

we can address those concerns, and we wish to work with him.

THE FINAL OMNIBUS BILL IS A SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT OVER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET REQUEST

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this year, the Democratic Congress proposed a 2008 budget that was both fiscally responsible and reinvested in long-forgotten domestic priorities. All year President Bush has stubbornly said that he will not sign any appropriations bill that was higher than his budget request. So after months of working with our Republican colleagues, we approved an omnibus spending bill last night that fits into the President's funding levels, but addresses important Democratic priorities.

At a time when crime rates are increasing all around our country, we invest \$1.2 billion over the President's budget to help local communities make their neighborhoods safer. At a time when significant infrastructure improvements are needed to prevent more bridges from collapsing, we invest \$1 billion to make our bridges safer. And as Americans continue to pay record prices at the pump, we invest an additional \$486 million in renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, this final omnibus bill invests in critical priorities that were ignored in the President's budget.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6, ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 877 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 877

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6) to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the production of clean renewable fuels, to protect consumers, to increase the efficiency of products, buildings, and vehicles, to promote research on and deploy greenhouse gas capture and storage options, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the text, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a motion offered by the Majority Leader or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall

be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. During consideration of the motion to concur pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the motion to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 3. On the first legislative day of the second session of the One Hundred Tenth Congress, the House shall not conduct organizational or legislative business.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 877.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1030

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

H. Res. 877 provides for the consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 6, to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the production of clean renewable fuels, to protect consumers, to increase the efficiency of products, buildings, and vehicles, and to promote research on and deploy greenhouse gas capture and storage options. In short, it's a comprehensive energy bill.

The rule makes in order a motion by the majority leader that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The rule waives all points of order against the motion except clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides 1 hour of debate, controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, this is historic legislation. Today, we will move from a policy of dependence on foreign oil, a policy of endless drilling, to a policy of independence and efficiency. It's a policy that is overdue. It's overdue for the health of the American economy, the health of the world environment, and for the strengthening of our foreign policy options.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the American economy is being hit very hard by spiraling fuel prices. Around the country, families are sitting around their kitchen tables wondering how they are going to afford their fuel bills this winter. In December of 2002, just a few

years ago, the price of a gallon of gas was \$1.48. It's now \$3.09. Five years ago, in Vermont it cost a family about \$600 to heat their homes. Now, it's about \$1,500.

Our current energy policy of spiraling costs, environmental degradation, and increasing dependence on people who are not particularly our friends is weakening America, harming our environment, and stretching the budgets of our families.

Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses each and every one of these problems. It's fiscally responsible. It starts by repealing some, but not all, of the big oil and gas tax giveaways and reinvests that money to ensure energy independence. It increases fuel efficiency standards, and this is probably the single most important provision of this bill. The last time this Congress increased fuel efficiency standards was 32 years ago, and since that time the American auto industry has lost market share. The cost of operating a car has increased. What this bill does, which is historic, is increase the mileage standards by 40 percent so that the fleet-wide average in 2020 will be 35 miles per gallon.

That is the first real step toward fuel efficiency in those 32 years. It's going to save American families \$700 to \$1,000 at the pump; it's going to produce \$22 billion in net annual savings for consumers by 2020; and through the application in this legislation of efficiency standards, which essentially is that you make a toaster that uses less rather than more energy, and other appliances the same, it's going to save consumers \$400 billion through 2030.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is long overdue, and it is a declaration of independence from the old energy policy that had us relying on people who were not our friends to supply us oil that we were addicted to, at prices that we could no longer afford. Today, we are going to turn the corner, and the American people are going to see direct results in our economy, in our environment, and in our security as a result of this landmark legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would like to thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is our duty to do all we can to provide future generations a better world in which to live. Our Nation has made great strides in protecting human health and the environment, but there is still much more to do. We must continue to decrease carbon emissions and invest in multiple forms of energy-efficient technologies to help preserve the environment and lessen our dependence on foreign energy sources.

For our national security, we must make investments to increase clean energy sources and increase domestic energy supplies. From 2001 to 2006, Republican-led Congresses invested nearly \$12

billion to develop cleaner, cheaper, and more reliable domestic energy sources. They included the development of biofuels such as cellulosic ethanol, advanced hybrid and plug-in, hybrid electric vehicle technologies, hydrogen fuel cell technologies, wind and solar energy, clean coal and advanced nuclear technologies.

The underlying legislation, the Renewable Fuels, Consumer Protection and Energy Efficiency Act of 2007, further promotes research and development into next-generation energy resources such as solar, wind, geothermal and marine energy. Furthermore, it authorizes almost \$3 billion for energy storage and development programs to make renewable energy sources more effective. But we must keep in mind that right now, 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.

I am pleased that incentives for the domestic production of oil and gas have been retained in this final legislation. These incentives are aimed at reducing U.S. dependence on foreign oil by encouraging domestic exploration and production of oil and natural gas. Removal of these incentives, which were included in earlier versions of this legislation, would have driven up the costs of oil and natural gas to American consumers even further and increased our dependence on foreign suppliers such as the strongman/clown in Venezuela, Hugo Chavez.

I am also pleased that a provision that would have taxed domestic oil companies at higher rates than the Chavez-controlled oil company was removed.

This legislation also provides for the H-Prize. The H-Prize will award cash prizes to individuals, universities and businesses making significant advances in the field of hydrogen energy. Hydrogen is a clean domestic energy source that produces no emissions other than water. The use of hydrogen as an energy source will simultaneously reduce dependence on foreign oil and emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants.

Unfortunately, this bill has taken almost a year to make it to the President's desk because the majority decided to shut out the minority from deliberations for much of the year. When this bill first came before the House in the opening days of the 110th Congress, the majority blocked all amendments with a closed rule. In August when we considered H.R. 3221, the majority shut out over 90 amendments and allowed only five minority amendments out of 23 amendments. Just last week, we considered Senate amendments to H.R. 6, and once again the majority blocked the minority from providing amendments. If the majority had just decided to follow its campaign promise and allow the minority to participate in the formulation of this legislation, this

bill could have been signed into law months ago.

I would also point out that the majority brings this legislation to the floor as a Senate amendment instead of as a conference report. As such, it fits into one of the loopholes of the majority's earmark rule, just as it did last week. Because the earmark rule did not apply to the legislation last week, it wasn't possible to find out that the bill contained earmarks until after the bill passed the House. So we wonder if the legislation we are considering today also contains earmarks. Unfortunately, we will not know, because the legislation is not subject to the earmark rule.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Today, I rise in strong support of the rule and H.R. 6. H.R. 6 will lower energy costs, strengthen our national security, reduce global warming emissions and create green collar jobs. The bill recognizes that energy policy is not only about improving the infrastructure, but also about creating economic opportunities for all.

Major investment in renewable energy could create 3 million green jobs over the course of 10 years. These jobs can lead to self-sufficiency, prosperity, higher wages and access to benefits and better career choices. These jobs will stay in the U.S. and will not be outsourced.

I am proud that the bill authorizes \$125 million for workforce training and green collar jobs which includes Pathways Out of Poverty grants, so that as Silicon Valley advances, so will people in East Los Angeles, the Bronx and the Midwest.

The bill says to American workers, particularly urban and rural workers, there is a place for you in the green economy. I urge passage of the rule and passage of H.R. 6.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote "no" on this rule as well as the underlying bill, and I want my reasons for doing so to be a matter of public record, because I believe that this vote will come back to haunt many Members, maybe in 3 years, maybe in 5, maybe in 10, but at some point.

This is actually not an energy bill, it is simply a CAFE bill, and so it should rightly be called the "how Congress destroyed the domestic auto industry bill."

Let's consider for a moment that the domestic auto industry is the only carbon-restricted industry in our Nation,

and this bill certainly continues that unfairness. In fact, under this legislation, the domestic auto industry will almost entirely shoulder the burden for this Congress so that we can say we are reducing CO₂ emissions, even though the auto industry is responsible for less than 20 percent of that.

This bill attacks the domestic auto industry because they are a very easy target. In fact, it is just the "weak chicken" scenario, and all the other chickens in the barnyard, including the oil industry and the natural gas and the utilities and coal, are all pecking the domestic auto industry to death, because by doing so they can avert any such government sanctions against themselves. And I mean that literally, because it is estimated that the cost to comply with this energy bill with these new CAFE mandates, it is going to cost the domestic auto industry \$85 billion. \$85 billion from an industry that is struggling just to survive right now with all the unfair trade practices and the legacy costs that they face. And if you don't believe me, just read the Detroit papers today to get a clear vision of exactly what is happening in the domestic auto industry.

But instead of spending all of those dollars on R&D and manufacturing vehicles that will truly reduce our addiction on foreign oil, like lithium ion batteries, or flex-fuel or hydrogen fuel cells, we are going to mandate higher CAFE standards, continuing to use an antiquated approach and an antiquated model that we started in the 1970s. The result of that has actually been that our consumption of oil since we have had these CAFE standards has doubled. It is very hard to say the CAFE mandates have been a success. Really, so what if thousands of jobs are lost in the domestic auto industry? Some in this Congress would say that we did it to ourselves.

And this bill will allow some to thump their chest. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a very hollow thumping, just to say they are green, because we should remember the entire history of the domestic auto industry and what it has meant for this country. Not just because it created the middle class in a State like Michigan, or because after 9/11 when the domestic auto manufacturers immediately offered zero-interest financing to keep the plants running and people buying cars so that our national economy would not succumb to the terrorists as they had hoped. But also because during World War II, Michigan was known as the "arsenal of democracy," because we had the manufacturing capability to build the armaments that literally led the world to peace and to keep our Nation free.

□ 1045

We didn't even build cars for 2 years then because we were so busy building tanks and planes and Jeeps. We were totally engaged in the war effort and protecting freedom and liberty and democracy. And in the future when our

country needs that capacity again, and we will, we will find that we will be at the mercy of countries who either manufacture their vehicles cheaply in their own countries and import them to us, or they will build their product here but, the company's ownership is foreign, countries like Japan or Korea or China. And will our national interests match theirs? We had better hope so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and on the underlying energy bill.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

I listened to my friend from Michigan, and in one respect I think she is right: there will be people who will be haunted by the bill that we are voting on here today, but not because it goes too far, but because it doesn't go far enough. I am confident, under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI and the commitment that we have by the American people, that we will go back to the comprehensive energy bill that we had a few moments ago.

I find it ironic talking about the CAFE standards and the problems. Now we see the American auto industry is reluctantly accepting to do in this country what they are already doing in Europe. And, frankly, if they don't get it right in terms of fuel efficiency, there is nothing that we are going to be able to do to bail them out, and they will continue to lose market share to foreign companies that are more energy efficient.

I am pleased that this bill contains provisions I have worked on to align the interests of the natural gas companies to promote energy efficiency rather than penalizing them for conservation. I am pleased that we are going to have increased energy efficiency for light bulbs, appliances, buildings, and government agencies. All of these are starting to lay the foundation for legislation that is long overdue.

I am sad that it does not include the renewable energy portfolio standard which half American States, and the public is already represented by States that have galloped ahead of us, and it is unfortunate that the Senate could not deal with the tax provisions that would have put government subsidies for emerging renewable technologies that need that government support to turn a profit and come to scale, and instead continue to lavish subsidies on the petroleum industry that frankly doesn't need it to turn a profit. But these we will return and address.

I am pleased that this is an important step in the right direction and urge support of the rule and the legislation today.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. It is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to, I hope, bring

some balance to this debate. I was stunned in my office listening to the opening comments that it is going to be a new era in America on energy prices.

Americans are struggling to heat their homes. Americans are struggling to have fuel to drive their cars affordably. Companies all across this country are struggling to make a profit because of energy prices. And the bill before us will not change that in the next 3 to 5 years.

I don't oppose better CAFE standards. It takes 2 or 3 years to design new cars, other years to build them. You are 4 to 5 years away from people. And the poorest among us seldom ever own a new car with high efficiency standards, the poorest among us.

Folks, America needs more affordable energy. We have the highest energy prices in the world because of this Congress, because we have locked up natural gas reserves, we have locked up oil reserves. We have not allowed the movement that should be in coal-to-liquids and coal-to-gas, and there has been resistance to expanding nuclear which provides the vast majority of America's energy. I hope renewables become a major force, but it will be years if not decades.

Today, Americans need affordable gasoline. They need affordable diesel fuel to fuel our trucks. They need affordable home heating fuel to heat their homes. They need affordable natural gas. And this bill does nothing for any of those.

The ethanol, biofuels, the second part of this bill, it is futuristic. We now have 7 billion gallons; that mandates 36 billion. It limits 15 to corn. And we know that corn was \$1.80 when it started; it is \$4.37 today, and rising. It is going to raise food prices. God forbid we get dependent on corn and we have a bad crop year. We will have high-cost food and unaffordable energy.

Now, I am not saying we shouldn't do that, but we should do it carefully. But we can't build America's energy future on CAFE standards. I am all for the fuel efficiency appliances. It takes years for that to happen. Americans today expect more from this Congress. High oil prices on the backs of Congress because we locked it up. Clean green natural gas, the affordable fuels that Americans should be using in greater quantities if it were affordable. \$11.37, it spiked a couple bucks in the last couple days because it is cold and we are starting to use a lot of gas. Natural gas is used in heavy amounts to make ethanol, almost an even swap. Natural gas is what will be the hydrogen car if we get there.

Folks, we need affordable energy that runs 90-some percent of this country's energy needs, and we are ignoring it. This bill does nothing. The big bill that we voted on last week did nothing. Natural gas supplies need to be increased; oil supplies need to be increased in this country so we are not buying it from foreign countries. Coal-

to-liquid, coal-to-gas needs to be advanced like we are force-feeding cellulosic ethanol. I am not against cellulosic ethanol. It is being sold to do most of the 36 billion gallons, and it is still in the laboratory, folks. I hope it comes out. I hope we build a successful plant. But it won't be this year; it won't be next year. It will be down the road.

People are struggling here in 2007, and 2008 coming, to heat their homes; and they are going to struggle in rural America to drive their car a long distance because they have to drive everywhere, they don't have mass transit. They need money to run their families, and energy costs are robbing them of their ability. Fifty-eight degrees was common for seniors in my district. That is because they couldn't afford more energy.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel passionately enough about renewable energy to have spent most of my career developing it, and I know firsthand that clean energy is an economic reality. Because of this, I will continue to fight for renewable energy standards and important tax incentives that are not included, but should be included, in this bill. However, I believe that H.R. 6 will create jobs here at home and is an important first step for greater energy independence and a green future.

H.R. 6 raises our fuel economy standards, stimulates energy efficiency, and allows the development of exciting clean energy technologies, such as the language I wrote to stimulate the development of geothermal energy technologies. New geothermal energy technologies have the potential to generate vast amounts of clean, domestically produced electricity, and we should begin research immediately. I support H.R. 6.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we are starting a clean energy revolution today. It is not the end of that revolution, it is not perhaps even the beginning of the end of that clean energy revolution, but it is the end of the beginning for two important points.

First, we are starting a revolution in transportation today in the United States, and exhibit A in that regard is the GM Volt. The GM Volt, which GM hopes to have in mass production, is a plug-in hybrid car. You plug it in at night, you drive it for 40 miles just on electricity, zero gasoline, and after 40 miles you use a hybrid train with gasoline and someday cellulosic ethanol for the remaining part of your range.

Our corporate average fuel economy standards, which we make the first

strides in in three decades, will enhance the opportunity for Americans to have not just a few miles here or there per gallon, but a revolution in transportation.

This car will get over 100 miles per gallon of gasoline. This car will operate all on electricity for the first 40 miles. It is this revolutionary attitude that we need to have in America, and we make the first steps, and the first shots in that revolution are fired today.

But it is not the end of that revolution, because we have much more to do. We did not succeed this week in advancing renewable energy to have 15 percent of renewables. We did not succeed this week to advance tax relief for those emerging new businesses.

But exhibit A, on the renewable energy front, is a picture of the solar thermal array produced by the Austra Energy Company. This company this last month signed enough contracts for 500,000 homes to be heated by solar thermal energy which, within the decade, will be price competitive with coal-based energy if we succeed in our next steps in this clean energy revolution. That is why we will be back next year to have the true clean energy revolution America deserves.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding. I rise in support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 6, the Energy Independence and Security Act. This legislation represents an historic opportunity to move our country towards a secure future. The bill marks a turning point in this Nation's history and moves us towards energy independence.

Energy security is something that my constituents in New Hampshire take very seriously. And although this legislation is not perfect, because it doesn't go far enough, we need a renewable portfolio standard that is a national standard. Industry recognizes that. The voters and the markets are ahead of the politicians on this. This bill is the start of a 21st-century energy policy for America.

With this bill, Mr. Speaker, we take a firm stand for real security, for healthy families, for a thriving economy in a competitive global market, and for a sustainable future for our planet.

Energy policy is the key to our national security. Our real security requires energy independence. We require new green jobs and an aggressive program to deal with global warming. We need this bill to start to protect our country and strengthen our economy. I ask all of my colleagues to cast their vote with America's future in mind.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of

the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from Vermont.

Ladies and gentlemen, today is an historic day. It is the day when we begin to take seriously the issue of energy dependency and the issue of global warming.

The legislation that we have before us today is the culmination of a vision which Speaker PELOSI had as she was sworn in almost 1 year ago. She announced at that time that her goal was to make a huge down payment on the issue of energy independence and global warming. Today, we vote to pass the legislation which will send a signal not only to the citizens of our country but to the citizens of the world that our Nation is now serious about these issues.

□ 1100

I want to compliment Chairman JOHN DINGELL of the Energy and Commerce Committee for his statesmanship and leadership on these issues throughout this year.

I want to compliment all of the Members on both sides who have worked so hard to bring us to this point. It has not been easy.

For this decade, I have worked very hard in order to raise by 10 miles per gallon the fuel economy standard of the vehicles of our country. Back in 1985 we reached a peak of about 27 miles per gallon. Since that time, we have gone backwards. In fact, during that period of time we have actually seen an increase in America's dependence on imported oil go from 27 percent of the oil which we consume in our country to 61 percent of the oil that we consume in our country. That is since 1985. And that has sent the wrong signal to OPEC and to the rest of the world.

Today, in this legislation, we increase to 35 miles per gallon the fuel economy standard of the vehicles that we are going to drive by the year 2020. In conjunction with the cellulosic fuel component, the biofuel component that is built into this legislation, by the year 2030 this bill will back out the equivalent of twice the amount of oil which we import from the Persian Gulf today.

What we have today, is this whirlpool within which the United States has caught itself where we send nearly \$150 million a day to the Persian Gulf to purchase the 2.2 million barrels per day that we import out of the Persian Gulf to bring to the United States. That is \$55 to \$60 billion a year that we are sending over to parts of the world which we should have no business in. And caught in that whirlpool are our young men and women in our military who are over in the Middle East protecting this oil supply so it can come to our country.

And for the first time the American people are now going to be made part

of this effort. We no longer are going to pretend that the efficiency of the vehicles which Americans drive has no relationship to this amount of money that we send to the Middle East and the number of troops that we have to send to the Middle East.

So this is going to be a very powerful message: 2.7 million barrels of oil a day from the Middle East not having to be imported by the year 2030 because of the increase in fuel economy standards; 1.8 million barrels of oil per day in equivalence of oil in now biofuels, cellulosic fuels, that will substitute for the oil that we otherwise would have to import from the Middle East.

Together that is over 4 million barrels of oil a day equivalent. What a tremendous victory for the American people here today. Everyone in our country will now be part of it. Rather than in the Middle East, we will produce the fuels in the Middle West in our country and stop pretending that we can't improve the efficiency of the vehicles we drive.

Secondly, this legislation will in fact reduce by nearly a quarter all of the greenhouse gases that the United States has to meet as a goal by the year 2030. So on climate change, energy efficiency will play a huge role in reducing the amount of greenhouse gases that the United States sends up into the atmosphere. The buildings will be greener. The lighting and appliances will be better. And because of fuel efficiency and renewable fuels, we will reduce by the amount of 100 coal-fired plants the amount of greenhouse gases we will send up into the atmosphere. What a victory. What a day the United States Congress will enjoy today.

I congratulate Speaker PELOSI for her work on this legislation. I congratulate my colleague TODD PLATTS, and all of the Members who have worked on it. I salute President Bush for saying that he will sign this legislation. It is an historic signal. And I urge all of the Members who are here to realize that this is a moment that will be remembered forever as the energy revolution day, as the climate change revolutionary day where we changed course and sent a signal to the world that we mean business.

So, ladies and gentlemen, please today vote "aye" and join with Speaker PELOSI, with HARRY REID and President Bush in this effort to change the direction of our country. It is a monumental day.

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

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee for allowing me to speak.

I have to admit, it is not very often I follow my colleague from Massachusetts and support a lot of what he said. The legislation before us today is the result of almost a year of hard work

and negotiation to compromise by the new majority to produce an energy bill that helps address the serious concern of climate change in our Nation.

For the first time in over 30 years, Democrats increase the fuel economy standards by 40 percent, as well as increase energy efficiency requirements and promote research and development of alternative sources of energy.

Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER and Chairman DINGELL deserve special praise for their work in crafting this historic legislation.

Almost as important as what is included is what is not included. H.R. 6 omitted provisions from the previous energy bills that I feared could raise the cost of energy for consumers, including a Federal renewable electricity standard, new taxes on the energy industry outside of those carefully negotiated in the original H.R. 6 from January of this year that could tilt the competitive playing field against U.S. companies, and provisions that could hamper domestic oil and natural gas production. These changes are commendable and represent a more balanced proposal which I support.

What was unfortunately omitted was the opportunity to create a balanced energy policy that invests in our energy future without ignoring America's energy needs today. Energy security cannot be achieved by alternative energy and conservation alone.

The Energy Information Administration predicts that natural gas, oil, and coal will comprise approximately the same share of our total energy supply in 2030 as they did in 2005, even with new investments in renewable sources of energy.

Comprehensive energy legislation must be enacted that will increase America's domestic energy supply, particularly clean-burning natural gas which will play a critical role in reducing our greenhouse gas emissions.

What's also lacking was the debate on renewable fuel standards, RFS, a provision not moved through the regular process of the House and that lacks a clear mechanism to reduce the mandate prior to taking effect in the case of environmental challenges, technological, feasibility or supply issues, or other adverse consequences.

There is no shortage of literature detailing the negative environmental impacts of corn-based ethanol, its questionable greenhouse gas emission reductions, its reduced fuel efficiency, and its effect on food and energy prices.

I hope in a few years down the road we don't find ourselves asking whether the supposed cure for our oil addiction is not worse than the disease.

In closing, I believe as Democrats we can craft a sensible energy policy that actually enhances our energy security. I hope our House leadership will continue to try to work with Democrats and Republicans together to address America's need to produce additional domestic energy, both conventional

and renewable, and to ensure the reliability and affordability of our Nation's critical energy supplies.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Dec. 8, 2007]

ENERGY POLICY

The energy bill passed by the U.S. House last week is more a political statement than a blueprint for U.S. energy policy. Titled the Energy Independence and Security Act, it misses many chances to attain those goals.

The bill's best feature is the requirement that automakers have a fleet average of 35 miles per gallon. The measure's proponents say the higher mileage standard would save the United States 1.1 million barrels of oil per day—about half of what the country imports from the Persian Gulf. With populations and demand for energy growing, more efficient cars and SUVs are essential.

The bill's reliance on the use of ethanol to cut crude imports is suspect, however. Most ethanol here is made from corn. The present mandate for gasoline blenders to use ethanol has driven up food prices, but the nation hasn't enjoyed a significant net gain in energy. The bill aims to force the development of efficient cellulosic ethanol, but the technology might be slow in coming. If House Democrats wanted to increase use of efficiently made ethanol, they would eliminate the tariff on imported ethanol made from sugar cane.

A requirement that utilities produce 15 percent of their electricity from renewable sources is arbitrary and does not suit every locality, but it would prompt market solutions. Texas, one of the leading producers of wind power, has a 5 percent renewable requirement, and the state's economy and consumers have benefited.

President Bush has voiced objection to the bill's new taxes applied to the oil industry, and he has good reason. Does it make sense to raise the tax burden on the companies that produce and distribute the energy the nation's prosperity rests on? The oil industry should be taxed as near as possible in the same manner as other corporations.

If Congress wanted to increase domestic oil and gas production, as it should, it would allow responsible drilling on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. There is no reason the Gulf of Mexico should bear the strain of providing the nation's only offshore energy.

Perhaps one day the Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate will agree on a compromise that would enhance efficiency and the nation's energy supply. For that to happen, both parties must decide policy based on the common good rather than on narrow competing interests.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that the well is to remain clear while another Member is speaking.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard about the CAFE standards. Most of us think they are a good idea and that that will help us conserve more energy.

But the truth is we shouldn't be paying the highest natural gas prices in the world when we have perhaps the first but at least the second most generous deposits of natural gas in the world. We have perhaps the most coal in the world, and we could be using it. We could be driving down the cost of energy if it were not for the policies that were put in place this year.

Now, this bill doesn't help that. In fact, it drives prices the other way. I understand, I have some colleagues in here who believe that if we can drive the price of gasoline high enough, drive the price of carbon energy high enough, then the alternatives become the way to go and everybody goes to them more quickly. I understand that.

Some of us, though, like me, believe that a free market will drive the prices and drive the market in the right direction. So as the price of energy becomes higher, as we use more of our own God-given deposits in this country and use them wisely, have zero emissions, that the alternatives will come in naturally without this artificial demand to drive it there.

The point is a lot of this legislation will end up, in conjunction with what we have already done this year, driving the price of gasoline to \$5 a gallon. That is what happens when you interfere to the extent we are interfering with this legislation and others this year.

The thing I would ask is that as the price of gasoline is driven to \$5 a gallon with legislative interests that is being pushed this year and next that, please, the people that have pushed it come down here to the well, to the floor and say, "That's right, gas is \$5 a gallon. We think in the long run you'll be better off and we are so proud that we made your gasoline \$5 a gallon." That's where we're headed. Let's be honest about it, and then those who did it take credit for it when it gets there.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so we can amend this rule and allow the House to consider a change to the rules of the House to restore accountability and enforceability to the earmark rule, while closing the loopholes we have found over the last few months.

Under the current rule, so long as the chairman of a committee of jurisdiction includes either a list of earmarks contained in the bill or a report or a statement there are no earmarks, no point of order lies against the bill. This is the same as the rule in the last Congress.

However, under the rule as it functioned under the Republican majority in the 109th Congress, even if the point of order was not available on the bill, it was always available on the rule as a question of consideration. But because the Democratic Rules Committee specifically exempts earmarks from the waiver of all points of order, they deprive Members of the ability to raise the question of earmarks on the rule or on the bill.

The earmark rule is also not applicable when the majority uses a procedure to accept "amendments between the Houses" such as they plan to do with the underlying legislation. Because the energy bill is not a conference report,

the bill will fall squarely within one of the loopholes to the earmark rule and the rules of the House will not require any disclosure of earmarks that will be contained in the legislation.

I would like to direct all Members to a letter that House Parliamentarian, John Sullivan, recently sent to House Rules Committee Chairwoman SLAUGHTER which confirms what we have been saying since January that the Democratic earmark rule contains loopholes. In his letter to Chairwoman SLAUGHTER, the Parliamentarian states that the Democratic earmark rule "does not comprehensively apply to all legislative propositions at all stages of the legislative process."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 2, 2007.
Hon. LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER,
Committee on Rules, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN SLAUGHTER: Thank you for your letter of October 2, 2007, asking for an elucidation of our advice on how best to word a special rule. As you also know, we have advised the committee that language waiving all points of order "except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI" should not be adopted as boilerplate for all special rules, notwithstanding that the committee may be resolved not to recommend that the House waive the earmark-disclosure requirements of clause 9.

In rule XXI, clause 9(a) establishes a point of order against undisclosed earmarks in certain measures and clause 9(b) establishes a point of order against a special rule that waives the application of clause 9(a). As illuminated in the rulings of September 25 and 27, 2007, clause 9(a) of rule XXI does not comprehensively apply to all legislative propositions at all stages of the legislative process.

Clause 9(a) addresses the disclosure of earmarks in a bill or joint resolution, in a conference report on a bill or joint resolution, or in a so-called "manager's amendment" to a bill or joint resolution. Other forms of amendment—whether they be floor amendments during initial House consideration or later amendments between the Houses—are not covered. (One might surmise that those who developed the rule felt that proposals to amend are naturally subject to immediate peer review, though they harbored reservations about the so-called "manager's amendment," i.e., one offered at the outset of consideration for amendment by a member of a committee of initial referral under the terms of a special rule.)

The question of order on September 25 involved a special rule providing for a motion to dispose of an amendment between the Houses. As such, clause 9(a) was inapposite. It had no application to the motion in the first instance. Accordingly, Speaker pro tempore Holden held that the special rule had no tendency to waive any application of clause 9(a). The question of order on September 27 involved a special rule providing (in pertinent part) that an amendment be considered as adopted. Speaker pro tempore Blumenauer employed the same rationale to hold that, because clause 9(a) had no application to the amendment in the first instance, the special rule had no tendency to waive any application of clause 9(a).

The same would be true in the more common case of a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text for the purpose of further amendment. Clause 9(a) of rule XXI is inapposite to such an amendment.

In none of these scenarios would a ruling by a presiding officer hold that earmarks are or are not included in a particular measure or proposition. Under clause 9(b) of rule XXI, the threshold question for the Chair—the cognizability of a point of order—turns on whether the earmark-disclosure requirements of clause 9(a) of rule XXI apply to the object of the special rule in the first place. Embedded in the question whether a special rule waives the application of clause 9(a) is the question whether clause 9(a) has any application.

In these cases to which clause 9 of rule XXI has no application in the first instance, stating a waiver of all points of order except those arising under that rule—when none can so arise—would be, at best, gratuitous. Its negative implication would be that such a point of order might lie. That would be as confusing as a waiver of all points of order against provisions of an authorization bill except those that can only arise in the case of a general appropriation bill (e.g., clause 2 of rule XXI). Both in this area and as a general principle, we try hard not to use language that yields a misleading implication.

I appreciate your consideration and trust that this response is to be shared among all members of the committee. Our office will share it with all inquiring parties.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. SULLIVAN,
Parliamentarian.

This amendment will restore the accountability and enforceability of the earmark rule. I urge my colleagues to close this loophole in the earmark rule by opposing the previous question.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Texas was expressing his concern about the impact on American families with the ever-escalating cost of gasoline, the ever-escalating cost of home heating fuel. Certainly you are no stranger in your job to the impact of that on our budget, trying to find money for the low-income heating assistance program. All of us have constituents that experience the kind of pain the gentleman from Texas is describing.

The problem is the policy we have pursued has resulted in endless consumption, endless escalation of prices, and constant dependence on the Persian Gulf folks who are not really our friends. If there is a metaphor for what has been the American energy policy through many administrations, one of dependence, of drilling and drilling, consumption and wastefulness, it was a photograph that appeared in the New York Times in April of 2005.

□ 1115

At that time there was an emerging sense that the cost of energy was having an enormously negative impact on our families. The cost of gasoline had

risen over \$2 a gallon. That price now seems quite wonderful; but in an effort to deal with it, the President of the United States invited the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia to Crawford and invited him there for discussions. And the picture on the front page of the paper was of the President of the United States and the Crown Prince holding hands going into the President's home to discuss energy policy. And the request by the President on behalf of the American people to the Crown Prince was that they raise production, in order, theoretically, to lower prices. Well, you know what? That's the same policy that we've pursued for generations, raise production, drill more, leave control in the hands, many times, of foreign countries that have very little regard for the long-term interests of the American people.

It's a policy that has not worked and is running into the dead-end reality that there are limits on how much fossil fuels we can drill. There's damage to the environment, and the cost is ever escalating as the demand for this commodity increases with the growth in economies in India, China, and the rest of the emerging world.

That was a photograph of dependence. This energy bill is about turning the corner and being the self-confident Nation that we should be, that within our own borders, with the resources and technical skills of our people, with what can be done in the agriculture sector, the engineering sector, that we can actually take resources that are immediately available to us, that are renewable, and we can transform them into the energy that our families need to drive their cars to and from day care, to get to and from work; that we can transform that into the energy that our industries need in order to produce, manufacture, and create jobs for the American people.

And the side benefit, and a central goal, is that it can, as it must, dramatically reduce the carbon emissions that are polluting this world and threatening our planetary future. That is a real crisis that requires immediate action.

We have a responsibility to the families that the gentleman from Texas mentioned to do everything that we can to make it affordable for them to do what they have to do to raise their families, to get to work. And we all jointly have a responsibility to the environment because it is our obligation, very simply, that we leave this planet as clean, hopefully cleaner than, as when we found it. The path that we're on has been one of further degradation. The path we're choosing is one of renewal and redemption. This is good for jobs. It's good for the environment. It's good for securing America's foreign policy independence.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 877

OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider the resolution (H. Res. 479) to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for enforcement of clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; (2) the amendment printed in section 5, if offered by Representative Boehner of Ohio or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for forty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. The amendment referred to in section 4 is as follows:

Strike all after "That" and insert the following:

(1) Clause 9(a) of rule XXI is amended by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (3), striking the period at the end of subparagraph (4) and inserting "; or", and adding the following at the end:

"(5) a Senate bill held at the desk, an amendment between the Houses, or an amendment considered as adopted pursuant to an order of the House, unless the Majority Leader or his designee has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill and amendments (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted the request for each respective item in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration."

(2) Clause 9(c) of rule XXI is amended to read as follows:

"(c) As disposition of a point of order under paragraph (a), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn."

(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. WELCH of Vermont. 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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 877, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 3793.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 187, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 1174]

YEAS—220

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

NAYS—187

Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Crenshaw
Akin	Brown (SC)	Davis (KY)
Alexander	Brown-Waite,	Davis, David
Bachmann	Ginny	Davis, Tom
Bachus	Buchanan	Deal (GA)
Baker	Burgess	Dent
Barrett (SC)	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bartlett (MD)	Buyer	Diaz-Balart, M.
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Doolittle
Biggert	Camp (MI)	Drake
Bilbray	Campbell (CA)	Dreier
Billirakis	Cantor	Duncan
Blackburn	Capito	Ehlers
Blunt	Carter	Emerson
Boehner	Castle	English (PA)
Bonner	Chabot	Everett
Bono	Coble	Fallin
Boozman	Cole (OK)	Feeney
Boustany	Conaway	Ferguson

Flake	Linder	Rogers (KY)	Carnahan	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)	LaTourette	Pence	Shays
Forbes	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)	Carney	(TX)	Pomeroy	Latta	Peterson (PA)	Shuster
Fortenberry	Lucas	Rohrabacher	Castor	Jefferson	Rahall	Lewis (CA)	Petri	Simpson
Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen	Chandler	Johnson (GA)	Rangel	Lewis (KY)	Pickering	Smith (NE)
Franks (AZ)	E.	Roskam	Clarke	Jones (OH)	Reyes	Linder	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Frelinghuysen	Mack	Royce	Clay	Kagen	Richardson	LoBiondo	Platts	Smith (TX)
Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)	Clyburn	Kanjorski	Rodriguez	Lucas	Poe	Souder
Gerlach	Marchant	Sali	Conyers	Kaptur	Ross	Lungren, Daniel	Porter	Stearns
Gingrey	McCarthy (CA)	Saxton	Cooper	Kennedy	Rothman	E.	Price (GA)	Sullivan
Gohmert	McCaul (TX)	Schmidt	Costa	Kildee	Roybal-Allard	Mack	Putnam	Tancredo
Goode	McCotter	Sensenbrenner	Costello	Kilpatrick	Ruppersberger	Manzullo	Radanovich	Terry
Goodlatte	McCrery	Sessions	Courtney	Kind	Rush	Marchant	Ramstad	Thornberry
Granger	McHenry	Shadegg	Cramer	Klein (FL)	Ryan (OH)	McCarthy (CA)	Regula	Tiahrt
Graves	McHugh	Shays	Crowley	Kucinich	Salazar	McCaul (TX)	Rehberg	Tiberi
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shimkus	Cuellar	Lampson	Sanchez, Linda	McCotter	Reichert	Turner
Hastings (WA)	McMorris	Shuster	Cummings	Langevin	T.	McCrery	Renzi	Upton
Hayes	Rodgers	Simpson	Davis (AL)	Lantos	Sanchez, Loretta	McHenry	Reynolds	Walberg
Heller	Mica	Smith (NE)	Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes	McHugh	Rogers (AL)	Walden (OR)
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Davis, Lincoln	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky	McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Walsh (NY)
Herger	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)	DeFazio	Lee	Schiff	McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Wamp
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Souder	DeGette	Levin	Schwartz	Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Weld
Hoekstra	Murphy, Tim	Stearns	Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Scott (GA)	Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland
Hulshof	Musgrave	Sullivan	DeLauro	Lipinski	Scott (VA)	Miller (FL)	Roskam	Whitfield (KY)
Hunter	Myrick	Tancredo	Dicks	Loeb	Serrano	Miller (MI)	Royce	Wicker
Inglis (SC)	Neugebauer	Terry	Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe	Sestak	Moran (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (NM)
Issa	Nunes	Thornberry	Doggett	Lowey	Shea-Porter	Murphy, Tim	Sali	Wilson (SC)
Johnson (IL)	Pearce	Tiahrt	Donnelly	Lynch	Sherman	Musgrave	Saxton	Wittman (VA)
Johnson, Sam	Pence	Tiberi	Doyle	Mahoney (FL)	Shuler	Myrick	Schmidt	Wolf
Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)	Turner	Edwards	Maloney (NY)	Sires	Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)
Jordan	Petri	Upton	Ellison	Markey	Skelton	Nunes	Sessions	
Keller	Pickering	Walberg	Marshall	Marshall	Slaughter	Pearce	Shadegg	
King (IA)	Pitts	Walden (OR)	Matheson	Smith (WA)	Smith (WA)			
King (NY)	Platts	Walsh (NY)	Emanuel	Snyder				
Kingston	Poe	Wamp	Matsui	McCarty (NY)	Solis	Bachus	Hinchey	Price (NC)
Kirk	Porter	Weldon (FL)	Engel	McCollum (MN)	Space	Cleaver	Hooley	Pryce (OH)
Kline (MN)	Price (GA)	Whitfield (KY)	Eshoo	McDermott	Spratt	Cubin	Jindal	Shimkus
Knollenberg	Putnam	Wicker	Etheridge	McGovern	Stark	Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Tanner
Kuhl (NY)	Radanovich	Wilson (NM)	Farr	McIntyre	Stupak	Fossella	Miller, Gary	Thompson (CA)
LaHood	Ramstad	Wilson (SC)	Fattah	McNerney	Sutton	Gallely	Ortiz	Weller
Lamborn	Regula	Wittman (VA)	Filner	McNulty	Tauscher	Gilchrest	Pastor	Wexler
Latham	Rehberg	Wolf	Frank (MA)	Meek (FL)	Taylor	Gutierrez	Paul	Woolsey
LaTourette	Reichert	Young (FL)	Giffords	Meeke (NY)	Thompson (MS)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter	Young (AK)
Latta	Renzi		Gillibrand	Melancon	Tierney			
Lewis (CA)	Reynolds		Gonzalez	Michaud	Towns			
Lewis (KY)	Rogers (AL)		Gordon	Miller (NC)	Tsongas			

NOT VOTING—27

Bachus	Hinchey	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Hooley	Pryce (OH)
Cubin	Jindal	Shimkus
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Tanner
Fossella	Miller, Gary	Thompson (CA)
Gallely	Ortiz	Weller
Gilchrest	Pastor	Wexler
Gutierrez	Paul	Woolsey
Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1148

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.

VETERANS GUARANTEED BONUS ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3793, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3793, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 1176]
 YEAS—405

Abercrombie	Baker	Bilirakis
Ackerman	Baldwin	Bishop (GA)
Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Bishop (NY)
Akin	Barrow	Bishop (UT)
Alexander	Bartlett (MD)	Blackburn
Allen	Barton (TX)	Blumenauer
Altmire	Bean	Blunt
Andrews	Becerra	Boehner
Arcuri	Berkley	Bonner
Baca	Berman	Bono
Bachmann	Berry	Boozman
Bachus	Biggert	Boren
Baird	Bilbray	Boswell

NOT VOTING—25

Bishop (UT)	Gutiérrez	Paul
Broun (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Pryce (OH)
Cannon	Hinchey	Thompson (CA)
Cubin	Hooley	Weller
Culberson	Jindal	Wexler
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Woolsey
Fossella	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Gallely	Ortiz	
Gilchrest	Pastor	

□ 1142

Messrs. TERRY, GINGREY and JOHNSON of Illinois changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

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. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 190, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 1175]
 YEAS—215

Abercrombie	Bean	Boucher
Ackerman	Becerra	Boyd (FL)
Allen	Berkley	Boyd (KS)
Altmire	Berman	Brady (PA)
Andrews	Berry	Braley (IA)
Arcuri	Bishop (GA)	Brown, Corrine
Baca	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Baird	Blumenauer	Capps
Baldwin	Boren	Capuano
Barrow	Boswell	Cardoza

NAYS—190

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