

and move forward and do what the voters and those who elected us to do, we have seen that there has been continuing obstructionist tactics.

The State-Foreign Ops appropriations bill gets to the heart of our national security interests, and it is one of the most important appropriations bills we consider each year. This bill has no place for obstructionism and partisan politics. That has to stop at the water's edge. We simply cannot risk the people's business coming to a screeching halt on such a critical national security measure.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of this institution, we must put aside our political differences and find the common ground. But until that time, we must also do what's necessary to continue doing the people's business and ensure that nothing stands in the way of providing for the safety and security of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, the State-Foreign Ops Appropriations bill funds the United States' diplomatic and development priorities. It is a cornerstone of our national security. It is critical that we send a strong, united message to the world about the United States' foreign policy commitments, about our priorities, about supporting this bill with overwhelming bipartisan support today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this rule and on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 617 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

Strike the resolved clause and all that follows and insert the following:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 3081) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. 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 one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, 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.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CARDOZA. 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. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. 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.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on January 20, 2009, Barack Obama was inaugurated as President of the United States, and the outstanding public debt of the United States stood at \$10.627 trillion;

Whereas on January 20, 2009, in the President's Inaugural Address, he stated, "[T]hose of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account, to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day, because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government.";

Whereas on February 17, 2009, the President signed into public law H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009;

Whereas the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 included \$575 billion of new spending and \$212 billion of revenue reductions for a total deficit impact of \$787 billion;

Whereas the borrowing necessary to finance the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 will cost an additional \$300 billion;

Whereas on February 26, 2009, the President unveiled his budget blueprint for FY 2010;

Whereas the President's budget for FY 2010 proposes the eleven highest annual deficits in U.S. history;

Whereas the President's budget for FY 2010 proposes to increase the national debt to \$23.1 trillion by FY 2019, more than doubling it from current levels;

Whereas on March 11, 2009, the President signed into public law H.R. 1105, the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009;

Whereas the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 constitutes nine of the twelve appropriations bills for FY 2009 which had not been enacted before the start of the fiscal year;

Whereas the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 spends \$19.1 billion more than the request of President Bush;

Whereas the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 spends \$19.0 billion more than simply extending the continuing resolution for FY 2009;

Whereas on April 1, 2009, the House considered H. Con. Res. 85, Congressional Democrats' budget proposal for FY 2010;

Whereas the Congressional Democrats' budget proposal for FY 2010, H. Con. Res. 85, proposes the six highest annual deficits in U.S. history;

Whereas the Congressional Democrats' budget proposal for FY 2010, H. Con. Res. 85, proposes to increase the national debt to

\$17.1 trillion over five years, \$5.3 trillion more than compared to the level on January 20, 2009;

Whereas Congressional Republicans produced an alternative budget proposal for FY 2010 which spends \$4.8 trillion less than the Congressional Democrats' budget over 10 years;

Whereas the Republican Study Committee produced an alternative budget proposal for FY 2010 which improves the budget outlook in every single year, balances the budget by FY 2019, and cuts the national debt by more than \$6 trillion compared to the President's budget;

Whereas on April 20, 2009, attempting to respond to public criticism, the President convened the first cabinet meeting of his Administration and challenged his cabinet to cut a collective \$100 million in the next 90 days;

Whereas the challenge to cut a collective \$100 million represents just 1/40,000 of the Federal budget;

Whereas on June 16, 2009, total outstanding Troubled Asset Relief Program, or TARP, funds to banks stood at \$197.6 billion;

Whereas on June 16, 2009, total outstanding TARP funds to AIG stood at \$69.8 billion;

Whereas on June 16, 2009, total outstanding TARP funds to domestic automotive manufacturers and their finance units stood at \$80 billion;

Whereas on June 19, 2009, the outstanding public debt of the United States was \$11.409 trillion;

Whereas on June 19, 2009, each citizen's share of the outstanding public debt of the United States came to \$37,236.88;

Whereas according to a New York Times/CBS News survey, three-fifths of Americans (60 percent) do not think the President has developed a clear plan for dealing with the current budget deficit (New York Times/CBS News, Conducted June 12-16, 2009, Survey of 895 Adults Nationwide);

Whereas the best means to develop a clear plan for dealing with runaway Federal spending is a real commitment to fiscal restraint and an open and transparent appropriations process in the House of Representatives;

Whereas before assuming control of the House of Representatives in January 2007, Congressional Democrats were committed to an open and transparent appropriations process;

Whereas according to a document by Congressional Democrats entitled "Democratic Declaration: Honest Leadership and Open Government," page 2 states, "Our goal is to restore accountability, honesty and openness at all levels of government.";

Whereas according to a document by Congressional Democrats entitled "A New Direction for America," page 29 states, "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 its alternatives, including a substitute.";

Whereas on November 21, 2006, The San Francisco Chronicle reported, "Speaker Pelosi pledged to restore 'minority rights'—including the right of Republicans to offer amendments to bills on the floor . . . The principle of civility and respect for minority participation in this House is something that we promised the American people, she said. 'It's the right thing to do.'" ("Pelosi's All Smiles through a Rough House Transition," The San Francisco Chronicle, November 21, 2006);

Whereas on December 6, 2006, Speaker Nancy Pelosi stated, "[We] promised the American people that we would have the most honest and open government and we will.";

Whereas on December 17, 2006, The Washington Post reported, "After a decade of bitter partisanship that has all but crippled efforts to deal with major national problems, Pelosi is determined to try to return the House to what it was in an earlier era—'where you debated ideas and listened to each others arguments.'" ("Pelosi's House Diplomacy," The Washington Post, December 17, 2006);

Whereas on December 5, 2006, Majority Leader Steny Hoyer stated, "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." ("Hoyer Says Dems' Plans Unruffled by Approps Logjam," CongressDaily PM, December 5, 2006);

Whereas during debate on June 14, 2005, in the Congressional Record on page H4410, Chairwoman Louise M. Slaughter of the House Rules Committee stated, "If we want to foster democracy in this body, we should take the time and thoughtfulness to debate all major legislation under an open rule, not just appropriations bills, which are already restricted. An open process should be the norm and not the exception.";

Whereas since January 2007, there has been a failure to commit to an open and transparent process in the House of Representatives;

Whereas more bills were considered under closed rules, 64 total, in the 110th Congress under Democratic control, than in the previous Congress, 49, under Republican control;

Whereas fewer bills were considered under open rules, 10 total, in the 110th Congress under Democratic control, than in the previous Congress, 22, under Republican control;

Whereas fewer amendments were allowed per bill, 7.68, in the 110th Congress under Democratic control, than in the previous Congress, 9.22, under Republican control;

Whereas the failure to commit to an open and transparent process in order to develop a clear plan for dealing with runaway Federal spending reached its pinnacle in the House's handling of H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 contains \$64.4 billion in discretionary spending, 11.6 percent more than enacted in FY 2009;

Whereas on June 11, 2009, the House Rules Committee issued an announcement stating that amendments for H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 must be pre-printed in the Congressional Record by the close of business on June 15, 2009;

Whereas both Republicans and Democrats filed 127 amendments in the Congressional Record for consideration on the House floor;

Whereas on June 15, 2009, the House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 544, a rule with a pre-printing requirement and unlimited pro forma amendments for purposes of debate;

Whereas on June 16, 2009, the House proceeded with one hour of general debate, or one minute to vet each \$1.07 billion in H.R. 2847, in the Committee of the Whole;

Whereas after one hour of general debate the House proceeded with amendment debate;

Whereas after just 22 minutes of amendment debate, or one minute to vet each \$3.02 billion in H.R. 2847, a motion that the Committee rise was offered by Congressional Democrats;

Whereas the House agreed on a motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 179 Ayes to 124 Noes, with all votes in the affirmative being cast by Democrats;

Whereas afterwards, the House Rules Committee convened a special, untelevised meeting to dispense with further proceedings on H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas on June 17, 2009, the House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 552, a new and restrictive structured rule for H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas every House Republican and 27 House Democrats voted against agreeing on H. Res. 552;

Whereas H. Res. 552 made in order just 23 amendments, with a possibility for 10 more amendments, out of the 127 amendments originally filed;

Whereas H. Res. 552 severely curtailed pro forma amendments for the purposes of debate;

Whereas the actions of Congressional Democrats to curtail debate and the number of amendments offered to H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 effectively ended the process to deal with runaway Federal spending in a positive and responsible manner;

Whereas Congressional Democrats continue to curtail debate and the number of amendments offered to appropriations bills;

Whereas on June 18, 2009, the House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 559, a restrictive structured rule for H.R. 2918, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas H. Res. 559 made in order just one amendment out of the 20 amendments originally filed;

Whereas on June 23, 2009, the House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 573, a restrictive structured rule for H.R. 2892, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas H. Res. 573 made in order just 9 amendments, with a possibility for 5 more amendments, out of the 91 amendments originally filed;

Whereas on June 24, 2009, the House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 578, a restrictive structured rule for H.R. 2896, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas H. Res. 578 made in order just 8 amendments, with a possibility for 5 more amendments, out of the 105 amendments originally filed; and

Whereas the actions taken have resulted in indignity being visited upon the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives recommit itself to fiscal restraint and develop a clear plan for dealing with runaway Federal spending;

(2) the House of Representatives return to its best traditions of an open and transparent appropriations process without a pre-printing requirement; and

(3) the House Rules Committee shall report out open rules for all general appropriations bills throughout the remainder of the 111th Congress.

□ 1400

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to present argument on why the resolution is privileged for immediate consideration?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, rule IX regarding questions of the

privilege of the House states that questions of privilege shall be first those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings. The integrity of its proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, the unprecedented actions that have been taken by the Democrats in charge have disenfranchised every single Member of this House. Appropriations bills have been, by tradition and previously by rule, brought to the floor under what's called an "open rule," which means that every single Member of the House has an opportunity to affect the bill, to represent his or her constituents.

Each of us represents basically the same number of folks, 650,000, 675,000. When Members are not allowed to bring amendments to the floor on the spending of their constituents' tax money, that disenfranchises those Members. That is an affront to the House. It presents an indignity to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the closed rule that was passed recently, yesterday, resulted in more closed rules on appropriations bills in this House of Representatives by this leadership, by these Democrats in charge, more than any in the history, not of this decade, not of this century, but in the history of this Republic. Mr. Speaker, in the history of this Republic.

Now, I know my friend from California says that this is not the way we want things to operate, but, Mr. Speaker, they control the process. They control the process. They control this tyranny. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed tyranny. It's tyranny by the majority. It's what de Tocqueville warned about over 150 years ago when he said that the majority can indeed shut down the rights of the minority. And that's exactly what is happening, which is why this resolution ought to be a privileged resolution, because what it directs the Rules Committee to do is to return to regular order; return to a process that allows each and every one of us to represent our constituents; return to a process that Mr. OBEY, then in the minority on the Appropriations Committee, said, "We have gotten so far from the regular order that I fear that if this continues, the House will not have the capacity to return to the precedents and procedures of the House that have given true meaning to the term 'representative democracy.' The reason we have stuck to regular order as long as we have in this Institution is to protect the rights of every Member to participate. And when we lose those rights, we lose the right to be called the greatest deliberative body in the world."

Mr. Speaker, the tyranny of this majority, the tyranny of the folks in charge right now, have resulted in an affront on this House. Those actions, these actions have clearly violated the integrity of our proceedings. Therefore, I believe that this resolution qualifies as a privileged resolution of this House.

I yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

In evaluating the resolution offered by the gentleman from Georgia under the standards of rule IX, the Chair must be mindful of a fundamental principle illuminated by annotations of precedent in section 706 of the House Rules and Manual. That basic principle is that a question of the privileges of the House may not be invoked to prescribe a special order of business for the House.

The Chair finds that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Georgia, by directing the Committee on Rules to report a certain kind of resolution, proposes a special order of business. Under a long and well-settled line of precedent presently culminating in the ruling of June 25, 2009, such a resolution cannot qualify as a question of the privileges of the House.

The Chair therefore holds that the resolution is not privileged under rule IX for consideration ahead of other business. Instead, the resolution may be submitted through the hopper in the regular course.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the appeal of the ruling of the Chair be laid on the table.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on tabling the appeal of the ruling of the Chair will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

ordering the previous question on H. Res. 617;

adopting H. Res. 617, if ordered; suspending the rules and adopting House Concurrent Resolution 127, if ordered; and

suspending the rules and adopting House Concurrent Resolution 131, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 179, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]

AYES—240

Abercrombie	Becerra	Boyd
Ackerman	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Adler (NJ)	Berman	Brale (IA)
Altmire	Berry	Bright
Andrews	Bishop (GA)	Brown, Corrine
Arcuri	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Baca	Blumenauer	Capps
Baird	Bocciari	Capuano
Baldwin	Boren	Cardoza
Barrow	Boswell	Carnahan
Bean	Boucher	Carney

Carson (IN)	Israel	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Perriello
Chandler	Jackson-Lee	Peterson
Childers	(TX)	Pingree (ME)
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Polis (CO)
Clay	Kagen	Pomeroy
Cleaver	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Kaptur	Quigley
Cohen	Kennedy	Rahall
Connolly (VA)	Kildee	Reyes
Conyers	Kilpatrick (MI)	Richardson
Cooper	Kilroy	Rodriguez
Costa	Kind	Ross
Costello	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rothman (NJ)
Courtney	Kissell	Royal-Allard
Crowley	Klein (FL)	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Kosmas	Rush
Cummings	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Dahlkemper	Langevin	Salazar
Davis (AL)	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	T.
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (TN)	Levin	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Schauer
DeGette	Lipinski	Schiff
Delahunt	Loeb sack	Schrader
Dicks	Lofgren, Zoe	Schwartz
Dingell	Lowey	Scott (GA)
Doggett	Lujan	Scott (VA)
Donnelly (IN)	Lynch	Serrano
Doyle	Maffei	Sestak
Driehaus	Maloney	Shea-Porter
Edwards (MD)	Markey (CO)	Sherman
Edwards (TX)	Markey (MA)	Shuler
Ellison	Marshall	Sires
Ellsworth	Massa	Skelton
Engel	Matheson	Slaughter
Eshoo	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Etheridge	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder
Farr	McColum	Space
Fattah	McDermott	Speier
Filner	McGovern	Spratt
Frank (MA)	McIntyre	Stark
Giffords	McMahon	Stupak
Gonzalez	McNerney	Sutton
Grayson	Meek (FL)	Tanner
Green, Al	Meeks (NY)	Teague
Green, Gene	Melancon	Thompson (CA)
Griffith	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Tierney
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Titus
Hall (NY)	Minnick	Tonko
Halvorson	Mitchell	Towns
Hare	Mollohan	Tsongas
Harman	Moore (KS)	Van Hollen
Hastings (FL)	Moore (WI)	Velázquez
Heinrich	Murphy (CT)	Visclosky
Herseth Sandlin	Murphy, Patrick	Walz
Higgins	Murtha	Wasserman
Hill	Nadler (NY)	Schultz
Himes	Napolitano	Waters
Hinchev	Neal (MA)	Watson
Hinojosa	Oberstar	Watt
Hirono	Obe y	Weiner
Hodes	Olver	Welch
Holden	Ortiz	Wexler
Holt	Pallone	Wilson (OH)
Honda	Pascrell	Wu
Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)	Yarmuth
Inslee	Payne	

NOES—179

Aderholt	Burton (IN)	Fallin
Akin	Buyer	Flake
Alexander	Calvert	Fleming
Austria	Camp	Forbes
Bachmann	Campbell	Fortenberry
Bachus	Cantor	Foster
Barrett (SC)	Cao	Foxx
Bartlett	Capito	Franks (AZ)
Barton (TX)	Carter	Frelinghuysen
Biggart	Cassidy	Gallegly
Bilbray	Castle	Garrett (NJ)
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Gerlach
Bishop (UT)	Coble	Gingrey (GA)
Blackburn	Coffman (CO)	Gohmert
Blunt	Cole	Goodlatte
Boehmer	Conaway	Graves
Bonner	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Bono Mack	Culberson	Hall (TX)
Boozman	Davis (KY)	Harper
Boustany	Deal (GA)	Hastings (WA)
Brady (TX)	Dent	Heller
Brown (GA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hensarling
Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Herger
Brown-Waite,	Dreier	Hoeksra
Ginny	Duncan	Hunter
Buchanan	Ehlers	Inglis
Burgess	Emerson	Issa

Jenkins	McKeon	Roskam	Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter	Jenkins	McKeon	Roskam
Johnson (IL)	McMorris	Royce	Blumenauer	Hodes	Perriello	Johnson (IL)	McMorris	Royce
Johnson, Sam	Rodgers	Ryan (WI)	Boccieri	Holt	Peters	Johnson, Sam	Rodgers	Ryan (WI)
Jones	Mica	Scalise	Boren	Hoyer	Peterson	Jones	Melancon	Scalise
Jordan (OH)	Miller (FL)	Schmidt	Boswell	Inslee	Pingree (ME)	Jordan (OH)	Mica	Schmidt
King (IA)	Miller (MI)	Schock	Boucher	Israel	Polis (CO)	King (IA)	Miller (FL)	Schock
King (NY)	Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner	Boyd	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)	King (NY)	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Kingston	Moran (KS)	Sessions	Brady (PA)	Jackson-Lee	Quigley	Kingston	Miller, Gary	Sessions
Kirk	Murphy, Tim	Shadegg	Braley (IA)	(TX)	Reyes	Kirk	Minnick	Shimkus
Kline (MN)	Myrick	Shimkus	Brown, Corrine	Johnson (GA)	Richardson	Kline (MN)	Mitchell	Shuler
Kratovil	Neugebauer	Shuster	Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez	Kratovil	Moran (KS)	Shuster
Lamborn	Nunes	Simpson	Capuano	Kaptur	Ross	Lamborn	Murphy, Tim	Simpson
Lance	Nye	Smith (NE)	Carnahan	Kennedy	Rothman (NJ)	Lance	Myrick	Simpson
Latham	Olson	Smith (TX)	Carney	Kildee	Roybal-Allard	Latham	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
LaTourette	Paul	Souder	Carson (IN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ruppersberger	LaTourette	Nunes	Smith (NJ)
Latta	Paulsen	Stearns	Castor (FL)	Kilroy	Rush	Latta	Olson	Smith (TX)
Lee (NY)	Pence	Sullivan	Chandler	Kind	Ryan (OH)	Lee (NY)	Paul	Souder
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Terry	Clarke	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Sánchez, Linda	Lewis (CA)	Paulsen	Stearns
Linder	Pitts	Thompson (PA)	Clay	Kissell	T.	Linder	Pence	Stupak
LoBiondo	Platts	Thornberry	Clyburn	Klein (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Lipinski	Petri	Sullivan
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Tiahrt	Cohen	Kosmas	Sarbanes	LoBiondo	Pitts	Terry
Luetkemeyer	Posey	Tiberi	Connolly (VA)	Kucinich	Schakowsky	Lucas	Platts	Terry
Lummis	Price (GA)	Turner	Conyers	Langevin	Schauer	Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Thornberry
Lungren, Daniel	Putnam	Upton	Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Schiff	Lummis	Posey	Tiahrt
E.	Radanovich	Walden	Costello	Larson (CT)	Schrader	Lungren, Daniel	Price (GA)	Tiberi
Mack	Rehberg	Wamp	Levin	Lee (CA)	Schwartz	E.	Putnam	Turner
Manzullo	Reichert	Westmoreland	Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Scott (GA)	Mack	Radanovich	Upton
Marchant	Roe (TN)	Whitfield	Cuellar	Loeback	Scott (VA)	Manzullo	Rahall	Walden
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)	Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano	Marchant	Rehberg	Wamp
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Wittman	Dahlkemper	Lowe	Sestak	McCarthy (CA)	Reichert	Westmoreland
McClintock	Rogers (MI)	Wolf	Davis (AL)	Lujan	Shea-Porter	McCaul	Roe (TN)	Whitfield
McCotter	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)	Davis (CA)	Lynch	Sherman	McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
McHenry	Rooney	Young (FL)	Davis (IL)	Maffei	Sires	McCotter	Rogers (KY)	Wittman
McHugh	Ros-Lehtinen		Davis (TN)	Maloney	Skelton	McHenry	Rohrabacher	Wolf
			DeFazio	Markey (CO)	Slaughter	McHugh	Rooney	Young (AK)
			DeGette	Markey (MA)	Smith (WA)	McIntyre	Ros-Lehtinen	
			Delahunt	Marshall				
			Dingell	Massa				
			Doggett	Matheson				
			Doyle	Matsui				
			Edwards (MD)	McCarthy (NY)				
			Edwards (TX)	McCollum				
			Ellsworth	McDermott				
			Engel	McGovern				
			Etheridge	McMahon				
			Farr	McNerney				
			Fattah	Meek (FL)				
			Filner	Meeke (NY)				
			Foster	Michaud				
			Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)				
			Giffords	Mollohan				
			Gonzalez	Moore (KS)				
			Gordon (TN)	Moore (WI)				
			Grayson	Moran (VA)				
			Green, Al	Murphy (CT)				
			Green, Gene	Murphy, Patrick				
			Grijalva	Murtha				
			Gutierrez	Nadler (NY)				
			Hall (NY)	Neal (MA)				
			Halvorson	Nye				
			Hare	Oberstar				
			Harman	Obey				
			Hastings (FL)	Olver				
			Heinrich	Ortiz				
			Herseth Sandlin	Pallone				
			Higgins	Pascrell				
			Himes	Pastor (AZ)				
			Hinchee	Payne				

NOT VOTING—13

DeLauro	Moran (VA)	Taylor
Fudge	Murphy (NY)	Waxman
Gordon (TN)	Rangel	Woolsey
Granger	Schakowsky	
Johnson (GA)	Smith (NJ)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1432

Messrs. LUETKEMEYER and LEWIS of California changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. KUCINICH and BERMAN and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to table 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. 3081, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 617 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 217, nays 187, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

YEAS—217

Abercrombie	Baca	Becerra
Ackerman	Baird	Berkley
Altmire	Baldwin	Berman
Andrews	Barrow	Berry
Arcuri	Bean	Bishop (GA)

NAYS—187

Akin	Calvert	Flake
Alexander	Camp	Fleming
Austria	Campbell	Forbes
Bachmann	Cao	Fortenberry
Bachus	Capito	Fox
Barrett (SC)	Carter	Franks (AZ)
Bartlett	Cassidy	Frelinghuysen
Barton (TX)	Castle	Gallely
Biggett	Chaffetz	Garrett (NJ)
Bilbray	Childers	Gerlach
Bilirakis	Coble	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Coffman (CO)	Gohmert
Blackburn	Cole	Goodlatte
Blunt	Conaway	Graves
Bonner	Crenshaw	Griffith
Bono Mack	Culberson	Guthrie
Boozman	Davis (KY)	Hall (TX)
Boustany	Deal (GA)	Harper
Brady (TX)	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Bright	Diaz-Balart, L.	Heller
Brown (GA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hensarling
Brown (SC)	Donnelly (IN)	Herger
Brown-Waite,	Dreier	Hill
Ginny	Driehaus	Hoekstra
Buchanan	Duncan	Holden
Burgess	Ehlers	Hunter
Burton (IN)	Emerson	Inglis
Buyer	Fallin	Issa

NOT VOTING—28

Aderholt	Eshoo	Pomeroy
Adler (NJ)	Fudge	Rangel
Boehner	Granger	Rogers (MI)
Cantor	Hirono	Salazar
Cardoza	Honda	Shadegg
Cleaver	Kagen	Taylor
Costa	Kanjorski	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Miller, George	Young (FL)
Dicks	Murphy (NY)	
Ellison	Napolitano	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on the vote.

□ 1438

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

Stated for: Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 512, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I was not present during the rollcall vote No. 512 on July 9, 2009. I would like the RECORD to reflect how I would have voted:

On rollcall vote No. 512 I would have voted “aye.”

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN’S SOFTBALL GAME

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, colleagues, the gentlewoman from Missouri and I would like to invite you to see how softball is really played when women come together in a bipartisan, bicameral effort to bring the parties together and to raise money for a good cause.

We encourage you all to come out this Tuesday, July 14, at 7:30 at Guy Mason Field for the first annual historic, bicameral and bipartisan congressional women’s softball game.

We have been practicing now for a month and have the assistance of several of our colleagues who are veterans