

the same issues, and in fact they use the exact same language. "Critical habitat." Both bills use identical language. "Provide certainty for landowners." Both bills use identical language. "Provide incentive for landowners." Both bills use identical language. And on and on and on.

What is the major difference? What is the major difference? In our bill, we protect the small property owners. Yes, we do. And we should. If the Federal Government steps in and takes somebody's land for a highway, we all pay for it. I do not see people running down here screaming it is an entitlement. I do not see people running down here screaming that it is a budget buster if we pay people if we take that property for a highway.

If we take it for a wildlife refuge to protect a wildlife refuge, we pay them for it, and nobody is down here screaming about it saying it is an entitlement. Nobody is down here screaming, saying it is unfair to pay somebody if you take their property for a wildlife refuge.

If you take their land for a national park, we pay them for it, and nobody is saying that is an entitlement. Nobody is saying that we are busting the budget.

But when we get to endangered species, we tell a farmer, you cannot farm part of your land, 10 percent, 20 percent, 50 percent, whatever it is, you cannot farm that part of your land, now, all of a sudden, oh, we cannot do that.

Well, we have got the responsibility to do it. If you take away somebody's private property, if you take away the use of their private property, you have to pay them for it. There is nothing wrong with that. Why you guys are so wed to the old debates and the old rhetoric, I have no idea.

We sat down as a committee and we worked out this bill. Half the Democrats that voted in the committee voted for it. It was a bill that was worked out. It is not everything I wanted; it is not everything the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) wanted. It was a compromise, a reasonable way to protect endangered species, to protect the habitat in which they need to recover; and if that does involve private property, yes, we pay them for it. And, dang it, we should.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California tries to make the substitute and the bill that is on the floor sound the same; but there are major differences, and we should recognize that. First of all, let us talk about some of those differences.

The bill before us is a huge giveaway to big developers. It creates a program where the burden is on the government

to disprove. It basically does not put a dollar amount in the bill, because they are afraid of the dollar amount because it is an entitlement program for landowners that want to gut the Endangered Species Act. But the estimates are 10, 20, 30, 40 billion. Who knows how much this is going to cost.

Our bill, the substitute, does not do that. It is modest. It says we should work with private landowners. It sets up a program so that the government goes out and works with those landowners to accomplish the goals of the Endangered Species Act.

The majority bill, and this is another major difference, changes the Endangered Species Act in a radical, radical way, especially with the adoption of the manager's amendment. The substitute reforms the Endangered Species Act, while protecting the core provisions of that magnificent environmental law that has been on the books for 30 years.

At the end of this, we have not respected this institution by the way we brought the bill before the floor, the way we have worked in committee to put it on a rocket docket and speed it through, speed it through this process. We need to slow down. We need to take a look at this and work in a bipartisan way.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would again urge my colleagues to, first of all, vote "no" on the rule, and I would also urge them to vote "no" on the underlying bill. I appreciate the work that the gentleman from California (Chairman POMBO) and others have put into this bill, but the bottom line is that the underlying bill eliminates habitat protections; it abandons the commitment to recovery of endangered species; it repeals protection against hazardous pesticides; it politicizes scientific decision-making; it eliminates the vital check-and-balance of consultation; it requires the Fish and Wildlife Service to allow unfettered habitat destruction; it would require taxpayers to pay developers, oil and gas companies and other industries, for complying with the law; and it is an entitlement.

I know the chairman has kind of objected to that characterization, but that is not my characterization. It is what CBO has concluded. It is what our colleague from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) who testified yesterday on behalf of the Republican Study Committee and the Republican Tuesday Group said last night in the Committee on Rules, that this bill creates an expensive new Federal entitlement program.

Mr. Speaker, the Endangered Species Act has done a great deal to protect endangered species. Everybody agrees that there needs to be adjustments. Everybody agrees that we can come together and make those necessary adjustments. But what we object to is that the underlying bill guts the En-

dangered Species Act. It is a bad bill; it is bad policy. I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of rhetoric thus far on the rule, and I suspect there will be a lot of rhetoric when we debate the bill; but there is one underlying thread here that needs to be mentioned. It was mentioned by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA), and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

□ 1130

That is that the Endangered Species Act needs to be updated.

I came here 10 years ago, and this is one of the big issues that was very important to my constituency when I first ran. There was talk then about amending the Endangered Species Act, but there was no agreement at all. We did get a bill out of committee. Unfortunately, it did not go any further.

But now we hear today that there is 90 percent agreement on the need to change the Endangered Species Act, but there is violent 10 percent disagreement on what those means should be. I contend that is huge, huge movement from where we have gone in 10 years. I do not know what the reasons are, but I expect the reasons are the inflammation of the existing Act.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.J. RES. 68, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 469 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 469

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 68) making continuing appropriations for the

fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, October 6, 2005, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution.

SEC. 3. A motion to proceed pursuant to section 2908 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 shall be in order only if offered by the Majority Leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 469 is a rule that provides for consideration of House Joint Resolution 68, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2006. This rule provides for 1 hour of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit the joint resolution.

Additionally, the resolution provides that suspensions will be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, October 6, 2005, and the Speaker or his designee shall consult the Minority Leader or her designee on any suspension considered under the rule.

Lastly, the rule provides that a motion to proceed pursuant to section 2908 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 shall be in order only if offered by the majority leader or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the entire House Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle for sticking to the timetable they laid out at the start of this legislative session. In an impressive display of bipartisanship and just sheer hard work, the House passed all 11 appropriations bills prior to the July 4 District Work Period. Since July, the Senate has returned to us only the interior and legislative branch appropriations bills, which have each been signed into law by the President. Additionally, the Senate has passed six of its remaining 10 appropriations bills. These six are awaiting closure in con-

ference. We are now just anticipating action from the Senate on those last four appropriations bills so we can move forward, finish the appropriations process, and avoid a cumbersome omnibus funding bill.

Unfortunately, the appropriations process within the two bodies has not been completed prior to the start of the new fiscal year which, of course, begins this October 1. We must institute a continuing resolution in order to allow the government to function through November 18, 2005, while we complete consideration of the remaining appropriations bills, waiting on the Senate to complete their final actions, and for the conference committees to do their work. This rule allows consideration of the imperative funding measure.

I am most impressed with the work of the Committee on Appropriations on this continuing resolution. Throughout the appropriations process, the committee has shown its commitment to the budget resolution and to fiscal responsibility. The committee has funded programs and activities at the lowest level of the House-passed level, the Senate-passed level, or the fiscal year 2005 current rate. For agencies for which the Senate has not passed a bill by the start of a new fiscal year, the funding rate is at the lower of the House-passed level, or the fiscal year 2005 current rate.

The legislation includes language prohibiting agencies from initiating or resuming programs or procurements not funded in the fiscal year 2005, and prohibits agencies from awarding new grants and certain other forms of assistance during the period of the CR, which, of course, is through November 18 of this year.

I again congratulate the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ranking Member OBEY) and the entire committee for their hard work this year. I urge Members to support this rule and the underlying CR so that we can finish the appropriations process, move down the road to responsible funding for the needs of this Nation, and avoid a cumbersome omnibus funding bill.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow us to debate H.J. Res. 68, a continuing resolution that will fund the Federal Government past September 30. While this is an essential procedural measure, it also represents an opportunity. Between now and November 18, when the resolution expires, Congress has a responsibility to step back and consider its priorities. The facts on the ground have changed, and our agenda here in the House must change accordingly.

I am confident that we will do right by those affected by the hurricanes, but we still need to ask ourselves where our financial and legislative duties are in response to Katrina construction, continued funding for Iraq and Afghanistan, and increasing fiscal deficit. Are we looking at the big picture? Are our priorities in line with our financial obligations? We know that because of Katrina, the victims, those displaced from their homes, are more likely to rely on medicaid. With that known expense, can we honestly reduce the funding for this responsibility and still extend tax cuts?

Mr. Speaker, we need to take care of our fellow citizens, but what we do now should not mean we pass on an unsustainable debt to future generations, especially when we know there is a way we can offset these costs. For the costs of this year's installments of the tax cuts enacted in 2001 and 2003, \$225 billion this year alone, we could pay for the gulf States' recovery from Katrina. We know that we need some of these cuts, such as AMT relief, but let us at least be reasonable and put them on the table.

We must have an honest discussion about our fiscal situation. I urge my colleagues to step back and take a hard look at how we will move forward, not just this fall, but next year and the decades after that.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues have heard me talk about my granddaughter Anna, and we all have someone like her, someone we see as our future, someone that means the world to us. I believe that she will grow up to a better future. But, to do right by them, we must all step up to the plate, not as Members of one party or another, but as leaders and statesmen willing to accept the reality of our fiscal situation and make the difficult decisions.

Our priorities in the coming months should not waver from the ultimate goal.

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

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

I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I certainly agree that this debate about the budget and the appropriations process is always a debate about our future, and it is a debate about priorities. Clearly, we have had a shift in priorities since that budget resolution passed. As a State that was hit by four hurricanes last year and had the beginnings of Katrina come across our State this year, our hearts go out to our brothers and sisters on the gulf coast, and we recognize that this government has a commitment to help lift up those citizens on the gulf coast and, where appropriate, we have a Federal responsibility in the rebuilding and reconstruction process in Louisiana and Mississippi and Alabama, and a lot of other places.

So I think that that reinforces the need for us to move ahead with this

continuing resolution and allow our appropriations process to work, instead of positioning ourselves to a situation where we end up with an omnibus bill that I do not think either one of us thinks is the appropriate way to go.

There is an opportunity here for us to reprioritize, using regular order, using the strength and talent that sits on our committees, and bringing about a measured approach to doing that. It is going to require offsets. The numbers that are coming out of there fluctuate wildly, and it is important that we have a handle on what those needs truly are. It is important that we recognize that had we not taken some of the steps that we have taken in the past, we would not have eliminated \$100 billion off of the deficit in the last year. We would not have been in a position where revenues to the government would have actually been higher than they were as a result of the lower taxes and the growth in the economy that has come about as a result of that.

But that is a debate for another day. This is a debate about the continuing resolution and the need for us to make sure that the government does not shut down.

The House has done its work. I think we can all be very proud of our appropriators finishing their schedule before July 4, and now we are in a position, unfortunately, of being in a bit of a holding pattern, waiting on the Senate and our conference committees to do their work. But it is important for us to pass this rule and allow the CR to move ahead.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support a closed rule, although I do understand the need for prompt action on the continuing resolution. As my good friend from Florida has pointed out, the Senate's slowness in acting on appropriations bills means that the continuing resolution that we are discussing here today is necessary.

However, as we prepare to provide the funds to keep the government running, I think we need to consider the larger budgetary picture. It is essential for us to respond to the devastation brought by hurricanes Katrina and Rita but, as we do, we should consider and respond to the fiscal and economic risks we have been running.

I think there is an urgent need for both the administration and the Congress to face hard reality and not continue with budget policies based on laws that defy the laws of fiscal gravity. For too long, there has been a dearth of both presidential leadership and accountability in this area.

That is why later today, along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), and perhaps the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), I will introduce a bill that I think could promote both. The bill is called the Stimulating Leadership in Cutting Expenditures Act, or the SLICE Act for short. It would do two things: First, it would authorize the President to identify specific items in Federal spending that he thinks should be cut; and second, require Congress to vote on each of those items.

The bill would apply both to appropriations and to spending items in the recently signed transportation bill. It would set deadlines for the President to propose cuts and for Congress to act on them.

Under the bill, Congress would have to vote on each proposed cut. We could not ignore those proposals, as can be done under current law, and if a majority approved the cut, it would take effect.

The President has said we should pay for responding to Katrina and Rita through spending cuts alone, but the President's own party and the majority in this House are divided on what to cut.

We may disagree on budget and tax priorities, Mr. Speaker, but one thing is certain. It is past time for a serious debate about specific proposals for ways to dig ourselves out of the deficit hole. This bill is intended to jump-start that debate.

I hope all of our colleagues will join us in this crucial effort to restore fiscal sanity to our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita not only brought death and destruction across a wide swath of the Gulf coast. They also delivered a blow to the Federal budget and sounded a wakeup call about the fiscal and economic risks we have been running.

A full response to these natural disasters must include more than emergency repairs, humanitarian relief, and community rebuilding. We also need to consider serious questions about the limits of government, the wisdom of wartime tax cuts, and our national capacity to look beyond short-term political priorities.

If anything good can come from these terrible storms, maybe it will be recognition by both the Bush administration and Congress that now we need to face hard reality and not continue with budget policies based on defying the laws of fiscal gravity. It's about time.

Even if Katrina and Rita had taken less destructive paths and the New Orleans levees had held, the problems would have been serious because the Federal budget was already on a dangerous course marked by tidal waves of red ink and towering piles of debt. Since 2001, the budget surplus that President Clinton and a Republican Congress bequeathed President Bush has been erased and our country is now in debt to the tune of \$8 trillion, or \$25,000 for every American man, woman and child.

This was the result of several factors, of course, but the size and scope of the Bush tax cuts must bear a large part of the blame.

Several parts of those tax cuts—for example, eliminating the marriage penalty, fixing the

10 percent bracket and extending child care tax credits—were good. They gave a reasonable boost for the economy and increased the fairness of the tax laws. But having campaigned on giving back most of the budget surplus in tax cuts, President Bush insisted on much more, and Congress went along.

Many of us warned against reducing the surplus so recklessly, and urged the administration and Congress to remember the need to be ready for future emergencies. Our pleas for restraint were ignored. And then came the attacks of 9/11 and with them the need for increased spending on homeland security, a military response in Afghanistan, and a war in Iraq. The budget nosedived from surplus into deep deficit.

Even in the face of national emergency, neither the President nor Congress has seen fit to call on Americans for any sacrifice, and instead of temporarily scaling back tax cuts, the President has insisted on making them permanent even as Federal spending has skyrocketed.

So now we are putting the costs of war and everything else the government does on the national credit card—but the debt is owed not just to ourselves (as in the past), but to China, Japan and India.

Why have we allowed things to get so far out of hand?

Part of the answer is that budget and tax policy in Washington has been so captive to very partisan and extreme ideological voices that it has been hard to find common ground and moderate consensus.

Even in this time of war, extremists in the Republican Party view tax cuts as almost a religious calling, while some in my party reject any spending cuts except in defense. And the Vice President dismisses complaints by saying "deficits don't matter."

So, it not surprising that the appropriations process has not been marked by fiscal discipline. Unless the President or Congressional leaders proclaim a need for restraint, let alone sacrifice, why would Members of Congress not work to meet the transportation and infrastructure needs of their districts and seek funding for other valued purposes?

But all this cannot go on forever. Sooner or later, something has to give. And, if the result is a new sense of responsibility, sooner is better—because there is an urgent need to rethink and revise our budget policies, including both taxes and spending.

It could be that, just as they revealed the problem, Katrina and Rita can provide a catalyst to beginning that overdue job.

The President has said the Federal Government will undertake to help rebuild the communities left devastated by the storms—and has said that spending for other purposes should be reduced to offset the costs.

I have serious doubts about the adequacy of that approach, about the desirability of whatever spending cuts the President may propose, and about the readiness of Congress to seriously consider any cuts at all.

But I am hopeful that maybe at last the time has come for a serious debate about specific proposals for ways to dig ourselves out of the deficit hole.

To help begin such a serious debate, earlier this year I introduced legislation that would give the President authority to require Congress to vote, up or down, on specific appropriations items the President deemed unworthy of funding—a workable and Constitutional

alternative to the line item-veto legislation that the Supreme Court struck down in 1998.

Now, I am introducing an updated version of this bill that focuses directly on the President's suggestion that disaster response costs be offset with spending cuts.

The bill is called the Stimulating Leadership In Cutting Expenditures or, "SLICE" Act.

That name fits because the bill would promote Presidential leadership and Congressional accountability on proposals to reduce other spending in order to offset the costs of responding to the recent natural disasters.

Toward that end, it would authorize the President to identify specific items of Federal spending that he thinks should be cut and would require Congress to vote on each of those items.

The bill would apply not only to regular appropriations, but also to the transportation bill that was passed and signed into law earlier this year.

The bill would establish a two-phase process: the President would have until November 1st to tell Congress which, if any, of the spending in the transportation bill should be cancelled. And he would have until the end of this year to identify any items in fiscal year 2006 appropriations bills we want to eliminate.

In each case, if the President proposes a cut, Congress would have to vote on it—we could not ignore the proposal, as can be done under current law—and if a majority approved the cut, it would take effect.

Mr. Speaker, as our budget situation has grown worse, there has been a lot of talk about "earmarks," meaning funding allocations initially proposed by Members of Congress rather than by the Administration.

Some people are opposed to all earmarks. I am not one of them. I think Members of Congress know the needs of their communities, and that Congress as a whole can and should exercise its judgment on how tax dollars are to be spent. So, I have sought earmarks for various items that have benefited Colorado and I will continue to do so.

At the same time, I know—everyone knows—that sometimes a large bill includes some earmarked items that might not be approved if they were considered separately, because they would be seen as unnecessary, inappropriate, or excessive.

Dealing with that problem requires leadership and accountability. My bill would promote both.

Presidents are elected to lead, and only they represent the entire Nation. The bill recognizes this by giving the President the leadership role of identifying just which other spending he thinks should be cut in order to offset some of the amounts the Federal Government will be spending in response to recent natural disasters.

And, under the Constitution, it is the Congress that is primarily accountable to the American people for how their tax dollars will be spent. The bill respects and emphasizes that Congressional role by requiring a vote on each spending cut proposed by the President.

I do not know exactly which spending the President might propose to cut, so I do not know whether I would support some, all, or any of those proposals.

But I do know that we should stop wasting time in theoretical debates about whether we should make spending cuts and start debating specific proposals.

My bill is intended to get that debate started now.

For the benefit of our colleagues, here is an outline of the bill:

STIMULATING LEADERSHIP IN CUTTING EXPENDITURES (SLICE) ACT

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate Presidential leadership and Congressional accountability regarding reduction of other spending to offset the costs of responding to recent natural disasters.

The bill would amend the Budget Act to provide as follows:

The President could propose rescission of any budget authority provided in the recently passed transportation bill or an appropriations Act through special messages including draft bills to make those rescissions.

The President would have until November 1, 2005 to propose canceling spending items in the new Transportation Act and until January 1, 2006 to propose rescissions from FY 06 appropriations bills.

The House's majority leader or minority leader would be required to introduce a bill proposed by the President within two legislative days. If neither did so, any Member could then introduce the bill.

The relevant Committee would be required to report the bill within seven days after introduction. The report could be made with or without recommendation regarding its passage. If the Committee did not meet that deadline, it would be discharged and the bill would go to the House floor.

The House would debate and vote on each proposed rescission within 10 legislative days after the bill's introduction. Debate would be limited to no more than four hours and no amendment, motion to recommit, or motion to reconsider would be allowed.

If passed by the House, the bill would go promptly to the Senate, which would have no more than 10 more days to consider and vote on it. Debate in the Senate would be limited to 10 hours and no amendment or motion to recommit would be allowed.

□ 1145

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

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

I applaud the gentleman's bipartisan effort to find ways to pay for these unanticipated expenses that we have come across, and I wish him the best in that effort. I think it is important that we all recognize on both sides of the aisle that offsets are going to be necessary and that we do have to reprioritize.

As the gentleman knows, the President submitted a list through the regular budget process of 150 programs to cut or eliminate earlier this year, and some of them received some attention and others received more attention than others. It is certainly a difficult proposition in this town to eliminate any program, but the President led early this year with that thought in mind and he had mixed success.

Again, recognizing the importance of your bipartisan effort and recognizing the facts that we are going to have to have these offsets, this bill, this rule that we are here to consider essentially keeps the government from shutting down while we have that debate. It appears that there is genuine broad support for the CR and for the rule, and I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for her work on the Rules Committee and what is essentially a broad commitment that we have to have this CR through November 18. Frankly, it is not for lack of effort on the House side. Both parties have a lot of reasons to be proud of the efforts of our appropriators and the entire House. We had a Herculean effort this summer to move these bills on schedule, move them out before July 4th, and because of Supreme Court nominations and everything else obviously the Senate has had other issues on their agenda, and we are in a holding pattern on the appropriations. Nobody wants to see the government shut down after Saturday, so it is important that we move this rule, move the underlying CR, and allow the regular order, the talent and skills that exist within this House, to work their magic as we deal with these unanticipated effects from two gulf storms, and we are not even finished with hurricane season yet.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

adoption of H. Res. 470, by the yeas and nays;

motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 388, by the yeas and nays;

motion to suspend the rules on H. Con. Res. 245, by the yeas and nays.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3824, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 470 on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 171, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—252

Abercrombie	Baca	Bartlett (MD)
Aderholt	Bachus	Barton (TX)
Akin	Baker	Bass
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Beauprez