

Johnson, E. B.	Miller (MI)	Scott (GA)
Jones (NC)	Miller, Gary	Scott (VA)
Jordan	Miller, George	Sensenbrenner
Kagen	Mitchell	Serrano
Kanjorski	Mollohan	Sessions
Kaptur	Moore (KS)	Sestak
Keller	Moore (WI)	Shadegg
Kennedy	Moran (KS)	Shays
Kildee	Murphy (CT)	Shea-Porter
Kilpatrick	Murphy, Patrick	Sherman
Kind	Murphy, Tim	Shuler
King (NY)	Murtha	Shuster
Kingston	Musgrave	Sires
Kirk	Myrick	Slaughter
Kline (MN)	Nadler	Smith (NE)
Kucinich	Napolitano	Smith (NJ)
Kuhl (NY)	Neal (MA)	Smith (TX)
LaHood	Neugebauer	Smith (WA)
Lamborn	Nunes	Snyder
Lampson	Oberstar	Solis
Langevin	Pallone	Space
Larsen (WA)	Pascarella	Spratt
Larson (CT)	Pastor	Stark
Latham	Paul	Stearns
LaTourette	Payne	Stupak
Latta	Pearce	Sullivan
Lee	Pence	Sutton
Levin	Perlmutter	Tancred
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (PA)	Tauscher
Linder	Petri	Terry
Lipinski	Pitts	Thompson (CA)
LoBiondo	Platts	Thompson (MS)
Loebach	Poe	Thornberry
Lofgren, Zoe	Pomeroy	Tiberi
Lucas	Porter	Tsongas
Lungren, Daniel	Price (GA)	Turner
E.	Price (NC)	Udall (CO)
Lynch	Putnam	Udall (NM)
Mack	Rahall	Upton
Mahoney (FL)	Ramstad	Van Hollen
Maloney (NY)	Regula	Velázquez
Manzullo	Rehberg	Visclosky
Markey	Reichert	Walberg
Marshall	Reynolds	Walden (OR)
Matheson	Richardson	Walsh (MN)
Matsui	Rodriguez	Wamp
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Wasserman
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Schultz
McCauley (TX)	Rohrabacher	Waters
McCollum (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen	Watson
McCotter	Roskam	Watt
McDermott	Ross	Welch (VT)
McGovern	Rothman	Weller
McHenry	Roybal-Allard	Westmoreland
McHugh	Royce	Wexler
McIntyre	Rush	Whitfield (KY)
McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (NM)
McMorris	Salazar	Wilson (OH)
Rodgers	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (SC)
McNerney	T.	Wittman (VA)
McNulty	Sanchez, Loretta	Wolf
Meek (FL)	Sarbanes	Woolsey
Meeks (NY)	Saxton	Wu
Melancon	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Mica	Schiff	Young (FL)
Michaud	Schmidt	
Miller (FL)	Schwartz	

NOT VOTING—57

Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Rangel
Bachus	Hinojosa	Renzi
Berman	Honda	Reyes
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Cannon	Jones (OH)	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	Klein (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Costa	Knollenberg	Sali
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Skelton
Davis, Tom	Marchant	Souder
DeLauro	McCrery	Taylor
Doyle	Miller (NC)	Tierney
Edwards	Moran (VA)	Towns
Engel	Obey	Walsh (NY)
Farr	Olver	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Ortiz	Weiner
Gilchrest	Pickering	Weldon (FL)
Gohmert	Pryce (OH)	Wynn
	Radanovich	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1123

Mrs. BIGGERT and Messrs. RUSH and VAN HOLLEN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5349, PROTECT AMERICA ACT OF 2007 EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the intent of the original 1978 FISA law was to enhance Americans' security while at the same time protecting Americans' privacy. Recognizing that no responsibility of the Federal Government is more important than providing for the defense and security of the American people, Congress should be doing all it can to ensure that FISA continues to reflect the intent of the original law.

In the nearly 30 years since FISA became law, we have seen tremendous advances in communications technology, such as the Internet, cell phones, and e-mail. However, under the original FISA law, our intelligence officials are not free to monitor foreign terrorists, Mr. Speaker, in foreign countries, without a court order, because of advances, as I mentioned, in communications technology.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat again: Because of advances in technology, our intelligence officials are not free to monitor foreign terrorists in foreign countries. It is clear that the law is outdated and must be modernized to reflect changes in communications technology over the past three decades.

In August, Congress, in a bipartisan manner, took an important step to close our Nation's intelligence gap. The Protect America Act passed only after repeated attempts by Republicans to give our Nation's intelligence professionals the tools and authority they need to protect our homeland. This action was long overdue, and this law marked a significant step forward in improving our national security. But, unfortunately, Democrats forced these needed technology tools to expire in 6 months.

In November, the House Democrat leaders brought legislation to the floor that does not go far enough to reform outdated FISA laws. It weakens Americans' privacy protection and fails to permanently close our Nation's intelligence gap. A bipartisan, permanent solution is needed that shows all Amer-

icans and our enemies that the United States is truly committed to closing our Nation's intelligence gap.

Yesterday, the Senate acted in a bipartisan manner by a vote of 68–29 to permanently close the terrorist loophole and ensure that intelligence officials are able to monitor communications of suspected terrorists overseas such as Osama bin Laden and other al Qaeda leaders. This commonsense solution would help keep our country safe from attack and should be acted on immediately and sent to the President to be signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrat leaders need to stop dragging their feet. They need to end their delaying tactics, indeed, to let the House vote on the Senate-approved measure. Today, I am going to give Members of the House an opportunity to support the bipartisan measure that the Senate passed just yesterday. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to allow the House an opportunity to concur with the Senate amendments. By approving the Senate amendments, the bill can become law before the current extension expires in just a few days.

We don't need to close the terrorist loophole just temporarily, Mr. Speaker. We need to close it permanently and update our Nation's surveillance laws in order to protect our Nation from another terrorist attack.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can permanently close the loophole.

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

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

I thank my colleague from Washington for his insightful history on the FISA bill. I would submit that I agree with him that the FISA bill is necessary for the security of America. No one questions that. No one on our side of the aisle questions that. The question that we do have is does the Senate bill actually take away some of the liberty that is so necessary to the American people.

All we are asking for is an extension of 21 days. When you think about it in the grand scheme of things, 21 days to make a determination whether or not this bill continues to give the American people the liberty that they have had for over 200 years, that is not a lot to ask for. I would much rather have 21 days, keep the bill in effect but extend it for 21 days, knowing full well that the end product is something that not only ensures our security but guarantees our liberty.

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

□ 1130

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I think they are absolutely right, we need to take a look at this in the bigger context. We have to set the stage for how we got to this point.

It's September 12, 2001. The President is meeting with his advisers. They're trying to identify exactly what this threat is from al Qaeda, how serious is this threat, what other activities or attacks might they be planning against the United States. And the President says: I need my intelligence and military folks to get the answers to these kinds of questions. Tell me what the threat is and tell me what the tools are that I need to implement to keep America safe.

They come back with a series of recommendations, saying here's what we know, here's what we don't know about the threat. They come back and say, here are the different options that are available to us to get the information that might be able to answer some of these questions.

The President and his leadership team consider the various options. They say, you know, we need to bring Congress into this to take a look at exactly what tools we're going to implement and make sure that we do this in a bipartisan basis and we do it in a basis that is consistent with American values and American law.

On October 25, the President and Vice President convene a meeting. The President's national security team comes up and they say, here's the tool that perhaps can be used. The chairman of the House Intelligence Committee is there. The Chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee is there. The ranking minority member of HPSCI is at the meeting. She's accompanied by the vice chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee. That's right. Back in October of 2001, the Speaker of the House was briefed on the various tools that could be used to keep America safe.

November 14, 2½ weeks later, the chairman of HPSCI, the ranking member, yeah, that's right, the current Speaker of the House, was briefed on the tools that were available and could be used, the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, the vice chairman.

March of 2002, the chairman of HPSCI, the ranking minority member of HPSCI, that's right, the current Speaker of the House, was in the meeting.

June of 2002, the chairman of HPSCI, the ranking minority member of HPSCI, that's right, again, the current Speaker of the House is brought in, is briefed on this program, and said this is the tool that we want to use, this is the tool that we need to use to keep America safe.

Four times in about 9 months, the current Speaker of the House was briefed on this program, about what the tool was, the kind of information that we were expecting to get and, after a period of time, the information that we were collecting that would keep America safe.

I was not in those meetings. I was not one of the select group of people that was informed. You would think that they would say, what are the civil liberty implications of this? You know, how are we using these tools? Where does it fit within the legal framework of America to keep us safe? And who's going to be working on this program? Who do we need to partner with? And there might have been certain companies or individuals that were identified as saying, these folks are going to partner with us and have partnered with us because they can help provide us with the information that will keep us safe and do it in a legal way.

Since that time, and since this program became public, there has been all kinds of accusations out there. But the bottom line is, there may have been people, there may have been companies and corporations that, when the President and Congress went to them and said, we need your help to keep America safe, they may have stepped up to the plate and provided us with the assistance that we knew that on a bipartisan basis the executive branch and Congress said, we need to do this, and we need to do it in a way that protects civil liberties, and we need to do it in a way that is legal and consistent with the law.

And the bottom line is, this is dealt with in the Senate bill. They recognized the help. They don't throw these people under the bus after we asked them to help.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's passion on this issue. Certainly it is the type of issue that elicits real passion from people. But I think we as a body need to be sure that the steps that we take are deliberative and thoughtful. Certainly reacting to an issue such as this in a passionate way may deprive us of taking the necessary steps that we need to ensure that the liberty of our citizens is kept intact.

Again, I would just point out that this bill is asking for an additional 21 days within which Congress can continue to review the documents that we have asked for that we have only recently received to make a determination, again, a deliberative determination based upon facts and reasons and not on passion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), also a member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important laws that is preventing another terrorist attack in this country will expire on Friday. It expires on Friday.

My colleague from New York says, well, we just need to take enough time and be deliberative and so on. My colleague from New York didn't vote for the temporary fix that we passed in August. In fact, in an exchange with him that I remember so well, he ques-

tioned whether we should extend the constitutional protections of the fourth amendment to people who are foreigners in a foreign country talking to each other.

The temporary fix that we made in August needs to be made permanent, and we need to move forward with a permanent law that allows our intelligence agencies to listen to foreigners in foreign countries without a warrant while protecting the civil liberties of Americans. That's what we passed in August. That's what the Rockefeller-Bond bill does from the Senate, and they passed it last night. We passed a 6-month bill in August. We had 6 months to review this. And then when that deadline passed on the 1st of February, they said, well, just give us another 15 days. We gave them another 15 days and they said, well, we really haven't had the time to look at this paper.

You've had almost 7 months. The time is now to get serious about our national security and giving our intelligence agencies the tools they need to prevent the next terrorist attack.

The Senate passed the Rockefeller-Bond bill last night by a vote of 68-29. It makes permanent the authorities that we passed in August of last year to listen to foreigners in foreign countries without a warrant. We spy on our enemies. We try to find out what their plans are so that we can stop them from killing Americans.

That Rockefeller-Bond bill also provides protection from lawsuits for the American companies that stepped up to the plate when this country was in crisis. In good faith, those American companies partnered with the U.S. Government, under instructions from that government, from our own government, to move forward and to help us to prevent another terrorist attack. And, ironically, they cannot defend themselves against lawsuits because the government says to do so would violate state secrets. It would give away secrets to our enemies. So they're stuck in court not even being able to defend themselves.

The cooperation that is being protected here in the Rockefeller-Bond bill is long established in criminal law and should certainly extend to the national security realm.

Today, I circulated a letter from 21 bipartisan attorneys general supporting these lawsuit protection provisions. Our intelligence agencies and their partners in private industry need certainty, the telecommunications companies whom we depend upon to cooperate need certainty, and our intelligence agents need certainty that we're not going to keep operating our intelligence community on a month-to-month basis.

In August we closed an intelligence gap, a vital gap that has been now closed, and the changes that we made have already provided intelligence that the Director of National Intelligence, Admiral Mike McConnell, has said

have helped us to disrupt terrorist attacks.

Intelligence is the first line of defense in protecting this country against terrorism. I would urge my colleagues to allow a vote today on the Rockefeller-Bond legislation, do not allow this bill to expire, and stand up and protect this country.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague seems to be asking us to rely upon assurances given to us by this administration, this same administration that has told us about weapons of mass destruction, the same administration that told us that Iran was building a nuclear bomb. And then she asks why we are skeptical about taking the word of the administration.

As my colleague knows, the House passed the RESTORE Act last November. It was not until last night that the Senate passed a bill reauthorizing and reforming the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. The bill is significantly different than the one we passed in November.

As is the case when the House and the Senate have differing bills, it is appropriate for the two to meet and reconcile their differences. That is exactly what we intend to do in a bipartisan and bicameral way.

However, as my colleagues also know, the President's preferred surveillance law is set to expire on Saturday. The underlying bill will extend that law for 3 weeks and give the House and Senate Judiciary and Intelligence Committees time to work toward a conference agreement. Additionally, it will also give our Members, Republican and Democrat, time to review reams of highly classified materials which were only provided to us by the White House in recent days, despite requests dating back all the way to May, 8 months ago. These materials are absolutely critical as the House considers the request which has been made by the White House to grant what amounts to a blanket transactional immunity to telecommunications companies who participated in the Bush administration's warrantless surveillance plan without any explanation of what that immunity is for. While the President has been quick to call on Congress to act, it is he who has continued to ignore countless congressional requests for information about the actions of his administration.

As a former State attorney, I know firsthand that not even a first-year prosecutor would even entertain the idea of granting immunity without knowing what that immunity is for and who that immunity is being granted to.

From his seat, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee noted last night in Rules that he cannot recall a time in his 45 years in the House when an administration has asked Congress to provide immunity to anyone or anything without telling us why. The House is not opposed to granting such immunity, but if we are going to act, then we need to know why.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge of passing long-term FISA reform, but it will take time because there are very real differences between the positions of the majority Members of this body and the Senate and the White House. Those who come to the floor today to delay this extension and engage in a manufactured obstructionism, which has become so symbolic of the congressional Republicans, are doing a great disservice to this Nation.

□ 1145

We will overcome this obstructionism, and we will use the next 3 weeks to reconcile our differences and come to the American people with a bill that protects our homeland without sacrificing our civil liberties.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the former attorney general of the State of California, Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule. Let's think about what we are talking about. The majority is asking us to extend for 21 days a bill that they don't support, a bill that they overwhelmingly voted against, a bill that they said harmed the American people, a bill that they said somehow doesn't protect civil liberties. Now, why do they want to extend it for 21 days if it is terrible? Perhaps there is some mischief in the air. Perhaps what they really want to do is to continue to kick this can down the road so that finally in the war of attrition we will give up and say, you know, those people who helped us, those companies referred to by Mr. HOEKSTRA that responded to a request by the United States Government to help us in our time of need, that is immediately after 9/11, we are not going to help them.

Remember what the greatest criticism of the 9/11 Commission was of government in all of its aspects, it was that we fail to connect the dots. What does that mean? We failed to put together intelligence information or to gather that intelligence information and put it together in a way that made sense that would give us a forewarning of what was about to take place. And they said it is not good enough to rely on the criminal justice system to gather evidence after the fact to prosecute somebody. No, in a war on terror what you want to do is to prevent the terrorist act in the first place.

So what we have here is a difference on that side of the aisle and this side of the aisle in which we believe a Good Samaritan law makes sense, a Good Samaritan law much like what we do to allow people to respond to an accident without having to fear that they will be sued for medical malpractice. And in some circumstances, does that mean that maybe one out of 1,000 times there might be medical malpractice for which you can't be sued? Yes. But we do it because the overall good of the

country is enhanced by giving incentives to people to help their neighbor.

That is what happened here. We have either an incentive or a disincentive for companies and individuals to respond to their country and act in good faith. That is what is at stake here, whether or not we are going to be safer or whether or not we are going to play these political games to support a bill that you all voted against.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL).

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today Congress is engaged in an important debate, perhaps the most important debate certainly in recent years. Our most solemn obligation to this country is to protect the American citizenry.

In my view our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are playing a dangerous political game, and the American people are the pawns in this game. I bring to the Congress a unique experience. I worked in the Justice Department under the FISA statute. I have worked on national security wiretaps, and I can tell you that the statute was never intended to cover foreign targets in a foreign country. And if Osama bin Laden is on the phone calling into the United States, I think the American people want us to pay attention to that and to listen to that conversation.

Intelligence, good intelligence has stopped every threat to this country since 9/11. Intelligence is the first line of defense in the war on terror. Without that, we cannot prevail in this war on terror, and we need to protect the American companies who we ask to protect the United States and the American people.

They stood up to the plate, and it is our time to stand up to the plate and now protect them. They were doing their patriotic duty in a time of war when America asked them.

If we do not protect them, then what company, American or otherwise, will dare help the United States of America in its greatest time of need, in a time of peril, in a time of war.

Yesterday, the Senate passed the FISA bill, which included this immunity and also protects Americans. I say we put that bill on the floor, let's pass that bill and let's make the Protect America Act permanent. Now is the time, not 21 days from now, not several months from now. For the American people, let's pass and protect the American people now.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would submit to my colleague that the only dangerous political game that is being played here is the attempt to cast this as a political game. There is no such attempt being made by anyone in the Democratic Party. The only attempt we are making is to give us time to go through the material that has only recently been given to us with the simple objective of ensuring that we get a bill which keeps our country safe and guarantees the liberty of our people.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a Member who for 6 years was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutions of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill before us. Last August, Congress passed and the President signed into law a bill that provides our law enforcement and intelligence community with the tools needed to protect this country, to protect the United States.

The events of September 11, 2001, exposed gaps in our intelligence-gathering activities, particularly those occurring outside the United States. Since that tragic day, the administration has worked with Congress to ensure that every tool in our arsenal is available to those who are charged with keeping our country safe, including working with telecommunications companies and allowing officials to gather intelligence from potential foreign terrorists outside this country.

These two aspects of the PAA have been critical in protecting the United States from actual or potential terrorist attacks or sabotage. Oversight by the FISA Court and minimization procedures approved by the courts ensure that such activities do not go beyond their scope.

Last night, the Senate passed bipartisan legislation that would maintain these critical features enabling the intelligence and law enforcement communities to continue with its critical work.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and immediately take up and pass the Senate bill so that law enforcement and the intelligence communities continue to have the necessary tools to keep the American people safe.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), a member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is really almost going beyond the pale of irresponsible and getting into dangerous.

I used to be an FBI agent, and every day in this country there is an FBI agent who goes up to somebody, an average citizen, it may be a coworker, it may be a neighbor, it may be somebody who owns a small business, it might be somebody who owns a big business, and says, We need your cooperation to catch child pornographers, and here is the evidence. Will you cooperate with your Nation? And we do it every single day, and great Americans stand up every single day and say, Yes, I will. I will go after child pornographers with you. I will go after crack dealers selling the drugs to our kids with you. I

will go after murderers who murder our children in the streets of America, and I will stand with you and cooperate so we can eliminate the dangers from our communities.

And you know what the government did? It went and said, Hey, to whatever business it was, small, big, large, we had people kill 3,000 people, murdered, on one day. And you know what, they are coming back. Will you cooperate with your government to stop the next round of murders?

But we play a very dangerous game. It is about civil liberties. Then why did we pass the bill before, and before that? Because there is civil liberty protection in this bill. It is a farce.

What is at risk here is the future certainty by our intelligence agencies and every single American who wonders: If I cooperate against a criminal of any sort, a terrorist, are they coming to get me next?

We need to refocus on who the bad guys are. It is not the companies who cooperated with their government. If you are a small business selling insurance or you are washing windows, it is the terrorists who threaten the lives of Americans.

We ought to be proud of every American who has the courage in a dangerous world to stand up and say: I will stand with you, United States of America, to get the true enemy, the bad guys, al Qaeda, terrorists, crack dealers, child pornographers, and everybody in between.

I urge the strong rejection of this rule, and let's get back to business and give them the tools to keep us safe.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague, you know, obviously raises a good point. As a former FBI agent, he was very concerned, he is very concerned, and he continues to be very concerned with doing the right thing, getting the people who are breaking the laws, hurting our children and who are putting our citizens in jeopardy. But no one in this Chamber has the market cornered on that. That is something that I think universally throughout this Chamber there is a strong desire to fulfill. That is why we are here. We are here to protect and defend our citizens and to protect and defend our Constitution, and that is all we are asking for today: 21 days to ensure that we are able to look over the recommendations, to look over the material that has recently been forwarded to us by this administration to ensure that we are not only protecting and securing this country, but rather that we are also doing it in a way that protects our liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LUNGREN and others who have spoken are right in one respect, yes, most of the House of Representatives voted not for the Protect America Act

but rather for a substitute that we passed, a very good piece of legislation, that would indeed protect Americans, known as the RESTORE Act. That passed the House. It should be the law.

We do not need the Protect America Act to protect Americans, the so-called Protect America Act. We do not need it to keep from going dark. But what we do need is the time and the attention to get this right. This is a serious, serious matter about protecting the safety of Americans but also about the definition, the relationship between the people of this country and their government.

There has been a fundamental shift under the Protect America Act in the relationship between the people of this country and their government. It is whether or not the government regards the ordinary American with suspicion first. Think about it.

The reason this country and our liberty has survived so well is because the government understands they are subservient to the people. The government has understood that they treat the people with respect, their bosses, and do not regard them with suspicion first.

To be able to seize, search, intercept without having to demonstrate to an independent judge that you know what you are doing is a sign of disrespect. It is a sign of suspicion. It is, in fact, a redefinition of the makeup of this country.

So if we need time to get this right, let's take the time. We don't need the Protect America Act to keep us from going dark, and I would argue we certainly don't need it, as they argue, to protect Americans from those who would do us harm. We have offered that protection in the RESTORE Act. Let's get this right.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another member of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the comments from the last speaker are very enlightening on this debate because we have heard for month after month the same arguments made time and time again, and the bottom line is there are a number of Members who are not for these authorities that allow our national security professionals to listen to terrorist communications. And there are a number of people who would just as soon let the Protect America Act expire and let it go out of effect. As the gentleman who just spoke said, we don't need it to protect the country.

□ 1200

But there are others of us who believe that we do need such authorities to protect the country, and a very large number of Members of the other body have just voted on a proposal that would do that.

And so my position, Mr. Speaker, is give us a chance to vote on it. We hear

excuse after excuse. We need more documents, we need more information, we need more legal opinions, we need 14 days, we need 21 days. But we have been debating the same issues month after month. Nothing has changed. No more information, no document is going to change the basic position the country stands in today and, that is, a law expires on Friday, and if the people for whom we have given the responsibility to protect the country are to do their job, that law is going to have to be made permanent so they can count on it, not dribbling it out a few weeks at a time, not treating them the way we treat soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan by giving them funding just a few months at a time, but giving them the authority they need to do their job.

I suggest the best way to do that is to bring up the bill that has already passed the Senate by an overwhelming bipartisan majority and give us a chance to vote on it. There will be some Members who vote "no." They think we don't need that authority. They think the Protect America Act is not needed. But I suggest a majority will vote "yes" and it will pass and the country will be safer.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

(Mr. FOSSELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

You know, kicking the can may be a fun game when there's nothing to do and there are no consequences at stake. But when it comes to national security and protecting the American people, providing the right tools to those on the front lines in the war against terrorism, kicking the can could be a fatal bargain.

Congress continues to kick the can down the road on a key tool that has kept this country safe since September 11. The other body closed a loophole in FISA that will ensure intelligence services have all the tools necessary to track terrorists overseas, terrorists who want to do us harm. Our Nation has not been attacked since September 11, in large part because of our ability to detect and disrupt terrorist plots before they've had a chance to carry out their evil acts. FISA is essential to those efforts.

Why do some ignore history? Why do some ignore the mindset of the likes of al Qaeda and others? Why do some want to weaken our ability to disrupt a terrorist attack before it occurs? Why do some put our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines in harm's way or at risk?

Last year we modernized the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act only after the National Intelligence Director told Congress that we were "missing a significant amount of foreign in-

telligence that we should be protecting to protect our country." What about those consequences?

Preventing the destruction of the Brooklyn Bridge is but one example. More tragically is the case of Specialist Alex Jimenez of Queens, New York. Last May, Specialist Jimenez was taken hostage by al Qaeda in Iraq. Information had been secured on one of the possible kidnappers, but intelligence experts were hamstrung by the outdated version of FISA. It prevented them from conducting surveillance on terrorists in a foreign nation without first obtaining a warrant. As the kidnappers acted, lawyers sat around a conference table here in Washington for 10 hours debating and drafting legal briefs to establish probable cause to conduct the surveillance. While the lawyers debated, losing precious time, Specialist Jimenez most likely was killed. They've yet to find the body and that of his colleague.

Let's stop kicking the can down the road. This is not a game we can afford to lose.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my friend and colleague from New York for his statements.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the speakers on the other side continue to try to couch this argument in a way and frame it in such a way that makes it appear that people on our side, the Democrats, don't care about the security of this country in the way that they do. And it's obvious that nothing could be further from the truth.

Simply by extending the FISA bill for 21 days to ensure that we have all the information that is out there and all the information that is available and that we have an opportunity to go through it in a thoughtful way doesn't mean that we have less concern for security but, rather, an equal amount of concern for security and also for the liberty of the American people.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend from New York if he has any more speakers.

Mr. ARCURI. I have no further speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. And so the gentleman is prepared to close after I close?

Mr. ARCURI. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. Speaker, the tragic events of September 11, 2001 taught us many lessons. One of the lessons we learned that day was that our Nation must remain aggressive in our fight against international terrorism. We must always stay one step ahead of those who wish to harm our fellow Americans. Now is not the time to tie the hands of our intelligence community. The modernization of foreign intelligence surveillance into the 21st century is a critical national security priority.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with that assessment. On January 28, 2008, less than 3 weeks ago, 21 members of the Blue Dog Coalition sent a letter to Speaker PELOSI in support of the Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation. The letter states, and I quote, "The Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation contains satisfactory language addressing all these issues and we would fully support that measure should it reach the House floor without substantial change. We believe these components will ensure a strong national security apparatus that can thwart terrorism across the globe and save American lives here in our country."

Mr. Speaker, that was a letter sent to Speaker PELOSI less than 2 weeks ago by the members of the Democrat Blue Dog Coalition.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2008.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Legislation reforming the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) is currently being considered by the Senate. Following the Senate's passage of a FISA bill, it will be necessary for the House to quickly consider FISA legislation to get a bill to the President before the Protect America Act expires in February.

It is our belief that such legislation should include the following provisions: Require individualized warrants for surveillance of U.S. citizens living or traveling abroad; Clarify that no court order is required to conduct surveillance of foreign-to-foreign communications that are routed through the United States; Provide enhanced oversight by Congress of surveillance laws and procedures; Compel compliance by private sector partners; Review by FISA Court of minimization procedures; Targeted immunity for carriers that participated in anti-terrorism surveillance programs.

The Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation contains satisfactory language addressing all these issues and we would fully support that measure should it reach the House floor without substantial change. We believe these components will ensure a strong national security apparatus that can thwart terrorism across the globe and save American lives here in our country.

It is also critical that we update the FISA laws in a timely manner. To pass a long-term extension of the Protect America Act, as some may suggest, would leave in place a limited, stopgap measure that does not fully address critical surveillance issues. We have it within our ability to replace the expiring Protect America Act by passing strong, bipartisan FISA modernization legislation that can be signed into law and we should do so—the consequences of not passing such a measure could place our national security at undue risk.

Sincerely,

Leonard L. Boswell, —, Mike Ross, Bud Cramer, Heath Shuler, Allen Boyd, Dan Boren, Jim Matheson, Lincoln Davis, Tim Holden, Dennis Moore, Earl Pomeroy, Melissa L. Bean, John Barrow, Joe Baca, John Tanner, Jim Cooper, Zachary T. Space, Brad Ellsworth, Charlie Melancon, Christopher P. Carney.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that House Democrat leaders chose to bring a 21-day extension bill to the floor instead of the bipartisan measure that passed the Senate by a vote of 68-29. I

might add, Mr. Speaker, those Senators had the information that has been alluded to several times on the floor today.

To make our country safer, Congress needs to act. The House should vote on the Senate measure, but the Democrat leaders have chosen instead to use delay tactics. The only reason I can see, Mr. Speaker, that we are not voting on the Senate measure is the fear of the leaders on the other side of the aisle that this bipartisan bill will pass.

But today, I will attempt to give all Members of the House an opportunity to vote on this bipartisan, long-term modernization of FISA. I call on all my colleagues, including members of the aforementioned Blue Dog Coalition that signed the letter to Speaker PELOSI on January 28, to join with me in defeating the previous question so that we can immediately move to concur in the Senate amendment and send the bill to the President to be signed into law. We need to do that before the current law expires, making our Nation at greater risk.

Mr. Speaker, 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and give us an opportunity to vote on a bipartisan, permanent solution that closes this terrorist loophole in the FISA Act.

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

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my colleague from Washington for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, if we have learned anything since the terrorist attacks of September 11, it is that the balance between security and civil liberties is not only difficult, it's absolutely critical. Providing this 3-week extension will do nothing to block or hinder the efforts of our intelligence community. Quite the contrary, it enhances their ability to do their jobs effectively and ensures the integrity of their efforts because it gives us time to get these reforms right.

I want to remind my colleagues that voting to defeat the previous question is a vote to deny the administration the ability to utilize its existing authority under law to assess threats, gather intelligence and protect the freedom and security of every American.

Twenty-one days isn't a long time. And based on the sensitivity and public interest in this issue, we owe that to the American people and the framers of the Constitution to strike a fair balance that allows us to protect the civil liberties of Americans and to provide the administration the tools and resources to protect our Nation from an-

other terrorist attack. Twenty-one days is a fair request.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this 21-day extension to FISA. If Congress does not act this week, critical tools that allow our intelligence officials to monitor terrorist communications overseas will expire. We not let that happen!

As we all know, yesterday, the Senate approved a comprehensive, long term, bipartisan bill by a vote of 68–29 to close the terrorist loophole in our intelligence laws. Their bill represents a strong compromise between Congress and the Administration. It is a responsible plan for protecting our nation against the threats of terrorism.

The intelligence community needs a long-term fix to gaps in our intelligence laws—not a 21-day delay. After 7 months of stalling and a 15-day extension, passage of another short-term extension is irresponsible, when we have a long-term solution ready to be voted on.

The Senate has passed a strong, bipartisan bill. The House must now act quickly to pass the Senate's bill and send it to the President. Failing to do so is effectively failing to protect our country.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this extension, and instead immediately pass the Senate's version of the bill so we can send this important bill to the President.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 976 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

(1) Strike "That upon the adoption of this resolution it" and insert the following:

"That upon adoption of this resolution, before consideration of any order of business other than one motion that the House adjourn, the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table. A motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment shall be considered as pending in the House without intervention of any point of order. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

"Sec. 2. It".

(2) Redesignate section 2 as section 3.

(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.

Mr. ARCURI. 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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adopting the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 195, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—210

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

NAYS—195

Aderholt	Brown-Waite,	Davis, David
Akin	Ginny	Davis, Tom
Alexander	Buchanan	Deal (GA)
Altmire	Burgess	Dent
Bachmann	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachus	Buyer	Diaz-Balart, M.
Barrett (SC)	Calvert	Donnelly
Bartlett (MD)	Camp (MI)	Drake
Barton (TX)	Campbell (CA)	Dreier
Biggert	Cannon	Duncan
Bilbray	Cantor	Ehlers
Billirakis	Capito	Emerson
Bishop (UT)	Carney	English (PA)
Blackburn	Carter	Everett
Blunt	Castle	Fallin
Boehner	Chabot	Feeney
Bonner	Coble	Ferguson
Bono Mack	Cole (OK)	Flake
Boozman	Conaway	Forbes
Boustany	Crenshaw	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Cubin	Fossella
Broun (GA)	Culberson	Fox
Brown (SC)	Davis (KY)	Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Rogers (MI)
Gallegly	Lungren, Daniel	Rohrabacher
Garrett (NJ)	E.	Ros-Lehtinen
Gerlach	Mack	Roskam
Gingrey	Manzullo	Royce
Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Goode	McCauley (TX)	Sali
Goodlatte	McCotter	Saxton
Granger	McCrery	Schmidt
Graves	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Sessions
Hayes	McKeon	Shadegg
Heller	McMorris	Shays
Hensarling	Rodgers	Shimkus
Hill	Mica	Shuster
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Hoekstra	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Hulshof	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Moran (KS)	Smith (TX)
Inglis (SC)	Murphy, Tim	Souder
Issa	Musgrave	Stearns
Johnson (IL)	Myrick	Sullivan
Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Tancredo
Jones (NC)	Nunes	Terry
Jordan	Paul	Thornberry
Keller	Pearce	Tiahrt
King (IA)	Pence	Tiberi
King (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Turner
Kingston	Petri	Upton
Kirk	Pitts	Walberg
Kline (MN)	Platts	Walsh (OR)
Knollenberg	Poe	Walsh (NY)
Kuhl (NY)	Porter	Wamp
LaHood	Price (GA)	Weldon (FL)
Lamborn	Putnam	Weller
Lampson	Radanovich	Westmoreland
Latham	Ramstad	Whitfield (KY)
LaTourette	Regula	Wilson (NM)
Latta	Rehberg	Wilson (SC)
Lewis (CA)	Reichert	Wittman (VA)
Lewis (KY)	Reynolds	Wolf
Linder	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Bishop (GA)	Honda	Renzi
Clay	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Doolittle	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Doyle	Marchant	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Mitchell	Towns
Gilchrest	Ortiz	Waxman
Herger	Pickering	Wynn
Hinojosa	Pryce (OH)	

□ 1237

Messrs. SULLIVAN and DONNELLY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. ARCURI

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 206, noes 194, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

AYES—206

Abercrombie	Arcuri	Barrow
Ackerman	Baca	Bean
Allen	Baird	Becerra
Andrews	Baldwin	Berman

Berry	Hinchey	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hodes	Peterson (MN)
Boren	Holden	Pomeroy
Boswell	Holt	Price (NC)
Boucher	Hooley	Rahall
Boyd (FL)	Hoyer	Rangel
Boyda (KS)	Inslee	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Israel	Rodriguez
Braley (IA)	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Rothman
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Salazar
Cardoza	Kagen	Sanchez, Linda
Carnahan	Kanjorski	T.
Castor	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Chandler	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kilpatrick	Schiff
Clyburn	Kind	Schwartz
Cohen	Klein (FL)	Scott (GA)
Conyers	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Langevin	Serrano
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Sestak
Costello	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lee	Sherman
Cramer	Levin	Shuler
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cuellar	Lipinski	Skelton
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Mahoney (FL)	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)	Solis
Davis, Lincoln	Markey	Space
DeFazio	Marshall	Spratt
DeGette	Matheson	Stark
Delahunt	Matsui	Stupak
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Dicks	McCollum (MN)	Tanner
Dingell	Dicks	Tauscher
Doggett	McIntyre	Taylor
Edwards	McNerney	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Ellsworth	Meeks (NY)	Tierney
Eshoo	Melancon	Tsongas
Etheridge	Michaud	Udall (CO)
Farr	Miller (NC)	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Miller, George	Van Hollen
Filner	Mitchell	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Visclosky
Giffords	Moore (KS)	Walz (MN)
Gillibrand	Moore (WI)	Wasserman
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Schultz
Gordon	Murphy (CT)	Waters
Green, Al	Murphy, Patrick	Watson
Green, Gene	Murtha	Watt
	Nadler	Weiner
	Napolitano	Welch (VT)
		Wexler
		Wilson (OH)
		Woolsey
		Wu
		Yarmuth

NOES—194

Aderholt	Campbell (CA)	Ferguson
Akin	Cannon	Flake
Alexander	Cantor	Forbes
Altmire	Capito	Fortenberry
Bachmann	Carney	Fossella
Bachus	Carter	Fox
Barrett (SC)	Castle	Franks (AZ)
Bartlett (MD)	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Barton (TX)	Coble	Gallegly
Biggert	Cole (OK)	Garrett (NJ)
Bilbray	Conaway	Gerlach
Billirakis	Crenshaw	Gingrey
Bishop (UT)	Cubin	Gohmert
Blackburn	Culberson	Goode
Blunt	Davis (KY)	Goodlatte
Boehner	Davis, David	Granger
Bonner	Davis, Tom	Graves
Bono Mack	Deal (GA)	Hall (TX)
Boozman	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Boustany	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hayes
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Heller
Broun (GA)	Donnelly	Hensarling
Brown (SC)	Drake	Hill
Brown-Waite,	Dreier	Hobson
Ginny	Duncan	Hoekstra
Buchanan	Ehlers	Hulshof
Burgess	Emerson	Hunter
Burton (IN)	English (PA)	Inglis (SC)
Buyer	Everett	Issa
Calvert	Fallin	Johnson (IL)
Camp (MI)	Feeney	Johnson, Sam

Jones (NC)	Miller (FL)	Schmidt	Cooper	Kagen	Rahall	McCotter	Putnam	Smith (TX)
Jordan	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner	Costa	Kanjorski	Rangel	McCrery	Radanovich	Souder
Keller	Miller, Gary	Sessions	Costello	Kaptur	Richardson	McHenry	Ramstad	Stearns
King (IA)	Moran (KS)	Shadegg	Courtney	Kennedy	Rodriguez	McHugh	Regula	Sullivan
King (NY)	Murphy, Tim	Shays	Cramer	Kildee	Ross	McKeon	Rehberg	Tancredo
Kingston	Musgrave	Shimkus	Crowley	Kilpatrick	Rothman	McMorris	Reichert	Terry
Kirk	Myrick	Shuster	Cuellar	Kind	Roybal-Allard	Rodgers	Reynolds	Thornberry
Kline (MN)	Nunes	Simpson	Cummings	Klein (FL)	Rush	Mica	Rogers (AL)	Tiahrt
Knollenberg	Paul	Smith (NE)	Davis (AL)	Langevin	Salazar	Michaud	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Kuhl (NY)	Pearce	Smith (NJ)	Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda	Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Turner
LaHood	Pence	Smith (TX)	Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	T.	Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Upton
Lamborn	Peterson (PA)	Souder	Davis, Lincoln	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta	Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Lampson	Petri	Stearns	DeGette	Levin	Sarbanes	Moran (KS)	Roskam	Walden (OR)
Latham	Pitts	Sullivan	DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky	Murphy, Tim	Royce	Walsh (NY)
LaTourette	Platts	Tancredo	Dicks	Lipinski	Schiff	Musgrave	Ryan (WI)	Wamp
Latta	Poe	Terry	Dingell	Loeb sack	Schwartz	Myrick	Sali	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Thornberry	Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott (GA)	Neugebauer	Saxton	Weller
Lewis (KY)	Price (GA)	Tiahrt	Donnelly	Lynch	Scott (VA)	Nunes	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Linder	Putnam	Tiberi	Edwards	Maloney (FL)	Serrano	Paul	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield (KY)
LoBiondo	Radanovich	Turner	Ellison	Maloney (NY)	Sestak	Pearce	Sessions	Wilson (NM)
Lucas	Ramstad	Upton	Ellsworth	Markey	Shea-Porter	Pence	Shadegg	Wilson (SC)
Lungren, Daniel	Regula	Walberg	Emanuel	Marshall	Sherman	Peterson (PA)	Shays	Wittman (VA)
E.	Rehberg	Walden (OR)	Eshoo	Matheson	Sires	Petri	Shimkus	Wolf
Mack	Reichert	Wamp	Etheridge	Matsui	Skelton	Pitts	Shuler	Wu
Manzullo	Reynolds	Weldon (FL)	Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter	Platts	Shuster	Young (AK)
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Weller	Fattah	McCollum (MN)	Smith (WA)	Poe	Simpson	Young (FL)
McCaul (TX)	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland	Finer	McDermott	Snyder	Porter	Smith (NE)	
McCotter	Rogers (MI)	Whitfield (KY)	Frank (MA)	McGovern	Solis	Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)	
McCrery	Rohrabacher	Wilson (NM)	Giffords	McNerney	Space			
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)	Gonzalez	McNulty	Spratt			
McHugh	Roskam	Wittman (VA)	Gordon	Meek (FL)	Stark			
McKeon	Royce	Wolf	Green, Al	Meeks (NY)	Stupak			
McMorris	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)	Green, Gene	Melancon	Sutton			
Rodgers	Sali	Young (FL)	Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Tanner			
Mica	Saxton		Gutierrez	Miller, George	Tauscher			
			Hall (NY)	Mitchell	Taylor			
			Hare	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)			
			Harman	Moore (KS)	Thompson (MS)			
			Hastings (FL)	Moore (WI)				
			Hastings (WA)	Moran (VA)				
			Herse th Sandlin	Murphy (CT)				
			Higgins	Murphy, Patrick				
			Hinche y	Murtha				
			Hirono	Nadler				
			Hodes	Napolitano				
			Holden	Neal (MA)				
			Hoyer	Oberstar				
			Inslee	Obey				
			Israel	Oliver				
			Jackson (IL)	Pallone				
			Jackson-Lee	Pascarell				
			(TX)	Pastor				
			Jefferson	Payne				
			Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter				
			Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)				
			Jones (OH)	Pomeroy				
				Price (NC)				

NOT VOTING—28

Berkley	Jackson-Lee	Pryce (OH)
Bishop (GA)	(TX)	Renzi
Doolittle	Loeb sack	Reyes
Doyle	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Emanuel	Marchant	Ryan (OH)
Engel	McDermott	Towns
Gilchrest	Meek (FL)	Walsh (NY)
Herger	Neugebauer	Waxman
Hinojosa	Ortiz	Wynn
Honda	Pickering	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1244

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the Chamber for rollcall vote 49. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 206, noes 199, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

AYES—206

Abercrombie	Berman	Capps
Ackerman	Berry	Capuano
Allen	Bishop (NY)	Cardoza
Altmire	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Andrews	Boren	Carney
Arcuri	Boswell	Castor
Baca	Boucher	Chandler
Baird	Boyd (FL)	Clarke
Baldwin	Boyd (KS)	Clay
Barrow	Brady (PA)	Cleaver
Bean	Braley (IA)	Clyburn
Becerra	Brown, Corrine	Cohen
Berkley	Butterfield	Conyers

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

NOES—199

Cubin	Herger
Culberson	Hill
Davis (KY)	Hobson
Davis, David	Hoekstra
Davis, Tom	Holt
Deal (GA)	Hulshof
DeFazio	Hunter
Dent	Inglis (SC)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)
Drake	Johnson, Sam
Dreier	Jones (NC)
Duncan	Jordan
Ehlers	Keller
Emerson	King (IA)
English (PA)	King (NY)
Everett	Kingston
Fallin	Kirk
Feeney	Kline (MN)
Ferguson	Knollenberg
Flake	Kucinich
Forbes	Kuhl (NY)
Fortenberry	LaHood
Fossella	Lamborn
Fox	Lampson
Franks (AZ)	Latham
Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Gallagher	Latta
Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Gerlach	Lewis (KY)
Gingrey	Linder
Gohmert	LoBiondo
Goode	Lucas
Goodlatte	Lungren, Daniel
Granger	E.
Graves	Mack
Hall (TX)	Manzullo
Hayes	Marchant
Heller	McCarthy (CA)
Hensarling	McCaul (TX)

NOT VOTING—23

Bachus	Honda	Reyes
Bishop (GA)	Hooley	Ruppersberger
Doolittle	Lowey	Ryan (OH)
Doyle	McIntyre	Towns
Engel	Ortiz	Waxman
Gilchrest	Pickering	Welch (VT)
Gillibrand	Pryce (OH)	Wynn
Hinojosa	Renzi	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1254

Mr. SHULER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote on the resolution.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. ARCURI

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 210, noes 195, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—210

Abercrombie	Berman	Capps
Ackerman	Berry	Capuano
Allen	Bishop (NY)	Cardoza
Altmire	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Andrews	Boren	Carney
Arcuri	Boswell	Castor
Baca	Boucher	Chandler
Baird	Boyd (FL)	Clarke
Baldwin	Boyd (KS)	Clay
Barrow	Brady (PA)	Cleaver
Bean	Braley (IA)	Clyburn
Becerra	Brown, Corrine	Cohen
Berkley	Butterfield	Conyers

Cooper	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)	McCaul (TX)	Price (GA)	Smith (NE)	Costa	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Costa	Kagen	Rahall	McCotter	Putnam	Smith (NJ)	Costello	(TX)	Olver
Costello	Kanjorski	Richardson	McCrery	Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Courtney	Jefferson	Pallone
Courtney	Kaptur	Rodriguez	McHenry	Ramstad	Souder	Cramer	Johnson (GA)	Pastor
Cramer	Kennedy	Ross	McHugh	Regula	Stearns	Crenshaw	Johnson, E. B.	Paul
Crowley	Kildee	Rothman	McKeon	Rehberg	Sullivan	Crowley	Johnson, Sam	Payne
Cuellar	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard	McMorris	Reichert	Tancredo	Cubin	Jones (NC)	Pearce
Cummings	Kind	Rush	Rodgers	Reynolds	Terry	Cuellar	Jones (OH)	Pence
Davis (AL)	Klein (FL)	Salazar	Mica	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry	Culberson	Jordan	Perlmutter
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda T.	Miller (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Tiahrt	Cummings	Kagan	Peterson (MN)
Davis (IL)	Langevin		Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Tiberi	Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)
Davis, Lincoln	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Turner	Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Petri
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes	Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton	Davis (IL)	Keller	Pitts
Delahunt	Lee	Schakowsky	Murphy, Tim	Roskam	Walberg	Davis (KY)	Kennedy	Platts
DeLauro	Levin	Schiff	Musgrave	Royce	Walden (OR)	Davis, David	Kildee	Poe
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Schwartz	Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Walsh (NY)	Davis, Lincoln	Kilpatrick	Pomeroy
Doggett	Lipinski	Scott (GA)	Neugebauer	Sali	Wamp	Davis, Tom	Kind	Porter
Donnelly	Loeb sack	Scott (VA)	Nunes	Saxton	Weldon (FL)	Deal (GA)	King (IA)	Price (GA)
Edwards	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano	Paul	Schmidt	Weller	DeFazio	King (NY)	Price (NC)
Ellison	Lynch	Sestak	Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland	DeGette	Kingston	Putnam
Ellsworth	Mahoney (FL)	Shea-Porter	Pence	Sessions	Whitfield (KY)	Delahunt	Kirk	Radanovich
Emanuel	Maloney (NY)	Sherman	Peterson (PA)	Shadegg	Wilson (NM)	DeLauro	Klein (FL)	Rahall
Eshoo	Markey	Sires	Petri	Shays	Wilson (SC)	Dent	Kline (MN)	Ramstad
Etheridge	Marshall	Skelton	Pitts	Shimkus	Wittman (VA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Regula
Farr	Matheson	Slaughter	Platts	Shuler	Wolf	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kucinich	Rehberg
Fattah	Matsui	Smith (WA)	Poe	Shuster	Young (AK)	Dicks	Kuhl (NY)	Reichert
Filner	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder	Porter	Simpson	Young (FL)	Dingell	LaHood	Reynolds
Frank (MA)	McCollum (MN)	Solis				Doggett	Lamborn	Richardson
Giffords	McDermott	Space				Donnelly	Lampson	Rodriguez
Gonzalez	McGovern	Spratt	Bishop (GA)	Honda	Renzi	Drake	Langevin	Rogers (AL)
Gordon	McIntyre	Stark	Dingell	Lowey	Reyes	Dreier	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
Green, Al	McNerney	Stupak	Doolittle	Ortiz	Ruppersberger	Duncan	Larson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
Green, Gene	McNulty	Sutton	Doyle	Pascarell	Ryan (OH)	Edwards	Latham	Rohrabacher
Grijalva	Meek (FL)	Tanner	Engel	Peterson (MN)	Towns	Ehlers	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)	Tauscher	Gillchrest	Pickering	Waxman	Ellison	Latta	Roskam
Hall (NY)	Melancon	Taylor	Gillibrand	Pryce (OH)	Wynn	Ellsworth	Lee	Ross
Hare	Michaud	Thompson (CA)	Hinojosa	Rangel		Emanuel	Levin	Rothman
Harman	Miller (NC)	Thompson (MS)				Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Tierney				English (PA)	Lewis (GA)	Royce
Herseth Sandlin	Mitchell	Tsongas				Eshoo	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Higgins	Mollohan	Udall (CO)				Etheridge	Linder	Salazar
Hill	Moore (KS)	Udall (NM)				Everett	Lipinski	Sali
Hinchey	Moore (WI)	Van Hollen				Fallin	LoBiondo	Sánchez, Linda T.
Hirono	Moran (VA)	Velázquez				Farr	Loeb sack	
Hodes	Murphy (CT)	Visclosky				Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe	Sanchez, Loretta
Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Walz (MN)				Feeney	Lucas	Sarbanes
Holt	Murtha	Wasserman				Ferguson	Lungren, Daniel E.	Saxton
Hooley	Nadler	Schultz				Filner		Schakowsky
Hoyer	Napolitano	Waters				Flake	Lynch	Schiff
Inslee	Neal (MA)	Watson				Forbes	Mack	Schmidt
Israel	Oberstar	Watt				Fortenberry	Mahoney (FL)	Schwartz
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Weiner				Fossella	Maloney (NY)	Scott (GA)
Jackson-Lee	Olver	Welch (VT)				Fox	Manzullo	Scott (VA)
(TX)	Pallone	Wexler				Frank (MA)	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Jefferson	Pastor	Wilson (OH)				Franks (AZ)	Markey	Serrano
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Woolsey				Frelinghuysen	Marshall	Sessions
Johnson (IL)	Perlmutter	Wu				Gallegly	Matheson	Sestak
Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy	Yarmuth				Garrett (NJ)	Matsui	Shadegg

NOT VOTING—23

□ 1303

So the motion to table was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 3, noes 395, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

AYES—3

Hastings (WA)	Johnson (IL)	Young (AK)
NOES—395		
Abercrombie	Blackburn	Calvert
Ackerman	Blumenauer	Camp (MI)
Aderholt	Blunt	Campbell (CA)
Akin	Boehner	Cannon
Alexander	Bonner	Cantor
Altmire	Bono Mack	Capito
Andrews	Boozman	Capps
Arcuri	Boren	Capuano
Baca	Boswell	Cardoza
Bachmann	Boucher	Carnahan
Baird	Boustany	Carney
Barrow	Boyd (FL)	Carter
Barrett (SC)	Boyda (KS)	Castle
Barwell	Brady (PA)	Castor
Barwell	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Barton (TX)	Braley (IA)	Chandler
Bean	Brown (GA)	Clarke
Becerra	Brown (SC)	Clay
Berkley	Brown, Corrine	Cleaver
Berman	Brown-Waite,	Clyburn
Berry	Ginny	Coble
Biggett	Buchanan	Cohen
Bilbray	Burgess	Cole (OK)
Bilirakis	Burton (IN)	Conaway
Bishop (NY)	Butterfield	Conyers
Bishop (UT)	Buyer	Cooper

NOES—195

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

Flake	Lynch	Schiff
Forbes	Mack	Schmidt
Fortenberry	Mahoney (FL)	Schwartz
Fossella	Maloney (NY)	Scott (GA)
Fox	Manzullo	Scott (VA)
Frank (MA)	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Franks (AZ)	Markey	Serrano
Frelinghuysen	Marshall	Sessions
Gallegly	Matheson	Sestak
Garrett (NJ)	Matsui	Shadegg
Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)	Shays
Giffords	McCarthy (NY)	Shea-Porter
Gillibrand	McCaul (TX)	Sherman
Gingrey	McCollum (MN)	Shimkus
Gohmert	McCotter	Shuler
Gonzalez	McDermott	Shuster
Goode	McGovern	Simpson
Goodlatte	McHenry	Sires
Gordon	McHugh	Skelton
Granger	McIntyre	Slaughter
Graves	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Green, Al	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Green, Gene	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Grijalva	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Hall (NY)	McNulty	Snyder
Hall (TX)	Meek (FL)	Solis
Hare	Meeks (NY)	Souder
Harman	Melancon	Space
Hastings (FL)	Mica	Spratt
Hayes	Michaud	Stark
Heller	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Stupak
Herger	Miller (NC)	Sullivan
Herseth Sandlin	Miller, Gary	Sutton
Hill	Miller, George	Tancredo
Hinchey	Mitchell	Tiahrt
Hirono	Mollohan	Tauscher
Hobson	Moore (KS)	Taylor
Hodes	Moore (WI)	Terry
Hoekstra	Moran (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Holden	Moran (VA)	Thompson (MS)
Holt	Murphy (CT)	Thornberry
Hooley	Murphy, Patrick	Tiahrt
Hoyer	Murphy, Tim	Tiberi
Hulshof	Murtha	Tierney
Hunter	Myrick	Tsongas
Inglis (SC)	Nadler	Udall (NM)
Inslee	Neal (MA)	Upton
Israel	Neugebauer	Van Hollen
Issa	Nunes	Velázquez
Jackson (IL)	Oberstar	Visclosky