, gender, age, religion, sexual orientation or disability. By upholding this most important of principles, our country will be richer for it.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman, my friend from Ohio, for yielding me the time to discuss this proposed rule for consideration of the Americans with Disabilities Restoration Act of 2007. And a hearty congratulations to the new Democrat majority for their openness as we celebrate the 58th closed rule, a new record for the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying legislation, which would amend and improve the Americans with Disabilities Act, or ADA as it is called, that was enacted into law in 1990 by President George Herbert Walker Bush with the strong bipartisan support of Congress.

The ADA—which was passed to, and I quote, provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities—protects individuals from discrimination in hiring, firing, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment on the basis of a person's disability.

Often referred to as the world's first comprehensive disability anti-discrimination law, the ADA specifies what employers, government agencies, and the managers of public facilities must do to ensure that persons with disabilities have the opportunity to fully participate in our society.

The ADA consists of three major titles protecting Americans with disabilities:

Title I prohibits discrimination in public or private employment;

Title II prohibits discrimination at public entities, like public universities or hospitals;

And title III prohibits discrimination at places of public accommodations like hotels and restaurants.

Mr. Speaker, this law has made a world of difference for millions of Americans with disabilities. But, for all of the great results that have come from this law, I believe it can still be improved. For far too long, our Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, have wrestled with some of the contents of Congress' intent in defining the ADA key concepts.

For example, the ADA requires employers to make reasonable accommodations to facilitate employees with disabilities but not if this causes undue hardship, leaving the courts to decide what is reasonable and what is undue. Most of all, Federal courts have spent years being puzzled over exactly who is considered disabled under the law. But, today, we have the opportunity to pass this legislation and to clarify Congress' intent, finally settling these outstanding questions of law once and for all, or so we hope.

I want to be clear that these shortcomings do not in any way minimize the great things that this legislation has achieved for disabled people in America. Today, many public accommodations like hotels, restaurants, and recreation facilities have opted for voluntary compliance. We have cut curbs, the areas where sidewalks slope down, to be at a level of the street to allow easy passage for wheelchairs and for other mechanisms that aid the disabled, which were virtually unheard of before ADA was passed and that now are in compliance in most major cities.

Unfortunately, since 1999, several U.S. Supreme Court decisions have narrowly provided the definition of disabilities so much so that persons with serious conditions, such as epilepsy, muscular dystrophy, cancer, diabetes, and cerebral palsy have been determined to not have impairments that meet the definition of "disability" under the ADA.

H.R. 3195 builds upon the ADA's original intent by clarifying what disabilities qualify an individual for coverage, and they address a number of the statute's further limitations that have been raised by disability advocates.

Because of this ambiguity, today, I join with more than 250 of my colleagues in supporting this legislation, which passed out of the Judiciary Committee by unanimous consent and out of the Education and Labor Committee by a vote of 43-1. Like my colleagues, I support expanding the definition of "disabled," which was the main goal of this legislation, as well supporting to ensure that people with disabilities do

not lose their coverage under the ADA because their condition is manageable and treatable with medication.

These policies have been endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Society for Human Resource Management, the Human Resources Policy Association, and many other pro-business organizations.

From the disability community, this legislation was also supported by the National Epilepsy Foundation, the American Diabetes Association, the American Association of People with Disabilities, and other leading advocacy groups.

Mr. Speaker, the ADA has transformed the American society since its enactment, helping millions of Americans with disabilities to succeed in the workplace and making transportation, housing, buildings, services, and other elements of daily life more accessible to individuals with disabilities.

I applaud my colleagues for bringing this legislation, an important action, to the floor today, and I look forward to its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am the last speaker on this side, so I will reserve my time until the gentleman has closed for his side and yielded back his time.

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

Since taking control of Congress in 2007, this Democrat Congress has totally neglected its responsibilities to do anything constructive to address the domestic supply issues that have created skyrocketing gas, diesel, and energy costs that American families are facing today, including costs that are unacceptable for many disabled Americans who are struggling to be able to get to work or to live their life.

So, today, I urge my colleagues to vote with me to defeat the previous question so this House can finally consider real solutions to the energy crisis. If the previous question is defeated, I will move to amend the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 5656, yet another time this Republican party is on the floor to say we support consumers and that we support American independence and security. This bill, H.R. 5656, would repeal the ban on acquiring advanced alternative fuels, and this bill was introduced by my dear friend JEB HENSARLING of Texas way back in March, 3 months ago.

This legislation would reduce the price of gasoline by allowing the Federal Government to procure advanced alternative fuels derived from diverse sources like oil shale, tar sands, and coal-to-liquid technology, common-sense marketplace answers to make sure that the American consumer and America is competitive with the world, rather than sending billions of dollars overseas, funding American enemies and providing the world with jobs and opportunities outside of what the consumer intended in this country.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, which this Democrat Congress passed, places artificial and unnecessary restraints on the Department of Defense. Perhaps it is no surprise that this Democrat Congress places artificial and unnecessary restraints on the Department of Defense in getting its own fuel from friendly sources, like the coal-to-liquid, oil shale, and tar sands resources that are abundant in the United States and in Canada, our friend to the north. Needlessly raising grave national and economic security concerns is what this Democrat Congress has done to our military.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is currently the largest U.S. oil supplier. It sent 1.8 million barrels every day of crude oil and 500,000 barrels per day of refined products to the United States in 2006. That is according to the Canadian government. About half of the Canadian crude is derived from oil sands, with the sands production forecast to reach almost 3 million barrels per day in 2015.

Section 526 is choking this flow of fuel from one of our Nation's most reliable allies and economic partners, and is increasing the military's reliance on fuels from unfriendly and unstable countries. On top of that, it is causing the American consumer to pay more at the pump. We saw a 10-cent rise in the price of each gallon of gasoline just in the last week.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for action. Now is not the time to be suing OPEC and to be saying "no" to a balanced energy proposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. I urge my colleagues to vote for our military and for our economy, including many disabled people who are having a tough time paying for the high energy costs as a result of this Democrat Congress' insensitive position to not allow Americans to have their own energy independence. It is time that we produce more from America and from friendly places, like reliable sources like Canada.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Texas is trying to shift the discussion away from this fantastic, fantastic bill, the Americans With Disabilities Act Amendments, onto an issue of energy. But the American people know that for the past 7 years this country under this administration has been following an energy policy from the White House written by the Vice President with the oil executives.

Truth be told, there are 68 million acres of leased land available for drilling. And we believe that, of course, that drilling should be taking place on

that 68 million acres of leased land, but we also believe that we should be looking diligently for alternative forms of energy.

The reality of it is that this is a defective tactic. This House has passed under this new Congress landmark energy legislation that will provide relief in years to come.

□ 1215

We have also passed measure after measure after measure that would provide relief to American consumers but only to have them blocked by those on the other side of the aisle and by the administration.

But, today, we don't rise to dwell on that. We rise to support and to celebrate this bill. The Americans with Disabilities Act was passed in 1999 with such a broad coalition of support that it was regarded as a mandate, Mr. Speaker, and we have made progress in a number of areas to ensure individuals with disabilities are fully able to participate in society. But, in many ways, the ADA is a promise that remains unfulfilled.

Today, through the ADA Amendments Act, we are unequivocally demonstrating our commitment to the principle of equal opportunity for all Americans. We will be removing the hurdles individuals with disabilities have faced when trying to enjoy the freedoms that are the right of every American.

The ADA Amendments Act has the full support of one of the most diverse coalitions of groups I have ever seen, from the disability community, the civil rights community, groups representing pro-business interests, and from Members on both sides of the aisle from this, the people's House.

It represents a balance between the interests of employers and individuals with disabilities, and it demonstrates our resolve to ensure that all Americans can work to reach their full potential.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1299 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sec. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5656) to repeal a requirement with respect to the procurement and acquisition of alternative fuels. 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 and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on House Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute if offered by Representative Waxman, which shall be considered as read and shall

be separately debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(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 germane amendment to the pending business."

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

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

Ms. 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. SESSIONS. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1298; adopting House Resolution 1298, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1297; adopting House Resolution 1297, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1299; and adopting House Resolution 1299, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2176, BAY MILLS INDIAN COMMUNITY LAND CLAIMS SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1298, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 194, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

YEAS—226

Abercrombie	Boyd (FL)	Cooper
Ackerman	Boyda (KS)	Costa
Allen	Brady (PA)	Costello
Altmire	Braley (IA)	Courtney
Andrews	Brown, Corrine	Cramer
Arcuri	Butterfield	Crowley
Baird	Capps	Cuellar
Baldwin	Capuano	Cummings
Barrow	Cardoza	Davis (AL)
Bean	Carnahan	Davis (CA)
Becerra	Carney	Davis (IL)
Berkley	Carson	Davis, Lincoln
Berman	Castor	DeFazio
Berry	Cazayoux	DeGette
Bilbray	Chandler	Delahunt
Bishop (GA)	Clarke	DeLauro
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Dicks
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Dingell
Boren	Clyburn	Doggett
Boswell	Cohen	Doyle
Boucher	Conyers	Edwards (MD)

Edwards (TX)	Lee	Roybal-Allard
Ellison	Levin	Ruppersberger
Ellsworth	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Emanuel	Lipinski	Salazar
Engel	Loeb	Sánchez, Linda
Eshoo	Loftgren, Zoe	T.
Etheridge	Lowe	Sanchez, Loretta
Farr	Lynch	Sarbanes
Fattah	Maloney (NY)	Schakowsky
Filner	Markey	Schiff
Foster	Marshall	Schwartz
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Scott (GA)
Giffords	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Gordon	McCollum (MN)	Sestak
Graves	McDermott	Shea-Porter
Green, Al	McGovern	Sherman
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Shuler
Grijalva	McNerney	Sires
Gutierrez	McNulty	Skelton
Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Hare	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)
Harman	Melancon	Solis
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Space
Herseth Sandlin	Miller (NC)	Spratt
Higgins	Miller, George	Stark
Hinchee	Mitchell	Stupak
Hinojosa	Mollohan	Sutton
Hirono	Moore (KS)	Tanner
Hodes	Moore (WI)	Tauscher
Holden	Moran (VA)	Taylor
Holt	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (CA)
Honda	Murphy, Patrick	Thompson (MS)
Hooley	Murtha	Tierney
Hoyer	Nadler	Towns
Inslee	Napolitano	Tsongas
Israel	Neal (MA)	Udall (CO)
Jackson (IL)	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
Jackson-Lee	Obey	Van Hollen
(TX)	Oliver	Velázquez
Jefferson	Ortiz	Visclosky
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Walz (MN)
Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell	Wasserman
Jones (OH)	Pastor	Schultz
Kagen	Payne	Waters
Kanjorski	Perlmutter	Watt
Kaptur	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Kennedy	Pomeroy	Weiner
Kildee	Price (NC)	Welch (VT)
Kilpatrick	Rahall	Wilson (OH)
Kind	Rangel	Woolsey
Klein (FL)	Reyes	Wu
Kucinich	Richardson	Yarmuth
Langevin	Rodriguez	Young (AK)
Larsen (WA)	Ross	
Larson (CT)	Rothman	

NAYS—194

Aderholt	Davis (KY)	Hill
Akin	Davis, David	Hobson
Alexander	Davis, Tom	Hoekstra
Bachmann	Deal (GA)	Hulshof
Bachus	Dent	Hunter
Barrett (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Inglis (SC)
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Issa
Barton (TX)	Donnelly	Johnson (IL)
Biggert	Doolittle	Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis	Drake	Jones (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Jordan
Blackburn	Duncan	Keller
Blunt	Ehlers	King (IA)
Boehner	Emerson	King (NY)
Bonner	English (PA)	Kingston
Bono Mack	Everett	Kirk
Boozman	Fallin	Kline (MN)
Boustany	Feeney	Knollenberg
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	LaHood
Broun (GA)	Flake	Lamborn
Brown (SC)	Forbes	Latham
Brown-Waite,	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Ginny	Fossella	Latta
Buchanan	Fox	Lewis (CA)
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (KY)
Burton (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Buyer	Gallagher	LoBiondo
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Lucas
Camp (MI)	Gerlach	Lungren, Daniel
Campbell (CA)	Gilchrest	E.
Cantor	Gingrey	Mack
Capito	Gohmert	Manzullo
Carter	Goode	Marchant
Castle	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Chabot	Granger	McCaul (TX)
Childers	Hall (TX)	McCotter
Coble	Hastings (WA)	McCrery
Cole (OK)	Hayes	McHenry
Conaway	Heller	McHugh
Crenshaw	Hensarling	McKeon
Culberson	Herger	

McMorris	Regula	Smith (NJ)
Rodgers	Rehberg	Smith (TX)
Mica	Reichert	Souder
Miller (FL)	Renzi	Stearns
Miller (MI)	Reynolds	Sullivan
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Tancred
Moran (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Murphy, Tim	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Musgrave	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi
Neugebauer	Roskam	Turner
Nunes	Royce	Upton
Paul	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
Pearce	Sali	Walden (OR)
Pence	Saxton	Walsh (NY)
Peterson (PA)	Scalise	Wamp
Petri	Schmidt	Weldon (FL)
Pickering	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Pitts	Sessions	Westmoreland
Platts	Shadegg	Whitfield (KY)
Poe	Shays	Wilson (NM)
Porter	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Price (GA)	Shuster	Wittman (VA)
Radanovich	Simpson	Wolf
Ramstad	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Baca	Lampson	Snyder
Cannon	Mahoney (FL)	Speier
Cubin	Pryce (OH)	Watson
Gillibrand	Putnam	Wexler
Kuhl (NY)	Rush	

□ 1243

Messrs. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, REICHERT, DONNELLY, and ENGLISH of Pennsylvania changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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 207, nays 204, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—207

Abercrombie	Chandler	Etheridge
Ackerman	Clarke	Farr
Allen	Clay	Fattah
Altmire	Cleaver	Filner
Andrews	Clyburn	Foster
Arcuri	Cohen	Frank (MA)
Baird	Cole (OK)	Giffords
Baldwin	Conyers	Gonzalez
Barrow	Cooper	Gordon
Bean	Costa	Green, Al
Becerra	Costello	Green, Gene
Berkley	Cramer	Grijalva
Berman	Crowley	Gutierrez
Berry	Cuellar	Hall (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Hare
Bishop (NY)	Davis (AL)	Harman
Boren	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Boswell	Davis (IL)	Herseth Sandlin
Boucher	Davis, Lincoln	Higgins
Boyd (FL)	DeFazio	Hill
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Hinchee
Braley (IA)	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Brown, Corrine	DeLauro	Hirono
Brown-Waite,	Dicks	Hodes
Ginny	Dingell	Holden
Butterfield	Doggett	Holt
Capps	Donnelly	Hooley
Capuano	Doyle	Hoyer
Cardoza	Edwards (MD)	Inslee
Carnahan	Edwards (TX)	Israel
Carney	Ellsworth	Jackson (IL)
Carson	Emanuel	Jackson-Lee
Castor	Engel	(TX)
Cazayoux		Jefferson