that on March 29th, for personal earmarks, and then admitting that they're putting earmarks in legislation to buy votes. That is taking place. Oh, and hiding those earmarks in slush funds. We forgot about that one.

Record spending. Never in the history of the world has a legislative body spent as much money as this body is spending under Democrat control. $193 billion in cuts to Medicare, inflicting that on our senior citizens, and yes, fixing that vote to give illegal immigrants benefits, shelter, food, paychecks, putting them before the American people.

We will continue to fight for freedom and stand for security.

□ 0915

INTRANSIGENCE CAUSES TRAGEDY

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, listeners should know that, unfortunately, truthfulness is not required on the floor of the House of Representatives under the rules.

It is not truthful that somehow we are extending benefits to illegal aliens. That is against the law of the United States. It is statute.

It is not truthful that we have enacted the largest tax increase in history. That is the attitude that brought about the bridge collapse in Minnesota. President Bush told us we couldn't have a penny more to invest in the infrastructure of this country, even though we knew the bridges were crumbling. The Democrats had a list of all the insufficient bridges in the country. But the President said, no, we can't afford it. Not a penny more.

Do you know what it would cost to catch up with our bridge problem over the next 20 years? We would have to invest a lot of money, an incredible amount of money. Two weeks in Iraq every year is what it would take to fix the bridge problem in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are stonewalling us on a reasonable plan to get out of Iraq, and they are stonewalling us on more money to fix our infrastructure problems. People are dying in Iraq, and they are dying in America because of their intransigence.

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

(Mr. WESTMORELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, my mama always told me that your actions speak louder than your words. I am sure many of your mothers have told you that your actions will speak louder than your words.

Let me just read you some words. This comes from Speaker PELOSI. ''Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer as alternatives including a substitute.'' What? Whoa.

''We intend to have a Rules Committee that gives opposition voices and alternative proposals the ability to be heard and considered on the floor of the House.'' The majority leader STENY HOYER. What? Whoa.

''I want us to work together,'' Mrs. SLAUGHTER, Rules Committee chairwoman. What? Whoa.

''Members should have at least 24 hours to examine bill and conference report text prior to floor consideration.'' Speaker PELOSI. What? Whoa.

''Rules governing floor debate must be reported before 10 p.m. for a bill to be considered the following day.'' Whut? Whoa.

Mr. Speaker, we need to let our actions match our words.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3221, NEW DIRECTION FOR ENERGY INDEPENDENCE, NATIONAL SECURITY, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, AND FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2776, RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY CONSERVATION TAX ACT OF 2007

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 615 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 615

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3221) moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours, with 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of each of the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, Science and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and Labor, Foreign Affairs, Small Business, and Oversight and Government Reform. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2776) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 3221, the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 2776, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 3221;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 3221 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 2776 to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 2776 to the engrossment of H.R. 3221, H.R. 2776 shall be laid on the table.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House is in session on a Saturday, a rare event. And why we do that, of course, is to finish up the work that is the culmination of the efforts of our committees that have then brought legislation to us to consider.

In this past week, we passed important legislation on employment discrimination, fair pay, an Iraq planning bill, Agriculture appropriations, and, very important, critical, actually, a children's health care bill.

Today, we are here to continue the business at hand, and that is to turn a new course for an energy future in this country that meets the needs and demands of the 21st century for a pro-jobs, pro-growth, pro-high-tech approach to solving our environmental challenges and our energy security issues.

H. Res. 615 provides a single rule for consideration of H.R. 3221, the New Direction For Energy Independence, National Security, and Consumer Protection Act and H.R. 2776, the Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Tax Act of 2007. This will be a single rule. The rule provides a structured rule for H.R. 3221. It provides a closed rule as is customary in tax matters on H.R. 2776.

Today's legislation is about energy independence and creating a new economy around facing directly the energy and environmental challenges before this country.

This year more than a dozen of our committees began the challenging task of drafting energy legislation that, in a wide array of jurisdictions, can challenge the growing energy crisis. I certainly commend all of the committee Chairs, all of the Members on both sides of the aisle, particularly the long-term efforts of men like Chairman DINGELL, Chairman RANGEL, Chairman WAXMAN and others who have presented to us for the consideration of the whole body this comprehensive package of energy legislation.

Early in January, as you remember, the House passed H.R. 6. That repealed nearly $14 billion that were tax breaks granted to oil companies. Those tax breaks have been granted to oil companies at a time when they had record profits of $125 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this House has made a different decision. What we have done is decided to repeal those tax cuts and invest that money instead in projects that are critical for renewable energy and energy efficiency incentives. This bill will provide long-term incentives for the development of renewable energy, and it will set the stage for a growing industry that requires investment in order to thrive.

One of the debates that we have been having is this: If we undertake the challenge of energy independence, will that harm our economy? This bill says that will promote our economy and create good jobs. We have seen across this country, in every State, entrepreneurs taking on the challenge of energy efficiency and energy efficiency in new technologies.

To give an example, in my own State of Vermont, we have a small company that began about 20 years ago, Energy Systems in Heinsberg, Vermont. They began developing technologies to help measure wind velocity for purposes of determining the feasibility of wind energy. It has emerged as one of our most prosperous businesses, creates good jobs, high-paying jobs, and it has been very beneficial to the economy of the State of Vermont, all-clean jobs, all-clean energy.

That example has been replicated across this country. This bill promotes that effort. The idea here in this legislation is very simple: If we make a commitment now to investing in our energy future, we can have that pro-growth, pro-high-tech, pro-environment economy. We can reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and we can protect our environment.

One of the potential opportunities that we have is the expansion of renewable energy development through carbon offsets. If that is going to be successful, it requires that these carbon offsets meet standards that are real, that are additional, verifiable and enforceable.

This legislation presented by the Oversight and Government Reform Committee is going to allow us to put in place that methodology to help us offset our carbon emissions and create jobs in clean energy future.

There are many other parts of this legislation, since we have had 12 committees that have been involved: the Renewable Energy Worker Training Program, to help create a workforce of green jobs; the $2.5 billion investment to help rural communities, farmers and small businesses by reducing their energy costs through efficiency; the new efficiency standards for appliances, which require more efficient lighting and promotes green buildings in the public and private sector; and, of course, we have an effort under way here in Congress to green the Capitol and offset our carbon footprint by the year 2030. That is, at this stage, a bipartisan effort reflecting the mutual commitment to use less rather than more.

□ 0930

The committee has done a very good job in crafting a bill that we can be proud to support. It doesn't do everything. The CAFE standards are not a part of this, as that continues to be a debate. Renewable electricity standards are something that the body will be able to consider in an amendment that has been made in order.

But, taken together, all of the components of this bill mark a very serious and perhaps seminal change in the approach by this Congress towards energy, moving away from our excessive dependence on fossil fuels and moving towards a self-sustaining renewable energy future.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to finishing the job that we have started here today.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for the time.

Mr. Speaker, last night, the majority on the Rules Committee passed a rule that in an extreme fashion limits debate on our national energy policy. The rule only allows for debate on 23 amendments to H.R. 3221, out of 106 amendments sought to be debated by Members of both parties in this House. And out of those 23 amendments made in order, only five are Republican amendments.

What is even more unfortunate is that in the same rule they completely shut out both Republicans and Democrats from offering any amendments to H.R. 2776. Between the two bills, Mr. Speaker, a total of 94 amendments were prohibited from being considered by this House. And to add insult to injury, the majority also denied the minority the opportunity to offer a substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refresh the majority of a campaign promise they made. The distinguished Speaker said, ''Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate, consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority a right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute.''

They promised openness. They promised bipartisanship. Some openness. Some bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in this body, I firmly believe, seeks to leave our children and grandchildren a better world in which to live. This great Nation has made great strides in protecting human health and the environment, but clearly we can do more.

From 2001 to 2006, Republican-led Congresses invested nearly $12 billion to develop cleaner, cheaper and more reliable domestic renewable energy sources. This includes sources such as cellulosic ethanol, hybrid electric vehicle technologies, hydrogen fuel cell technologies, wind and solar energy, clean coal and advanced nuclear technologies. But we must always keep in mind that alternative fuels will not eliminate the need for traditional energy sources, and, without additional supply, the tight market conditions that have put pressure on prices are going to persist.

Mr. Speaker, that is something that I must say our friends on the other side of the aisle seem to not grasp. Ignoring this lesson will result in our continued dependence on foreign supplies, using U.S. dollars to line the pockets of thugs and dictators like Chavez in Venezuela as he spreads anti-American

propaganda and actions throughout this hemisphere and the world.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, by inclusion of the production tax credit in H.R. 2776. That PTC provides a tax credit for electricity produced from renewable energy facilities. Sources such as wind, solar and biomass are included under the tax credit.

Since its enactment in 1992, the credit has encouraged the development of thousands of megawatts of clean, renewable electric generation facilities. Florida, for example, Mr. Speaker, is home to Florida Power & Light, owner and operator of two of the largest solar projects in the world and the Nation's largest wind energy company. Because of the long-term commitment to renewable energies by this Congress, companies like FPL have made significant, needed investments to advance non-emitting forms of energy, and that is the kind of work that we must continue.

Now, the majority, Mr. Speaker, promised that it would run the House in an open and bipartisan manner. If this is an open and bipartisan process, I would hate to see a closed one. Later today I fear the majority will break precedent again and come to the floor to close the open amendment process on the Department of Defense appropriations bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a difficult week for both sides of the aisle, but moving forward with restrictive rules such as this on important issues only makes matters worse. It is most unwise, as well as unfortunate.

This rule is unnecessarily unfair and should be soundly defeated.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I rise in support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule today lays the framework for a historic debate, a debate that will talk about the energy future of the United States of America, an agenda that has not been discussed out here on the House floor, although there has been a pent-up demand by the American people that we move to this new renewable energy agenda for the 21st century.

Climate change has now become a problem, not only for the United States, but for the whole world. We must be the leader.

In 1986, we imported 27 percent of our oil. Today, we import 61 percent of our oil. Today, we begin the effort to turn that around, to unleash the entrepreneurial spirit of our country, to unleash a technological revolution that can capture the solar, capture the wind, capture the cellulosic future for our country; make our country more efficient, have the devices which we use to consume energy infinitely more efficient. That is the debate that we have been missing here in America, and today we begin that debate here on the House floor.

This is what the American people want. This is what the world has been waiting for, a debate on the energy future of the United States; unleashing its technological genius, and as a result, making it possible for the rest of the world to gain access to these technologies.

This is the day, and we have to be the leaders. This rule is now constructed in a way in which we can begin the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule that is bringing this legislation to the floor today, because what we have is 768 pages of a bill, H.R. 3221, and, guess what, it doesn't do a thing about producing one drop of energy. It does not get the price down at the pump.

And that is what the American people continue to ask us, what are you going to do about high home heating bills? What are you going to do about the price at the pump? And, yes, indeed, as my esteemed colleague just said, alternatives are important. Looking to the future is important. R&D, all of that. We have to have emphasis there.

But at the same time, we have to realize production, American production and American solutions are important to this debate, and we have got 768 pages that do not put the emphasis on American production to address this.

What we do have is increased regulation. We have got a section in this bill that would put the Federal Government more into the process by which States develop and enforce their own building codes.

Regulation is not going to get us to further conservation. We know that efficiency is important. We know that conservation is important. But we also know if you overregulate and if you overtax, you are going to be killing jobs.

We know for a fact that if you get in here and you tax something more, you are going to get less of it. If you incentivize it, you are going to get more of it. The American people want to see the price down at the pump. That is not what they are going to see in this bill that is brought before us today.

Conservation and efficiency is important. It is not the total answer, and we are missing a great opportunity to incentivize American production of American fuels that will move us towards energy independence. We are not doing that with this legislation.

In the portion of this that deals with the tax, one of the things that we have seen happen here is that we have more taxes. They put cigar taxes in place. They put health insurance taxes in place.

I tell you, this new majority, if it is moving, if it is shaking, if it is waving in the wind, they are going to tax it, because they need money to pay for the programs that they are putting on the books. And it is the American taxpayer that is paying more at the pump that is watching their gas tax go up. They are watching cigarette and cigar taxes go up. When they get their statement for their health insurance, they are going to see a tax on that, because they had to find a way to pay for all these new programs.

Mr. Speaker, they are just addicted to putting a tax on everything that is moving. We are seeing the same thing take place in this lack-of-energy bill that is brought before us today.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time until the gentleman has closed for his side and has yielded back his time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I get into my comments on the substance of the rule, I want to put to rest a rumor. My good friend Mr. MARKEY is hobbling around on crutches. My good friend Chairman DINGELL is also hobbling around on crutches. It is not because of anything the Republicans have done on the Energy and Commerce Committee. We actually like each other. It is just one of those years I guess for being in the majority and the burdens of leadership, is all I can say.

We have a rule before us today on an energy bill. There is not a lot you can say positive about it except that it is a rule. It is a modified closed rule. There are some amendments made in order. There is not a substitute made in order.

Now, somewhere I have a press release from the chairwoman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished Congresswoman SLAUGHTER of New York, and I also have a press release from the distinguished Speaker, Speaker PELOSI of California, and they were talking about an open process, and when we had major bills on the floor, that it would be normal procedure for the minority to have a substitute.

So we took them at their word. DENNY HASTERT, the former Speaker, and myself and RALPH HALL, the ranking member of the Science Committee, and DON YOUNG, the ranking member of the Resources Committee, and Mr. MICA, the ranking member of the Transportation Committee, we prepared a comprehensive alternative substitute. We took it to the Rules Committee. We asked that it be made in order.

Chairman DINGELL of the Energy and Commerce Committee supported that it be made in order. The subcommittee chairman, RICK BOUCHER of the Energy and Air Quality Subcommittee, to their credit, said that it should be in order. It is not in order.

□ 0945

So you have an energy bill before you that doesn't have any energy. Nothing on coal to liquids, nothing on alternative fuels, nothing on oil and gas. There is a little bit of a cleanup section on loan guarantees for nuclear power plants, but that is kind of offset because you have to use Davis-Bacon to build them now.

So, all in all, what we have got is a big bill. Congresswoman BLACKBURN pointed it out and held it up. But it is kind of a where-is-the-energy energy bill. If they had just made our substitute in order, you would have had a chance to actually have a bipartisan coalition come together on energy.

There is a majority on the House floor on both sides of the aisle for a comprehensive energy package. We put it together in the last Congress, ''we'' being JOHN DINGELL and JOE BARTON and others. We had an energy conference report that is now law that almost all of the Republicans voted for and almost half of the Democrats. Chairman DINGELL signed the conference report, as did several other Democrats who are now chairmen and subcommittee chairmen in this Congress.

So if you want lower gasoline prices, if you want more refineries built, if you want LNG facilities sited, if you really want to see alternative fuels jump-started in this country, don't look in that bill that we are going to vote on because of this rule. We will send you a copy of the Republican substitute which isn't going to be considered, and you will find all of those things in our substitute.

I would hope that we could vote ''no'' on the rule, send it back to the Rules Committee, make in order the substitute, come out on a bipartisan fashion and actually vote on a comprehensive energy package.

What is in the bill is mandatory building codes preempting the States, something called green energy which is good in concept but which would require every building in this country by 2050 be a consumer on a net basis of zero energy, regardless of the cost; a preemption of building codes for manufactured housing which will probably put the manufactured housing business out of business in this country. And, oh, yes, if you are a small mom-and-pop air conditioner repairman, you are probably going to be put out of business, too, because there is a standards section on appliance standards which requires more efficient, which is not a bad idea in concept of air conditioning, which is probably going to be very difficult to implement and put at risk many, many of our small mom-and-pop air conditioning repair businesses in this country.

So what you have is no comprehensive energy package. Instead, you get a Federal Government, big brother, preempt the States, preempt the local governments on building codes and telling people what kind of light bulbs to use and what kind of air conditioners to use.

This is not my grandfather's energy package. Please vote ''no'' on the rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

A major component of the Democrats' energy legislation and the Democrats' answer to our energy crisis is, hold on, wait one minute, wait one minute, it is promoting the use of the bicycle. Oh, I cannot make this stuff up. Yes, the American people have heard this. Their answer to our fuel crisis, the crisis at the pumps, is: Ride a bike.

Democrats believe that using taxpayer funds in this bill to the tune of $1 million a year should be devoted to the principle of: ''Save energy, ride a bike.'' Some might argue that depending on bicycles to solve our energy crisis is naive, perhaps ridiculous. Some might even say Congress should use this energy legislation to create new energy, bring new nuclear power plants on line, use clean coal technology, energy exploration, but no, no. They want to tell the American people, stop driving, ride a bike. This is absolutely amazing.

Apparently, the Democrats believe that the miracle on two wheels that we know as a bicycle will end our dependence on foreign oil. I cannot make this stuff up. It is absolutely amazing.

Ladies and gentlemen, I bring you the Democrats, promoting 19th century solutions to 21st century problems. If you don't like it, ride a bike. If you don't like the price at the pumps, ride a bike.

Stay tuned for the next big idea for the Democrats: Improving energy efficiency by the horse and buggy.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank my friend from Florida for yielding.

I want to read one thing. ''Every person has a right to have his or her voice heard, respectful of both the wishes of the Founders and the expectations of the American people. We offer the following principles for restoring democracy in the people's House, guaranteeing that the voices of all the people are heard.'' That quote is from Speaker NANCY PELOSI; yet the Republican substitute to this bill was not allowed.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

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

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas and nays are requested. Those favoring the yeas and nays will please rise.

The Chair is counting for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is not required for an affirmative vote on a motion to adjourn.

The Chair is counting for the yeas and nays.

A sufficient number having risen, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Members will record their votes by electronic device.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Parliamentary Inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Could the Speaker tell me what the magic number was that rose in order to get a vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair's count is not subject to challenge. The Chair counted one-fifth of those present standing.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 136, nays 246, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 824]

YEAS—136

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus