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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1020

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 602

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

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

Ms. SUTTON. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This Congress can send a strong message today that we want to ensure that our Nation is prepared for the future. Let's pass this rule and the 21st Century Competitiveness Act.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I recognize, as a member of the Science Committee, all the hard work that has gone into the America COMPETES Act to maintain and enhance our Nation's investment in the core STEM field, science, technology, engineering and mathematics. I believe that every member of our committee understands well that the future of our competitive economic edge rests in energizing our students at every level so they can pursue these fields of study.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition, by a vote of 258–167, this House passed a motion to instruct conferees Tuesday to insist on the House authorization levels and to restore language on coal-to-liquids technology that had previously been accepted in this House by a vote of 264–154. Both instructions were ignored in conference. The coal-to-liquids technology provision was offered as an amendment in the conference yesterday and was voted down, despite the wishes of this whole House.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

When you look, and it's a sad situation right now, but only Cyprus and South Africa have lower overall math and science scores than we have in this country right now. What is the reason for that? Is it that we are not as smart as other countries? No, that's not the case.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1040

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

In physics, dead last of all developed nations.

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

General science, about fifth from the the bottom.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We begin to look around the world, and we notice that nations who in years past were looking to the United States for the cutting edge of technology now are graduating more mathematicians and engineers in 1 month, such as China, than we might be graduating in 1 year. We understand the premise of this competitive legislation. H.R. 2272 is long overdue, and it is reaching to answer a crisis.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1100

They want, first, only temporary authority to listen to foreigners in foreign countries. And, second, they want to still be in a situation where you have to get a court order to approve eavesdropping on foreigners in foreign countries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Let's get this court back to focusing what it was intended to do, which is to protect the civil liberties of Americans, and allow our intelligence community to do what they are intended to do, which is to keep this country safe and prevent the next terrorist attack.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are preparing our Nation for a bright future. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 602 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 602, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 601; and adoption of House Resolution 601, if ordered.

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

[Roll No. 791]

YEAS—225

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

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

NAYS—198

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

NOT VOTING—9

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

□ 1132

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

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 792]

YEAS—229

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

NAYS—194

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

NOT VOTING—9

Cannon
Clarke
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Ellison
Johnson, Sam
Mahoney (FL)
Meeks (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1140

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 793]

YEAS—225

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

NAYS—201

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

NOT VOTING—6

Clarke
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Ellison
Johnson, Sam

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1147

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 794]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—200

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)