

Davis (AL)	Langevin	Ross
Davis (CA)	Lantos	Rothman
Davis, Lincoln	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Lee	Rush
DeLauro	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Salazar
Dingell	Linder	Sánchez, Linda T.
Doggett	Lipinski	Sánchez, Loretta
Donnelly	LoBiondo	Sarbanes
Doyle	Loeb sack	Saxton
Drake	Lofgren, Zoe	Schakowsky
Edwards	Lowe y	Schiff
Ellison	Lynch	Schwartz
Ellsworth	Mahoney (FL)	Scott (GA)
Emanuel	Maloney (NY)	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	Markey	Serrano
Etheridge	Marshall	Sestak
Farr	Matheson	Shea-Porter
Filner	Matsui	Sherman
Forbes	McCarthy (NY)	Shuler
Fortenberry	McCollum (MN)	Skelton
Frank (MA)	McCrery	Slaughter
Giffords	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Gillibrand	McGovern	Snyder
Gillmor	McHugh	Solis
Gonzalez	McIntyre	Souder
Gordon	McNerney	Space
Green, Al	McNulty	Spratt
Green, Gene	Meehan	Stark
Grijalva	Meek (FL)	Stearns
Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)	Stupak
Hall (NY)	Melancon	Sutton
Hare	Michaud	Tanner
Harman	Miller (NC)	Tauscher
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Taylor
Herger	Mitchell	Terry
Herseth Sandlin	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)
Higgins	Moore (KS)	Thompson (MS)
Hill	Moore (WI)	Tiberi
Hinche y	Moran (KS)	Tierney
Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)	Turner
Hodes	Murphy, Patrick	Udall (CO)
Holden	Murphy, Tim	Udall (NM)
Holt	Murtha	Van Hollen
Honda	Musgrave	Velázquez
Hoyer	Napolitano	Visclosky
Hunter	Neal (MA)	Walden (OR)
Inslee	Oberstar	Walsh (NY)
Israel	Obey	Walz (MN)
Jackson (IL)	Olver	Wasserman
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Schultz
(TX)	Pallone	Waters
Jefferson	Pascrell	Watt
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Waxman
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	Weiner
Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)	Welch (VT)
Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Kagen	Petri	Wexler
Kanjorski	Pickering	Wicker
Kaptur	Platts	Wilson (OH)
Keller	Poe	Woolsey
Kennedy	Pomeroy	Wu
Kildee	Price (NC)	Wynn
Kilpatrick	Rahall	Yarmuth
Kind	Ramstad	Young (FL)
Klein (FL)	Rangel	
Kucinich	Reyes	
Lampson	Rodriguez	

NOT VOTING—18

Abercrombie	Fattah	Sires
Carson	Hirono	Sullivan
Cubin	McMorris	Towns
Davis (IL)	Rodgers	Watson
Davis, Jo Ann	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Delahunt	Moran (VA)	
Engel	Nadler	

□ 1149

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Messrs. LANTOS, BOOZMAN, KELLER of Florida, WALSH of New York, TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, SEXTON, SCHIFF, TIBERI, ANDREWS and CONYERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, as I stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: “On Rollcall vote 340, I was recorded as a ‘yes’ vote when I intended to cast a ‘no’ vote.” I wish to clarify on the RECORD my miscast vote and my strong support for the National Drug Intelligence Center located in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, right outside of the 18th Congressional District. I was pleased to support funding for the NDIC in the Intelligence authorization bills in both the 108th and 109th Congress.

I look forward to continuing my work in support of the critical intelligence work of this agency.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). The time remaining in the debate on the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) controls 4 minutes, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) controls 9½ minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I'd ask my friend from Florida how many speakers she has on her side.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I have one remaining speaker before the close, so I'll reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak against this rule. There are two provisions in this bill regarding specialty metals that will make a bad situation worse. I offered two amendments to help correct this problem but, unfortunately, the majority did not allow either of the amendments. As a result, the Democrat majority will force high quality union jobs overseas.

My amendment would have also addressed the problems with the specialty metals and the country of origin specialty metals problem.

Can you believe that today we simply exempt foreign suppliers from the specialty metals provisions. If a product containing specialty metals comes from 18 other countries like France, Germany or Canada, they simply do not have to comply.

This provision is a competitive disadvantage for American industry and American workers. And here's how it works today. Caterpillar makes diesel engines for the Army. These are very common, commercially available engines that operate in civilian construction and trucking industry all over the world. This engine is manufactured by American workers in their Greenville, South Carolina plant.

But Caterpillar also manufactures the very same engine in Belgium. Because of the world demand, Belgium is also a qualifying country. That means that if Caterpillar makes an engine for the MRAP in South Carolina, they must go through the expensive process of documenting the nation of origin of the specialty metals content of every component in the engine. Or they could simply shift the production to Belgium and avoid the process and save money. This puts American jobs at risk because of this outdated legislation, and this rule denies us the ability to protect American workers in this bill.

It's simply unconscionable that we would legislate a competitive disadvantage upon American companies and American workers. And it's even more disheartening that Congress refuses to address the unintended consequences of this decade old problem.

DOD should be leveraging the industrial might of the United States to provide the best technology for our soldiers. But we're denied that ability in this rule.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying bill. I know Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member HUNTER have worked exceptionally hard on this bipartisan measure, and I thank them for their leadership.

Our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have put great strain on our military, and this bill will reverse the decline in readiness. It adds funds for force protection programs such as mine resistant combat vehicles, IED countermeasures and body armor and a much deserved pay raise for the troops.

I'm also pleased that the measure recognizes the importance of submarines to our national security by adding \$588 million to construct a second Virginia-class submarine as early as 2009, 3 years earlier than planned. This is welcome news to the men and woman at Electric Boat in Rhode Island, as well as Groton, Connecticut, as well as our entire submarine industrial base, which is threatened by an insufficient workload. The Navy's current shipbuilding plan would have our submarine fleet drop to dangerously low levels in future years, just as other nations are increasing their naval capabilities.

I've been working exceptionally hard for 6 years to address this important national security issue, and I thank Chairman SKELTON and Seapower Chairman TAYLOR for their commitment to a robust submarine force.

This is a good bill and a good rule and, Madam Speaker, I urge its passage. And I thank my colleague for the time.

The rule before us makes in order an amendment I am offering with the gentleman from Maine, Mr. MICHAUD, that would require military pharmacies to include emergency contraception in the basic core formulary. Access

to this contraception is important to our servicewomen—particularly those who have been the victims of sexual assault—and I urge my colleagues to support our amendment.

We can show our appreciation for all the men and women who keep our Nation safe by voting for this rule and the defense authorization act.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. COLE.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and having formerly served on the Rules Committee, I'm both disappointed and disturbed by the manner in which the rule has been reported to the floor.

Let's be forthright about this, Madam Speaker. The committee authorized an enormous number of amendments. But numbers alone do not translate into meaningful policy options and good debate on the floor of this body.

Let's look at a couple of things that the committee chose not to make in order. The committee did not make in order an amendment by Mr. AKIN that addresses important concerns, including the evisceration of the Army's only modernization effort and reducing by \$367 million the Future Combat System.

The committee did not make in order many of the amendments that were necessary to address the evisceration of our Missile Defense System and that, Madam Speaker, at a time when our intelligence tells us the North Koreans and the Iranians are continuing to develop dangerous missile capability.

With respect to the underlying legislation itself, Madam Speaker, Chairman SKELTON was given an incredibly difficult job. He was not given enough money, in my opinion, enough authorizing authority to address all the needs that he faced.

Nevertheless, he and Ranking Member HUNTER and their subcommittee chairmen accomplished some important things that we should not lose sight of. One good thing that was accomplished was the increase in the end strength of both the Army and the Marine Corps, something many of us have long advocated, something the President now agrees to and something I'm glad to see underway.

Additionally, the legislation included the Wounded Warriors Act, and also included my language to create a program for pre- and post-deployment neurocognitive assessments of our servicemen. I think that was a very good thing, and I appreciate the chairman for working with us on that.

The underlying legislation also addresses depot concerns and maintenance in a way that encourages me, that increased the amount of money in depot accounts.

And finally, I was happy to see that the majority continues to recognize, as

we do, the importance of developing the non-line-of-sight cannon and remains committed to the new field increase.

With that, I still remain disappointed the rule did not allow the options.

□ 1200

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

This is a very important bill. Amongst other things it is because for the first time the Department of Defense is required to consider the effects of global warming on Defense Department facilities, capabilities, and missions. It requires that the Department of Defense in three central defense planning documents, the National Security Strategy, the National Defense Strategy, and the Quadrennial Defense Review, look at the impacts of global warming on the facilities and capabilities of the United States military.

This is a central issue. I am the chairman of the Select Committee on Global Warming. We had testifying before us General Gordon Sullivan, representing 11 three- and four-star admirals and generals who are all very concerned that this issue of global warming has major national security implications for the United States.

By including this requirement in this bill, we are beginning to focus upon the long-term needs that we have to focus on in order to protect our country and give the resources to the Department of Defense.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule, and in strong support of a provision within the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 which requires, for the first time, the Department of Defense to consider the effect of global warming on Department facilities, capabilities, and missions.

I commend Chairman SKELTON for including this important language, which will allow our armed forces to begin preparing, in a strategic, Department-wide manner, for the impact that global warming could have on our national security.

This provision requires the threat of global warming to be assessed, and guidance for military planners to be issued, in the next versions of three central defense planning documents: The National Security Strategy, The National Defense Strategy, and the Quadrennial Defense Review.

The very first hearing of the new Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming focused on the geopolitical and security consequences of our dependence on foreign energy and the looming threat of global warming. We heard from former Chief of Staff of the Army General Gordon Sullivan, who presented a report by eleven retired three- and four-star generals and admirals arguing that global warming is a grave national security threat, and must be treated as such by our defense establishment and by this Congress.

Last month, Congressman BARTLETT and I introduced the Global Climate Change Secu-

urity Oversight Act, with the intention of jump-starting our government's analysis of and preparation for the national security consequences of global warming. Our bill would require a National Intelligence Estimate on the impact of global warming, and last week exactly such an NIE was mandated by the Intelligence Authorization bill. Our bill also encourages the Department of Defense to integrate into our defense planning the threats posed by global warming, and I am very pleased that this priority is being mandated in this year's Defense Authorization Act.

Thinking about global warming as a national security issue is new for many Members, but with the speed that the major provisions of the Global Climate Change Security Oversight Act have been adopted by this House, I feel confident that the Congress is making progress in broadening how we think about global warming. It is crucial for the national security of this country that the Congress continue along this path. We must push our defense and intelligence communities to address this threat, and we must offer, debate, and implement solutions to the underlying problem.

I am also pleased to support and cosponsor an amendment that will be offered during debate on this bill by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, which would require the use of high efficiency light bulb in Department of Defense buildings when new bulbs are installed or old bulbs are replaced. This amendment will help lower energy consumption in Defense Department facilities, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, help promote energy independence, and result in millions of dollars of savings for the American taxpayer—all without impeding the operations of the U.S. military.

I urge adoption of the Rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I rise today in strong opposition to this rule, and there is one very good reason. Partisanship has reached an unconscionable level in this House.

Just for the simple fact that I am in the minority party, the Rules Committee did not allow an amendment which would have given a 9-year-old child from my district access to the death gratuity that her mother wanted her to have when she was killed in Iraq, just for partisan reasons.

Susan Jaenke, the mother of Jaimie Jaenke, who was killed in Iraq, along with her granddaughter, Kayla, came to Washington at great expense and trouble and testified before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee. There was broad bipartisan support for an amendment that would simply allow access to the death gratuity of Jaimie Jaenke by her daughter.

This is outrageous, the fact that you would deny a 9-year-old child access. Her grandparents don't have the money to raise this child. She has no spouse. It would not cost a dime. It is the right thing to do. In the committee, on a bipartisan basis, people said they would do anything possible to help in this situation. I brought this before the Rules

Committee and explained what is going on, how this child is denied access to funding so that she can have a decent life; and it was denied simply for partisan reasons. I would think you would be ashamed.

And this is not just a single case. There are at least 143 cases exactly like this. And to deny a child access to this benefit is simply outrageous.

Vote against this outrageous rule.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule.

The authorizing committee saw fit to include some 680 earmarks that we got news of just yesterday in the bill. Yet I offered four amendments to debate these earmarks and wasn't allowed any of them.

If they can allow 680 earmarks at the last minute in a bill, you would think that the Rules Committee could have seen fit to at least allow debate on a few of them.

The earmarks include \$5 million for Diminishing Manufacturing Sources for Automation Alley in Troy, Michigan; \$2 million for the Physician Order Entry Initiative for Mission Hospitals, which is a private hospital in Asheville, North Carolina, and keep in mind this is a Defense authorization bill here; \$10 million for Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, a former naval shipyard being economically revitalized with taxpayer dollars, defense dollars, for the city of San Francisco; and \$500,000 for Rapid Identification of Technology Sources for the San Diego East County Economic Development Council.

Our role here should be to ensure that our Defense dollars are spent on defense, not economic revitalization, not nondefense private ventures. That is why these amendments were offered. Unfortunately, the only shot we might have at checking these amendments is in the appropriations process. By the time we get there, the Members will say these projects were authorized, implying that there was some sort of scrutiny given when there surely has not been.

So, unfortunately, we cannot support this rule. It doesn't allow debate on any of the 680 earmarks in the bill.

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

Madam Speaker, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so that I can amend section 2(c) of this rule after "shall not be subject to amendment" and insert "(except the amendment numbered 43 in the report, to be offered by Representative MICHAUD of Maine, or his designee)."

By defeating the previous question, Members will be able to offer amendments to the Michaud amendment, and

a full and wide range of views can be discussed. Those rules were denied because we were not allowed to offer secondary amendments, at least, to the Rules Committee.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

To my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, I thank you for your diligence and hard work. Great thanks also to the professional staff of the Armed Services Committee. And I think we all must salute the great leadership of Chairman IKE SKELTON, who produced a bipartisan product that passed that committee 58-0.

Madam Speaker, I urge this Congress to chart a new direction today for a stronger and safer America. We will improve the readiness of our Armed Forces, including the National Guard and Reserves. We will put a stop on the blank check given to the White House by previous Congresses for the war in Iraq and, instead, require greater accountability for operations and contracting in the region. We will drive more strategic decisions and investments to better protect our national security.

With that, Madam Speaker, 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. 403 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

In section 2(c) after "shall not be subject to amendment" insert "(except the amendment numbered 43 in the report, to be offered by Representative Michaud of Maine, or his designee)".

(Pretty much the same as what Mr. Sessions offered last night)

(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 be-

fore the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

Ms. CASTOR. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 351]

YEAS—225

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

NAYS—198

Aderholt Bono Castle
 Akin Boozman Chabot
 Alexander Boustany Coble
 Bachmann Brady (TX) Cole (OK)
 Bachus Brown (SC) Conaway
 Baker Brown-Waite, Cramer
 Barrett (SC) Ginny Crenshaw
 Barrow Buchanan Culberson
 Bartlett (MD) Burgess Davis (KY)
 Barton (TX) Burton (IN) Davis, David
 Biggert Buyer Davis, Tom
 Bilbray Calvert Deal (GA)
 Bilirakis Camp (MI) Dent
 Bishop (UT) Campbell (CA) Diaz-Balart, L.
 Blackburn Cannon Diaz-Balart, M.
 Blunt Cantor Doolittle
 Boehner Capito Drake
 Bonner Carter Dreier

Duncan Kline (MN) Reichert
 Ehlers Knollenberg Renzi
 Emerson Kuhl (NY) Reynolds
 English (PA) LaHood Rogers (AL)
 Everett Lamborn Rogers (KY)
 Fallon Latham Rogers (MI)
 Feeney LaTourette Rohrabacher
 Ferguson Lewis (CA) Ros-Lehtinen
 Flake Lewis (KY) Roskam
 Forbes Linder Royce
 Fortenberry LoBiondo Ryan (WI)
 Fossella Lucas Sali
 Foxx Lungren, Daniel Saxton
 Franks (AZ) E. Schmidt
 Frelinghuysen Mack Sensenbrenner
 Gallegly Manullo Sessions
 Garrett (NJ) Marchant Shadegg
 Gerlach McCarthy (CA) Shays
 Gilchrist McCaul (TX) Shimkus
 Gillmor McCotter Shuster
 Gingrey McCrery Simpson
 Gohmert McHenry Smith (NE)
 Goode McHugh Smith (NJ)
 Goodlatte McKeon Smith (TX)
 Granger Mica Souder
 Graves Miller (MI) Stearns
 Hall (TX) Miller, Gary Sullivan
 Hastert Moran (KS) Tancredo
 Hastings (WA) Musgrave Terry
 Hayes Myrick Thornberry
 Heller Neugebauer Tiahrt
 Hensarling Nunes Tiberi
 Herger Paul Turner
 Hobson Pearce Upton
 Hoekstra Pence Walberg
 Hulshof Peterson (PA) Walden (OR)
 Hunter Petri Walsh (NY)
 Inglis (SC) Pickering Wamp
 Issa Pitts Weldon (FL)
 Jindal Platts Weller
 Johnson (IL) Poe Westmoreland
 Johnson, Sam Porter Whitfield
 Jones (NC) Price (GA) Wicker
 Jordan Pryce (OH) Wilson (NM)
 Keller Putnam Wilson (SC)
 King (IA) Radanovich Wolf
 King (NY) Ramstad Young (AK)
 Kingston Regula Young (FL)
 Kirk Rehberg

NOT VOTING—9

Cubin Fattah Nadler
 Davis, Jo Ann McMorris Sires
 Delahunt Rodgers
 Engel Miller (FL)

□ 1232

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

Mr. BAIRD changed his 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. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

[Roll No. 352]

YEAS—229

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

Costa Kanjorski Rahall
 Costello Kaptur Rangel
 Courtney Kennedy Reyes
 Cramer Kildee Rodriguez
 Crowley Kilpatrick Ross
 Cuellar Kind Rothman
 Cummings Klein (FL) Royal-Allard
 Davis (AL) Kucinich Ruppberger
 Davis (CA) Lampson Rush
 Davis (IL) Langevin Ryan (OH)
 Davis, Lincoln Lantos Salazar
 Davis, Tom Larsen (WA) Sanchez, Linda
 DeFazio Larson (CT) T.
 DeGette Lee Sanchez, Loretta
 DeLauro Levin Sarbanes
 Dicks Lewis (GA) Schakowsky
 Dingell Lipinski Schiff
 Doggett Loeb sack Schwartz
 Donnelly Lofgren, Zoe Scott (VA)
 Doyle Lowey Scott (GA)
 Edwards Lynch Serrano
 Ellison Mahoney (FL) Sestak
 Ellsworth Maloney (NY) Shea-Porter
 Emanuel Markey Sherman
 Eshoo Marshall Shuler
 Etheridge Matheson Skelton
 Farr Matsui Slaughter
 Filner Frank (MA) McCollum (MN) Smith (WA)
 Giffords Giffords McDermott Snyder
 Gillibrand Gillibrand McGovern Solis
 Gonzalez Gonzalez McIntyre Space
 Gordon Gordon McNerney Spratt
 Green, Al Green, Al McNulty Stark
 Green, Gene Meehan Stupak
 Grijalva Meek (FL) Sutton
 Gutierrez Gutierrez Meeks (NY) Tanner
 Hall (NY) Hall (NY) Melancon Tauscher
 Hare Hare Michaud Taylor
 Harman Harman Miller (NC) Thompson (CA)
 Hastings (FL) Hastings (FL) Miller, George Thompson (MS)
 Herseth Sandlin Herseth Sandlin Mitchell Tierney
 Higgins Mollohan Moore (KS) Towns
 Hill Hill Moore (KS) Udall (CO)
 Hinchey Hinchey Moore (WI) Udall (NM)
 Hinojosa Hinojosa Moran (VA) Van Hollen
 Hirono Hirono Moran (VA) Van Hollen
 Hodes Hodes Murphy (CT) Velázquez
 Holden Holden Murphy, Patrick Visclosky
 Holt Holt Murtha Walz (MN)
 Honda Honda Napolitano Wasserman
 Hooley Hooley Neal (MA) Schultz
 Hoyer Hoyer Oberstar Waters
 Inslee Inslee Obey Watson
 Israel Israel Olver Watt
 Jackson (IL) Jackson (IL) Ortiz Waxman
 Jackson-Lee Jackson-Lee (TX) Pallone Weiner
 Jefferson Jefferson Pallone Welch (VT)
 Johnson (GA) Johnson (GA) Pastor Wexler
 Johnson, E. B. Johnson, E. B. Payne Wilson (OH)
 Jones (NC) Jones (NC) Perlmutter Woolsey
 Jones (OH) Jones (OH) Pomeroy Wu
 Kagen Kagen Price (NC) Yarmuth

NAYS—194

Aderholt Capito Gallegly
 Akin Carter Garrett (NJ)
 Alexander Castle Gerlach
 Bachmann Chabot Gilchrist
 Bachus Coble Gillmor
 Baker Cole (OK) Gingrey
 Barrett (SC) Conaway Gohmert
 Bartlett (MD) Crenshaw Goode
 Barton (TX) Culberson Goodlatte
 Biggert Davis (KY) Granger
 Bilbray Davis, David Graves
 Bilirakis Deal (GA) Hall (TX)
 Bishop (UT) Dent Hastert
 Blackburn Diaz-Balart, L. Hastings (WA)
 Blunt Diaz-Balart, M. Hayes
 Boehner Doolittle Heller
 Bonner Drake Hensarling
 Bono Dreier Herger
 Boozman Duncan Hobson
 Boustany Ehlers Hoekstra
 Brady (TX) Brady (TX) Emerson Hulshof
 Brown (SC) Brown (SC) English (PA) Hunter
 Brown-Waite, Brown-Waite, Everett Inglis (SC)
 Ginny Ginny Fallon Issa
 Buchanan Buchanan Feeney Jindal
 Burgess Burgess Ferguson Johnson (IL)
 Burton (IN) Burton (IN) Flake Johnson, Sam
 Buyer Buyer Forbes Jordan
 Calvert Calvert Fortenberry Keller
 Camp (MI) Camp (MI) King (IA)
 Campbell (CA) Campbell (CA) Fossella King (NY)
 Cannon Cannon Foxx Kingston
 Cantor Cantor Franks (AZ) Kirk
 Frelinghuysen Frelinghuysen

Kline (MN) Pearce
Knollenberg Pence
Kuhl (NY) Peterson (PA)
LaHood Petri
Lamborn Pickering
Latham Pitts
LaTourette Platts
Lewis (CA) Poe
Lewis (KY) Porter
Linder Price (GA)
LoBiondo Pryce (OH)
Lucas Putnam
Lungren, Daniel Radanovich
E. Ramstad
Mack Regula
Manzullo Rehberg
Marchant Reichert
McCarthy (CA) Renzi
McCaul (TX) Reynolds
McCotter Rogers (AL)
McCrery Rogers (KY)
McHenry Rogers (MI)
McHugh Rohrabacher
McKeon Ros-Lehtinen
Mica Roskam
Miller (MI) Royce
Miller, Gary Ryan (WI)
Moran (KS) Sali
Musgrave Saxton
Myrick Schmidt
Neugebauer Sensenbrenner
Nunes Sessions
Paul Shadegg

Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancred
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Goodlatte
Granger
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Hobson
Brady (TX)
Hulshof
Ginny
Buchanan

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 157, nays 245, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]
YEAS—157

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Goodlatte
Granger
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Hobson
Brady (TX)
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul

Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Shea-Porter
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh

McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Shea-Porter
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh

NOT VOTING—30
Calvert
Capito
Coble
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Delahunt
Engel
Hill
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marshall
McMorris
Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler
Pascrell
Paul

NOT VOTING—9
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Delahunt
Engel

□ 1241

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.

PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that votes in series be reduced to 2 minutes.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I object. The minority has not cleared this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, because the amendment to equalize benefits for wounded Guardsmen and Reservists with the regular Army was rejected by the Rules Committee yesterday, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:
Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

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

NAYS—245

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Allmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filmer
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 21, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. SPRATT submitted the following conference report and statement on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) revising the congressional budget for fiscal year 2007, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008,

Mr. RANGEL and Mr. McNERNEY changed their vote from ‘yea’ to ‘nay.’

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 353, had I been present, I would have voted ‘nay.’

□ 1300