

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7110, JOB CREATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF ACT OF 2008

Mr. WELCH of Vermont, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-891) on the resolution (H. Res. 1507) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7110) making supplemental appropriations for job creation and preservation, infrastructure investment, and economic and energy assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1503 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1503

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of September 26, 2008, providing for consideration or disposition of a measure making supplemental appropriations for job creation and preservation, infrastructure investment, and economic and energy assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes.

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

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of my colleague; I understand that the customary 30 minutes was yielded to my friend from Pasco, Washington. And I would just like to state for the record that I will be managing the rule on this side, and so I would hope very much that my friend from Tampa might consider yielding to me.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I will correct that. I will yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague and good friend from California, the ranking member on the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CASTOR. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1503.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1503 waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII, which requires a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee. This waiver would apply to any rule reported on the legislative day of September 26, 2008 that provides for consideration or disposition of a measure making supplemental appropriations for job creation and preservation, infrastructure investment, and economic and energy assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a humble first-term Representative who represents hundreds of thousands of hard-working families and seniors who are caught in the center of an economic storm. For them, the economic squeeze did not arise last week or last month, but it has been ongoing for well over a year.

I also rise as the daughter of parents who worked hard all of their lives and saved for retirement and, like millions of Americans, they are watching their savings dwindle and decline. And I rise as a parent, who, along with my husband, is saving for our children's college education.

For students and families across America, the cost of attending college has risen. And as we look out to future years, like other parents, our college savings accounts for our kids feel a little less tangible now, and I fear that college for students may be a little less attainable unless we act in a bipartisan way this week.

Many middle class American families are unable to even save now for retirement or their children's college fund because they've lost a job, or if they do have a job, the raise did not come, or the raise came, and it was not enough to meet the rising cost of living in America today.

So at this time, as our country's leaders join together to develop a rescue plan—which has been dramatically altered from the beginning of the week when it was proposed in a two-and-a-half page proposal to spend \$700 billion—we must join together, Mr. Speaker, in a bipartisan way to provide a lifeline to families as well.

Mr. Speaker, we must stand up for everyday Americans. While stabilizing financial markets on the day of the largest bank failure in history is vitally important, correspondingly, stabilizing families and taxpayers is just as important. American families need a little breathing room, and they need a job if they're out of work. So it is our moral imperative, at this moment in history, to examine this modest stimulus proposal, create jobs back home through an infusion of cash for infrastructure projects, for unemployment benefits, and for health care dollars for Americans who have no other place to turn.

This stimulus package will jumpstart America's economy. And here's our action plan:

First; jobs, jobs, jobs through infrastructure investments. We're talking about highways, transit capital grants, Amtrak, airport improvements. Do you know how many thousands of construction jobs have been let go and we have lost across America? This will put Americans back to work.

We're also going to provide resources to our local communities to help them with clean water projects, sewer projects, the Corps of Engineers, Mississippi River and tributaries, and also vital—and I speak as a parent of two young daughters—school construction dollars.

We also provide, as part of our action plan, energy development dollars for energy efficiency and renewable energy, electricity delivery, and reliability programs. That is the major portion of our economic stimulus proposal for American families.

We will also provide unemployment compensation and job training dollars, which seems oh so modest because it totals merely \$6 billion. It's modest in the face of a proposal this week to spend \$700 billion, unfettered, at the beginning of the week.

We will also respond to the least among us, Medicaid dollars. Now, that's a term that gets thrown around a lot, but I want the American people to understand that when we talk Medicaid—and you will hear the discussion here today will be FMAP, Federal Medical Assistance Percentage in Medicaid. What Medicaid is is largely health care dollars for children from poor families. Now, many middle class families are now slipping into that lower socioeconomic level today. Their parents don't have health insurance. If they're working, they're working maybe at a small business or part-time, and there is no other place to turn during this dire economic downturn.

The least we can do, when we're discussing a bailout for Wall Street and for banks and financial markets, is to also consider, at the same time, a very modest proposal of \$60 billion for America's families, for jobs, for health care for kids, seniors who have no other place to turn, and unemployment compensation.

First, on jobs. You know, today's wages are stagnant; they're at the most stagnant point that they have been since World War II. Medium household income was .6 percent lower in 2007 than it was at the end of the 1990s. And even more troubling are the rising inequities of incomes among families in different communities. Data released from the Joint Economic Committee reports that over the past decade, median incomes for the richest households have risen while middle and low-income families have seen their income fall.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. unemployment rate rose to 9.4 million Americans—a 6.1 percent increase—in August, the highest it has been since 2003. This continues the unfortunate job loss for the

eighth consecutive month, with over 600,000 American jobs lost this year.

Unemployment benefits under our action plan will be extended for merely another 7 weeks, a very modest proposal. It extended in every State an additional 13 weeks, and an additional 13 weeks in States with unemployment rates higher than 6 percent, like my home State of Florida.

Florida families have been especially hard hit by the economic downturn. In the past year, Florida has lost over 100,000 jobs, and the unemployment rate continues to rise. The housing crisis has dragged down job opportunities in construction and other related fields, and we keep seeing continued joblessness and layoffs. At the same time, in Florida we have seen a 21 percent increase in families receiving food stamps over the past year, which is one of the highest increases in the Nation.

But fortunately, under this stimulus plan, we're going to immediately take action to fund new jobs through infrastructure projects. See, investing in infrastructure can rapidly move people from unemployment rolls to payrolls. Just this week, we heard our Republican Governor, Charlie Christ, sent his DOT secretary to the Hill to meet with the bipartisan Florida delegation. She advised that there are projects ready to go, have been permitted, are ready to go. So this action plan will take those projects off the shelf and put people to work building roads, building bridges, sewer projects all across America.

For hundreds of thousands of Floridians who are unemployed, and other Americans, they're still looking for work, and this package will help them find a job. It's that simple.

□ 1345

On health care, on the Medicaid portion which remember largely goes to health care services for children so they can get to the doctors' office, seniors in nursing homes and pregnant women, this stimulus package will improve and bolster that health care safety net at this critical time in our Nation's history. Unlike the hope of trickle-down, this action plan and economic stimulus project is a rapid and effective way to support those hard-working families.

During the last economic downturn, the Congress approved \$10 billion to temporarily enhance the health care safety net of Medicaid. This similar increase today will again provide vital, basic health services to families that need it most as quickly as possible. And at the same time, an increase in health care funding will help families who are not served by Medicaid but are taking up the slack in this economy, that are paying higher premiums and co-pays because the charity care in the emergency room, someone has to pay for that. And that usually is tacked on to the cost of the typical family's employer-provided health care cost. Higher co-pays and higher premiums are a direct result of many families in this

country not having anyplace else to turn for health care.

In fact, the Kaiser Family Foundation and the Center for Studying Health System Change released a report yesterday that says that employees are paying more medical expenses out of their own pockets. They're having a harder time coming up with money to pay their bills. The study displayed the mounting additional strain that medical care is placing on working Americans. It is estimated that 57 million Americans live in families struggling with medical bills, and 43 million of those have health insurance coverage.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret across America that with stagnant wages and a higher cost of living, be it health care, be it higher gas prices, be it home heating oil, be it, in Florida, property insurance, that we have got to take action for them. And it cannot simply be a trickle-down rescue package. It also needs to be a very modest, but at the same time meaningful, support for families.

When we are able to provide additional moneys to States for health care and for infrastructure and jobs, what this does is it takes the pressure off all other programs that are funded by our State and local governments, including education. In my State of Florida, they have had to cut billions and billions of dollars out of our State budget. Unbelievably, for the first time in many decades, this year the State of Florida ratcheted back the amount of money provided per student in our public school system. The State university chancellor of the State of Florida announced yesterday that there is a freeze on new students being allowed into the Florida college system because they simply do not have the resources during this economic downturn to provide a seat for new freshmen in our colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, economists agree that any stimulus package must put money in the hands of those who will spend it right away in order to stimulate the economy. This package will do just that by focusing funding where it is needed most, creating jobs, jobs, jobs through infrastructure, enhancing the health care safety net for our children and our seniors and providing a lifeline to American families who are struggling during this economic downturn.

At this point, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished Rules Committee colleague, my friend from Tampa, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, even though we went through that little bump with my colleague from Pasco temporarily handling it. And I have to say that this is obviously a very solemn, serious and difficult time for our Nation as we are in the midst of facing a financial crisis the likes of which no Member of this House has seen, probably even our oldest Members have not witnessed. Maybe we have a couple of

people. Maybe RALPH HALL lived during the Depression. But it is something that most of us clearly have never witnessed before.

People are likening this to the economic challenges that we faced following the Second World War. And we are attempting, as we all know, in a bipartisan way to deal with this issue. Our distinguished Republican whip, Mr. BLUNT, is involved in these bipartisan negotiations so that we will be able to have a package emerge from this institution in a bipartisan way that will be able to stabilize the markets, respect the American taxpayer and ensure the kind of stability when people are seeking to keep their homes, run their small businesses and engage in the normal activities that exist in the United States of America.

And it's with that as a backdrop, Mr. Speaker, that I have to paraphrase the statement of the former running mate of Ross Perot, the late Admiral James Stockdale, who, in the famous oft-quoted Vice Presidential debate in 1992, said: "Who am I and why am I here?" I would ask that somewhat rhetorically, Mr. Speaker, because we are here dealing with a very important issue. Of course job creation is priority number one. Making sure that we can stimulate our economy is a very, very important issue. But this is not the way to do it. And 1 hour ago, the United States Senate made that decision by defeating the motion to proceed in the Senate. So this is dead.

The President of the United States put out a statement of administration policy in which he said that this measure would be vetoed if it were to get to the President. And it's not going to. And so that is why I ask, Who are we and why are we here? Because there is absolutely nothing but political posturing taking place.

Mr. Speaker, it is being done in the most outrageous of ways in that we regularly show here something that was touted 2 years ago, but we never hear the majority Members talk about any longer, and that is a document called "A New Direction for America." This document was designed to talk about the very important degree of openness and transparency that would exist if in fact the Democrats were to take control of the United States Congress. And unfortunately with where we are, we have completely eviscerated that entire concept of "A New Direction for America."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are all accustomed to hectic, get-out-of-town weeks. The heaviest lifting typically falls to weeks prior to district work periods, when we're all anxious to return home to hear from our constituents. But even under the circumstances, this week's proceedings are absolutely unprecedented. The emergency negotiations, as I mentioned, on a financial rescue package are very difficult. And they are very challenging. And we want to see it done in an appropriate way. But they have been made all the

more frantic because they're set against a backdrop of a year's worth of unfinished business right here in the House of Representatives.

The Democratic majority has unfortunately shirked virtually every one of its core duties and obligations as legislators. Our most basic and fundamental job is the responsible and efficient spending of the taxpayers' dollars. That is the single most important thing that we do here, is responsibly, with the power of the purse, spending these dollars. This is done through the passage of 12 appropriations bills as we all know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how many of these 12 bills has the House passed as we began this very difficult week? One. Only one of the 12 appropriations bills was passed. And how many have become law? Zero. Not a one. So we arrived at this last week of session for the fiscal year without enacting a single appropriations bill.

The Democratic leadership had long since abandoned any plan for attempting to make progress on our constitutional power of the purse. Their solution? Write a bill to put off their duties for another 6 months. They can't be bothered to do their jobs now or after the election. They want to wait until the fiscal year is half over before finally getting to work.

So we started this week after what amounts to a 9-month vacation from responsible legislating. The Democratic majority decided to take three of the 12 appropriations bills, one of which never even went through committee, and slap them together. They tacked on \$55 billion in extra funding for various causes, extended their fiscal deadline for 6 months and sent it up to the Rules Committee barely an hour before we reported it out.

The entire body of their appropriations work for the entire year was put together in one bill, the bulk of which was delayed by half a year. They were kind enough to give us an hour before meeting on the rule at nearly 11 o'clock at night. It was on the floor the next morning. And voila. They put the entire Federal budget to bed as far as they were concerned.

But that was Tuesday. What did we do yesterday? The Democratic majority's flawed tax extenders bill, and a \$100 million mistake. In their rush to pump out bad legislation, the Rules Committee ended up passing out a rule and bringing it to the floor for a bill that no longer existed. Democrats and Republicans were actually voting on two different bills. The discrepancy, as I said, was over \$100 million in tax increases.

Now to many in this institution on the other side of the aisle who have this sort of tax-and-spend mentality, \$100 million in taxes may seem to be very insignificant. But not to the American people. Not to the American taxpayer, Mr. Speaker, and certainly not at times like these. Fortunately this mistake was caught, and we re-

turned to the Rules Committee to fix it. What other mistakes have gone unnoticed? We may never know until it's too late. But this is the very real risk when you jam through a flawed agenda in a frantic and haphazard way.

And this bill is a perfect example of that.

Having punted on appropriations and jamming through the tax extenders bill after two tries, now the Democratic majority is free to turn to everything else they meant to do this year. How do you do a year's worth of work in 1 week? For starters, you don't, Mr. Speaker. You just don't.

There are a host of very critical issues that simply won't be addressed this week, such as our Nation's energy crisis. But you can certainly move things along by shutting down due process entirely. We did their hodgepodge appropriations bill without a single amendment or even a motion to recommit. We did their tax extenders bill without a single amendment either.

Now we are considering a rule to waive the rules to allow the underlying bill to be expedited. Then we will consider a rule to bring up the underlying bill. Again, this is a bill that the President has said he would veto and a bill that is similar to it is not even going to get through the United States Senate. So once again, under a completely closed process, there is no opportunity whatsoever for Members to participate in any kind of real debate.

What is the result of this haphazard way of legislating? First and foremost, there is clearly no deliberation. Now say what you want about this place, but the American people do send us here to think about, to discuss, to ponder and to try and work out a compromise in a bipartisan way as we proceed with what it is that we are trying to do. So no deliberation at all. I mean, there is no means for amendment. There is no means for open debate. Second, as we have just seen again from that tax extenders bill, mistakes are inevitable.

This clearly goes beyond poor policy. And shirking our duties for another 6 months is clearly very, very poor policy. As yesterday's proceedings demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, we are also talking about the sloppy mistakes that are an inevitable result of shoddy work.

The Democrats roundly criticized us for moving our agenda too quickly in the past few Congresses. They were particularly critical of not giving Members or the American people enough time to review legislation so this deliberative process could proceed.

Now on this document which I pointed to when I first stood up here entitled "A New Direction for America," this document, by the way, I would say to our colleagues, is still available on the Speaker's Web site. So if anyone would like to read a copy of "A New Direction for America," I commend it to them.

In this document, they promised this new direction, as I said. And it reads as

follows: "Members should have at least 24 hours to examine bill and conference report text prior to floor consideration."

□ 1400

"Rules governing floor debate," it reads, "must be reported before 10 p.m. for a bill to be considered the following day."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea how "2 hours" equals "at least 24 hours," which is what was promised in this New Direction for America by Speaker PELOSI. It is that kind of math, long on promises, short on results, that got us into our current financial crisis.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider today's underlying bill, amusingly called a stimulus bill by the Democratic majority, the American people should know it was written through the night and sent to us at 9:43 this morning. Not even Republican appropriators had seen it, so not even members of the Appropriations Committee have seen it.

I just had a chance to look through it, and we have some unbelievable things we have found in this. Members should know the Democratic majority is rushing to cover up 9 months of nothing with a flurry of activity in these waning hours of the 110th Congress. They are resorting to draconian measures and shutting out all meaningful debate in this charade. They are pushing off the real work for another 6 months. And they are producing such shoddy work that a \$100 million tax increase is "a mistake," and that kind of thing is appearing here.

Mr. Speaker, this is one sorry week for the House of Representatives. I don't believe that the American people will be fooled.

Now, of course, as my colleague talked about the importance of infrastructure construction, building schools, making sure that we provide relief to those who are truly in need and have suffered from the economic downturn that we all know is there, to do it in the way that is being done is, I think, a very, very sad commentary on this great deliberative institution.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule. It is a martial law rule which is very, very unfair. We do need to, at the very least, give our Members an opportunity to have a chance to read this bill.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important at this critical time in our Nation's economic history, in the history of what is going on in people's lives today, that we really try to rise above partisanship. That is what is going on right now. The White House and leaders here in the Congress are meeting on a very important economic package. This is a separate piece of that. We do intend to address it. We will stay here for as long as it takes.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CASTOR. I would be happy to yield for a moment.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I appreciate that, because I appreciate her comment about rising above partisanship. I guess what troubles us on this side of the aisle is we are being denied any opportunity to even offer a bipartisan amendment to this bill, for example on the county roads and schools issue.

I wonder, I would like to ask the gentlewoman, would she be willing to allow us on the Republican side to offer a single amendment, any amendment to this bill that was just provided to us at 9:43 this morning? That would sure go a long way toward bridging the gap that seems to be down the center aisle.

Would the gentlewoman be willing to work with us on allowing us any opportunity to amend this bill?

Ms. CASTOR. I thank the gentleman, and reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, we did consider the amendment in the Rules Committee on a couple of occasions. It was not accepted.

What is important right now is our leaders meet to focus on the economic condition of this country and that we do not get bogged down in the process. The American people cannot wait for these costly, time-consuming debates. They are out of work, they need to get their kids to the doctor's office, and we will stay and work here for as long as it takes to provide that additional relief to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida, and I certainly associate myself with her remarks with regard to this very important stimulus bill.

I want to rise in strong support of the rule allowing for H.R. 7110 to be considered, but I would particularly like to focus on the FMAP, or the Medicaid provisions of the bill, which would provide important financial assistance to cash-strapped States in order to maintain their Medicaid programs.

Medicaid provides over 61 million Americans with access to medical care and specialized support and services. It protects our most vulnerable populations, our poor and disabled.

Unfortunately, as State economies face growing fiscal pressures, the Medicaid programs in many States are threatened and millions of American citizens are in danger of losing access to the health care coverage that they desperately need. These cuts affect not only those already on Medicaid, but also those who will come to need it as the economy continues to plummet. As people lose their jobs, they also lose access to employer-sponsored health care coverage, forcing more people to turn to Medicaid for their health care needs.

A study conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation found that increasing the national unemployment rate by 1 percentage point increases Medicaid and SCHIP enrollment by 1 million. At a time when States are already struggling to balance their budgets, this type of change in unemployment rates

would increase State spending by approximately \$1.4 billion.

H.R. 7110 will provide a temporary FMAP increase to help avert cuts to State Medicaid programs. In effect, we are increasing the Federal share. This is a proven strategy for stimulating the economy. A similar provision was passed in 2003 by the Republican Congress and signed into law by President Bush as part of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act. So I essentially consider this a bipartisan effort. Studies have shown that the temporary increase then provided the funding needed to successfully avert or limit cuts to State Medicaid programs and helped stimulate the economies of the States back in 2003.

Mr. Speaker, the FMAP provision included in H.R. 7110 is an important measure that will help provide much-needed fiscal relief to our States and help protect access to health care services for some of our most vulnerable citizens. And it is an economic stimulus. It basically means that more money would be available to the States to cover more people, and that means more jobs. It means the actual delivery of health care services serves as a major stimulator of the economy.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support the rule, as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to as I do this engage in a colloquy with my good friend from Hood River, Oregon, who has long been a great champion of something known as the Secure Rural Schools Program, something that has enjoyed very strong bipartisan support. In fact, five Democratic members the Rules Committee are cosponsors of legislation designed to address that.

I will say that obviously we know that as we deal with this economic downturn, everyone has acknowledged it, there are many things that do need to be addressed. And we know that FMAP is one of them, dealing with Medicaid reimbursement to our States, infrastructure construction, as I said, working to do what we can to stimulate economic growth.

We happen to believe very strongly that it is also essential for us to do all that we can to stimulate private sector economic growth. Now, I know that that term may be difficult for some in this institution to comprehend, but we do have a \$14 trillion, that is with a T, a \$14 trillion economy in the United States of America. We are the world's only complete superpower. And we are going through extraordinarily challenging economic times. But we need to remember that our goal with the package that we put together in dealing with this financial crisis will be one that is designed to create stability, security and confidence in our credit markets and in the overall financial system. No doubt about that.

My State of California, the West and other parts of the country are dealing

with the fact that the Washington Mutual Bank was just taken over, and I have to say having spoken with top leaders at J.P. Morgan, I am very grateful that all of those deposits are in fact secure with J.P. Morgan's acquisition having taken place there. But we know in other areas there is a lot of uncertainty.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we want to do what we can to put into place policies that will encourage private sector economic growth. Unfortunately, this so-called stimulus package that has been presented to us is one that is focused on public sector economic growth.

Again, many parts of it we support. It is very key for us to have an infrastructure system in this country if we are going to encourage the private sector movement of goods in the country and for people to be able to move around. We know that these are very important items. But there are many, many other things that we need to do to deal with private economic growth.

Now, I talked about the procedural problem that we have and the fact that this New Direction for America has been eviscerated by the actions that we are taking here, and that has been the case for the entire Congress, tragically. But we just now had, as my friend from Hood River said very well, received this at 9:43 this morning, so a number of us are having a chance to look at this.

My friend just pointed to me on page 12, the fact that we have something in this bill known as the 21st Century Green High Performing Public School Facilities for the Department of Education, which would allow for the construction of so-called green schools, putting roughly \$3 billion, \$3 billion in this, to build schools in the Mariana Islands, Micronesia and other spots. And I know that the package that my friend from Hood River, Oregon, has been championing, working with our Rules Committee colleague Mr. HASTINGS on for secure rural schools, has a cost of about \$3.1 billion over a 4-year period.

So we are just finding these things out in this measure. To me, it is beyond the pale that they would come forward without allowing a single opportunity to work in a bipartisan way.

I congratulate my friend from Tampa for talking about the need for us to work in a bipartisan way. She is absolutely right. I totally concur with that. Unfortunately, this legislation is doing anything but that.

I would like to now yield to my friend from Hood River, Oregon, a great champion of the Secure Rural Schools Program.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I thank my friend from California for his leadership in the Rules Committee and his steadfast support for rural community schools. Even though you don't necessarily represent a rural district, you have certainly shown your interest in my State and in helping out.

I guess one of the issues that arises today, it is sort of hard to figure this

floor anymore and the Democrat majority, because the Democrat major lectured us in the Rules Committee last night and down here on the floor all day, saying we are not going to put rural schools reauthorization funding in the \$60 billion tax extenders bill because it is not paid for, and we are not going to do this and we are not going to do that. So they raised \$60 billion in taxes to cut \$60 billion in taxes. So that was the reason then, not paid for.

Now we have dropped upon us a bill that most of us are just getting to see for the first time that is at least 46 pages long that spends \$60 billion. \$60 billion. I guess we will borrow more money from China to do it. And I don't see a single offset in here.

I would ask if the gentlewoman from Tampa would yield to a question. Is there a single offset in here to offset any of this \$60 billion?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would be happy to yield to my friend from Tampa if she would like to explain exactly how this is going to be paid for.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, similar to the administration's \$700 billion emergency economic rescue package, this emergency stimulus package, to provide jobs to the American people, to enhance the health care safety net, this is an emergency situation.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, I began my remarks by talking about the fact that we are dealing with a very serious economic downturn and a financial crisis in this country, and very serious attempts are being made to work in a bipartisan way. We have Republican representation. I know Speaker PELOSI and those at the White House are working on this.

Now, to liken this \$60 billion package that was just dropped on us, which is designed to dramatically increase public spending, with the effort that Democrats and Republicans alike are pursuing to try and deal with the economic challenges that we face as a country when it comes to the confidence level of markets and people who are losing their homes, is just preposterous.

I would be happy to further yield to my friend from Hood River.

□ 1415

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman, because clearly we weren't going to get the answer, and I will give it to you. There are no offsets here. There are no offsets here, it's \$60 billion in spending, which apparently is okay for the Democrat majority to do after 2:15 in the afternoon in Washington, D.C., but earlier we were told we couldn't fund a 100 year-old commitment to rural counties and school districts because there wasn't an offset. That was this morning when they dealt with the tax extender.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, it was not only this morning, but it was last night. It has been day in,

day out in the Rules Committee. We have repeatedly offered an amendment that five Democratic Members of the Rules Committee have cosponsored as legislation that the gentleman has. Yet they have refused vote after vote upstairs in the Rules Committee to allow us to deal with this very important issue of secure rural schools.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I will tell you what I hear when I go home: Why does the Federal Government make promises it can't keep? Why does it start new programs when it doesn't take care of the programs it has in place?

This is a real-time perfect example. This program, identified on page 12 of this bill, would allocate \$3 billion for this green school program. Now, I am actually one of the cochairs of the Renewable Energy Caucus. I believe firmly in renewable energy, I am a fan of it.

There is probably more renewable energy in my district than anywhere in the State of Oregon, and the State of Oregon is about to be leader in the country in wind energy. All of that is good. Conservation is good. I believe in it fully.

But what happens here is you are starting a new program for \$3 billion, and you are throwing over the cliff the people in rural America, the 4,400 counties, 600 school districts in 42 States who had a commitment with this Federal Government, dating back 100 years, where there are forested lands, that revenues would be shared, and that the Federal Government would be a good partner, a good neighbor.

That's why Theodore Roosevelt, when he created the great forest reserves, said the only way they will continue to survive and thrive is if the local communities are brought into the process. For my colleagues who may be from the east coast, understand this is a map of the United States. It shows Federal landownership.

Look at how much is owned by the Federal Government in the western States versus the eastern States. If you had 55 percent of your State owned by the Federal Government, and it was in forests that you, the Congress, are refusing to allow proper management of, this is what you end up with. This is after the Egli fire in 2007. These children are out where the fire burned. In the southern part of my district today, there's 500,000 acres that are ready to do this, because they are dead, in our Federal forests.

The legislation that I had hoped to get a bipartisan opportunity to offer a bipartisan amendment in a House that should be bipartisan would restore the county Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, a part of which allows for collaborative organizations, including environmental groups, to work with local communities to develop plans to get in and manage the forests so we don't burn them all up. If you care about green-

house gas emissions, as I know many on that side of the aisle does, stop allowing your forests to burn up.

I would have, if given the opportunity, substituted the \$3 billion that you are going to send out to every State in the country, and especially to areas that I recall Jake Abramoff used to lobby for, the Mariana Islands and everywhere else, I would have substituted that \$3 billion and put it in place to keep a pledge and promise and commitment to the rural communities in this country and their schools and their sheriffs' departments and their search and rescue departments, and their teachers.

Because, you see, we have got to quit in this Congress starting new programs and not taking care of the old ones. We have got to stop breaking promises and commitments to the people of this country. It could have started here. When I hear, oh, gee, I wish this were all bipartisan, and I wish that, you know, process didn't matter, I've just got to call it the way I see it.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I would like to thank my friend for his very thoughtful contribution.

Here we are dealing with these very, very serious and important challenges that exist all over the country. The gentleman has come forward with Democratic and Republican support for his effort, and it's being denied, once again, under a process that really undermines the deliberative nature of the institution.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, please, how much time is left on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady very much.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for the American people and my colleagues here to understand just what we are discussing. I am delighted that the gentlelady from Florida indicated, she used the word, the appropriate word, it is the economic emergency stimulus package. What we are doing right here is to insist that we are able to move that package forward as quickly as possible.

To my good friend from Oregon, I think it's important to note that we do care about rural schools. In fact, we had a bill by PETER DEFazio to fund those rural schools. Of course, it was not responded to warmly by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

But what we do have, as was indicated, \$3 billion to green our schools. Whether they be rural or whether they be urban, that creates jobs much that

is the public-private partnership that this economic stimulus package addresses.

Now I stand here wearing several hats. One, my whole area now in the gulf region has been impacted by Hurricane Ike. Hurricane Gustav came through and a number of other hurricanes.

We need this emergency economic stimulus package. Let me tell you why, very briefly, and I think it's important for us to realize, whatever the government does, it has impact in the private sector. If we put \$3.6 billion to purchase buses and equipment to the American people, it is the private sector that will provide that for us. This is an emergency economic engine.

As a chairperson of the Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection Subcommittee, I can tell you that airport improvement grants are crucial in determining major safety and security. That is the private sector that will be put to work. Now, some 84,000 Americans have lost their jobs.

It is important to have an extension of unemployment benefits to help these people restart their lives to pay their rent or mortgage. It is equally important to fund Amtrak and public housing, then, of course, to break down this thing called highway infrastructure, crumbling, that is, by its very nature, a partnership with the private sector.

Thousands upon jobs of contractors, of engineers, architects and designers will be working to put the Nation's crumbling infrastructure back to work, and fixing crumbling schools. I have 180 schools out because the power is down. That's an infrastructure issue that needs to be fixed and rebuilt.

What we are doing here is responding to the emergency needs of America. This is an economic stimulus package that is thoughtful, that is sound, and it addresses the concerns of the American people.

My people, or these people in the gulf region, are strong, they are resilient, they are rebuilding. But I must say to you this economic is something that we need. It is crucial that we begin to put America back together again.

I am supporting this legislation because it balances the needs of America, but, yet, yields to the concept of public and private partnership. It helps a broken system with Medicaid assistance because it recognizes that people who are unemployed cannot provide for themselves.

Pass this same-day rule and pass the stimulus package.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlelady an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Pass this stimulus package, because on behalf of the gulf region and all of those, the gulf region, the Midwest who suffered horrific devastation by Mother Nature's devastation, this economic stimulus passage is needed today, not

yet today, not tomorrow, but needed today.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of New York. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here in strong support of this economic stimulus package, which will have an immediate effect on our economy by creating investments in infrastructure projects that can start fast, meet existing needs and create jobs. These projects provide short-term benefits by putting people to work, buying goods, and leave behind long-term infrastructure assets that will benefit Americans for years to come.

Outside of the crumbling schools that will be repaired, the water projects, the transit, the advanced battery technologies, et cetera, I want to just mention the one that I am thinking right now about the most, highway infrastructure, \$12.8 billion for our Nation's crumbling, aging, highways and bridges, to improve our safety and reduce traffic congestion. In my district, there are 13 bridges on the deficient list that was released after the I-35 bridge collapse in Minnesota.

If we can spend \$12 billion a month in Iraq, certainly we can come up with this \$12.8 billion to repair the bridges that our school buses, our trucks carrying commerce, and our family vehicles are going across every day. This will be a job-creation program whose jobs cannot be outsourced. We would be rebuilding the value of our own country, nation building here at home, and creating jobs for our people that cannot be sent abroad.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of my friend from Tampa how many speakers she has remaining.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, we are done with speakers on our side.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a copy of a letter from the Republican Governor from the State of Florida, Charlie Crist, who writes: "I am writing to you in the last days of the 110th Congress to reiterate my support for congressional action regarding the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage," the Medicaid portion of this bill.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Tallahassee, FL, September 25, 2008.

Hon. ALCEE HASTINGS,
House of Representatives, 2353 Rayburn House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART,
House of Representatives, 2244 Rayburn House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN HASTINGS AND DIAZ-BALART: I am writing to you in the last days of the 110th Congress to reiterate my support for Congressional action regarding the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP).

As you will recall, the impact of seven hurricanes in 2004 and 2005 and subsequent reconstruction has disproportionately affected Florida's FMAP allotment, resulting in \$213.5 million in additional state expendi-

tures in federal fiscal year 2009. Furthermore, continued decline is expected in 2010. For every percentage point reduction in federal support for Florida, our state loses approximately \$150 million and makes it increasingly more difficult to serve residents who need care. This reduction in the federal share of Medicaid funding has placed additional pressure on the state during these economic times.

Our goal is to continue to provide quality services to those currently receiving benefits, and those who just now find themselves in need of assistance. Florida continues to seek a temporary increase in its FMAP and hopes to work with you on a longer term solution to address natural disaster implications to the FMAP allotment. As Congress considers providing relief for states, I ask for your support in ensuring FMAP relief in a manner that will best enable Florida to serve the most residents in need.

I appreciate your willingness to work on this issue as well as other matters impacting our great state.

Sincerely,

CHARLIE CRIST.

Mr. Speaker, I will reserve until my colleague from the Rules Committee has made his closing statement.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that my friend is going to provide her closing statement, I would inquire, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that we are, as I pointed out at the beginning of the debate on this issue, faced with a very serious economic downturn. A crisis of confidence exists in our financial markets. An attempt is being made in a bipartisan way to deal with that at this very moment. We all hope that there can be a resolution that ensures that taxpayers are not going to be unfairly saddled with a responsibility, and that the government is not going to expand its reach any further.

As we look at those bipartisan negotiations going on right now between the two bodies, including the White House, Democrats and Republicans alike, it seems to me that we need to recognize that what we are engaging in here is little more than posturing. Yes, we all acknowledge that there are things in this measure that are very important that we need to address, but this is not the way to do it—in an overnight package that was presented at 9:43 this morning, 46 pages long, rammed through the Rules Committee with a partisan vote, and already terminated in the United States Senate, and with the President of the United States stating that if he were to get this measure, he would, in fact, veto it. So I wonder why it is that we are here.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has twice this week, before the Rules Committee, said that the most famous line from Franklin Delano Roosevelt's famous speech was, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself," but, he said, the line that got the greatest ovation was, "We must take action."

It is very clear that we do need to take action. But action should not be taken in a way that completely undermines the deliberative process.

There were mistakes that were made in the past Congresses, and I will acknowledge that. Some of those mistakes that were made led to the establishment of this document called "A New Direction for America."

This "A New Direction for America" has just been obliterated. It is absolutely worthless, because it has been thrown out the window, a commitment made that has been ignored.

I want to say that I hope that we can defeat this rule. We are going to try to defeat the previous question. Recognizing that this Nation needs to use more of its natural resources while looking to the future with renewable sources of energy, Republicans are advocating an all-of-above approach. We believe that this legislation will lower the price of gasoline, which is what fuels America's cars today.

□ 1430

If the previous question is defeated, I will move to amend the rule to allow a resolution which will prevent Congress from skipping town until we pass comprehensive legislation that will bring down the high cost of energy for American consumers. My colleagues will have the opportunity to support giving States the opportunity to explore and extract energy resources right off their own coasts, opening America's Arctic energy slope, extending renewal energy incentives, supporting research for alternative clean fuels, and minimizing unnecessary litigation that delays or prevents American energy production.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous materials inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, the economic crisis for many American families did not begin this week. The economic squeeze has been ongoing for a long time. For example, just this summer in my district in the Tampa Bay area that I have the privilege to represent, we held foreclosure workshops for families facing foreclosure, maybe they had just gotten their first notice. I was shocked, hundreds of families showed up at the workshop where we sat them down with a lender, one on one, to try to begin that workout period. It was great. They could get a little grace period, they could get a little breathing room. I heard numerous stories about a lost job in a family, something that was completely unanticipated.

Mr. Speaker, at this time when our Nation's leaders are meeting in a bipartisan way with the White House, the

leaders here in the Congress, the folks at Treasury, listening to experts from all around the country and listening to everyday, average Americans weigh in on this emergency situation, I think it is very important that all of our colleagues hear the American people.

If you vote for this rule and the underlying bill, I think everyone here can prove that they are listening and hear the American people and understand their struggles today, understand that they have lost jobs. And that's what this package will provide—jobs, jobs, jobs. We are going to expedite infrastructure projects across the country, bridge building, road building, put a lot of these folks that have been put out of work in the construction sector back to work.

Health care, health care services for our children and for our seniors that do not have any place else to turn. Hear the American people, hear their voices. It is not just health care for those children and the seniors that have nowhere else to turn, but it takes the burden off all the rest who are paying higher copays and higher premiums. They won't have to pick up that tab that is being put upon them unfairly because everyone is going to the emergency room for primary care. Hear the American people.

I think that most of the Nation's leaders are taking this very seriously. They are meeting right now to address the emergency. But part of the emergency response must be carving a modest sliver directly for people at home.

At the beginning of the week, the administration came with a 2½ page proposal for \$700 billion. People got to work. Everyone understood that was unreasonable. You can't give a blank check. So they went back to the drawing board and ratcheted it back, and they keep working on it. But think about it, \$700 billion that a lot of experts thought was okay for Wall Street, largely; and what we are asking for here is \$60 billion for families, for jobs, for health care for kids and our seniors, to give breathing room for unemployment compensation for a few more weeks to, hopefully, get them through this emergency.

I really do appreciate the White House's response to this because yesterday after their meeting, they did not rule out this stimulus package. They don't like what the Senate is doing. It is a little different there, but this is serious business. Do you hear the American people?

It is our moral imperative at this time of emergency to hear the American people. Now, most of us weren't around during the Great Depression, but I know there are many people who are students of history and love to read about FDR and how he handled that crisis. Hopefully we are not there yet. Hopefully these times are not as dire as the times that I heard about from my parents and grandparents.

But let's act now to ensure that we do not face such hard times.

Mr. Speaker, do you hear the American people? Do you hear what they are saying about their retirement accounts? Do you hear what they are saying about their saving for college for their kids?

I hope all of our colleagues hear the American people, support this rule, support this job creation and infrastructure investment package. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. DREIER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1503 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 2. It shall not be in order in the House to consider a concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of either House of Congress until comprehensive energy legislation has been enacted into law that includes provisions designed to—

(A) allow states to expand the exploration and extraction of natural resources along the Outer Continental Shelf;

(B) open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and oil shale reserves to environmentally prudent exploration and extraction;

(C) extend expiring renewable energy incentives;

(D) encourage the streamlined approval of new refining capacity and nuclear power facilities;

(E) encourage advanced research and development of clean coal, coal-to-liquid, and carbon sequestration technologies; and

(F) minimize drawn out legal challenges that unreasonably delay or prevent actual domestic energy production.

(The information contained herein was provided by the 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 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 hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.”

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

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

Ms. CASTOR. 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. DREIER. 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 the resolution, if ordered, and motions to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 4120 and House Concurrent Resolution 214, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 198, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 654]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Boswell	Clyburn
Ackerman	Boucher	Cohen
Allen	Boyd (FL)	Conyers
Altmire	Boyd (KS)	Cooper
Andrews	Brady (PA)	Costello
Arcuri	Braley (IA)	Courtney
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Cramer
Baird	Butterfield	Crowley
Baldwin	Capps	Cuellar
Barrow	Capuano	Cummings
Bean	Cardoza	Davis (AL)
Becerra	Carnahan	Davis (CA)
Berkley	Carney	Davis (IL)
Berman	Carson	Davis, Lincoln
Berry	Castor	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Chandler	Delahunt
Bishop (NY)	Clarke	DeLauro
Blumenauer	Clay	Dicks
Boren	Cleaver	Dingell

Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Donnelly	Larson (CT)	Rothman
Doyle	Lee	Roybal-Allard
Edwards (MD)	Levin	Ruppersberger
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Ellison	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Ellsworth	Loeb	Salazar
Emanuel	Loeb	Sánchez, Linda
Engel	Lofgren, Zoe	T.
Eshoo	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Etheridge	Lynch	Sarbanes
Farr	Mahoney (FL)	Schakowsky
Fattah	Maloney (NY)	Schiff
Filner	Markey	Schwartz
Foster	Marshall	Scott (GA)
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Scott (VA)
Giffords	Matsui	Serrano
Gillibrand	McCarthy (NY)	Sestak
Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)	Shays
Gordon	McDermott	Shea-Porter
Green, Al	McGovern	Sherman
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Shuler
Grijalva	McNerney	Sires
Gutierrez	McNulty	Skelton
Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Hare	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)
Harman	Melancon	Snyder
Hastings (FL)	Michael	Solis
Herseth Sandlin	Miller (NC)	Space
Higgins	Miller, George	Speier
Hinche	Mollohan	Spratt
Hinojosa	Moore (KS)	Stark
Hirono	Moore (WI)	Stupak
Hodes	Moran (VA)	Sutton
Holden	Murphy (CT)	Tanner
Holt	Murphy, Patrick	Tauscher
Honda	Murtha	Taylor
Hooley	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Towns
Inslee	Neal (MA)	Tsongas
Israel	Oberstar	Udall (CO)
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Udall (NM)
Jackson-Lee	Oliver	Van Hollen
(TX)	Ortiz	Velázquez
Jefferson	Pallone	Visclosky
Johnson (GA)	Pascarell	Walz (MN)
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Wasserman
Kagen	Payne	Schultz
Kanjorski	Perlmuter	Watson
Kaptur	Peterson (MN)	Watt
Kennedy	Pomeroy	Waxman
Kildee	Price (NC)	Weiner
Kilpatrick	Rahall	Welch (VT)
Kind	Rangel	Wilson (OH)
Klein (FL)	Reichert	Woolsey
Langevin	Reyes	Yarmuth
	Rodriguez	

NAYS—198

Aderholt	Crenshaw	Hensarling
Akin	Culberson	Heger
Alexander	Davis (KY)	Hill
Bachmann	Davis, David	Hobson
Bachus	Davis, Tom	Hoekstra
Barrett (SC)	Deal (GA)	Hulshof
Bartlett (MD)	DeFazio	Hunter
Barton (TX)	Dent	Inglis (SC)
Biggart	Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Drake	Jones (NC)
Blackburn	Dreier	Jordan
Blunt	Duncan	Keller
Boehner	Ehlers	King (IA)
Bonner	Emerson	King (NY)
Bono Mack	English (PA)	Kingston
Boozman	Everett	Kirk
Boustany	Fallin	Kline (MN)
Brady (TX)	Feeney	Knollenberg
Brown (GA)	Ferguson	Kucinich
Brown (SC)	Flake	Kuhl (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Forbes	LaHood
Ginny	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Buchanan	Fossella	Lampson
Burgess	Fox	Latham
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	LaTourette
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Calvert	Gallagher	Lewis (CA)
Camp (MI)	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Campbell (CA)	Gerlach	Linder
Cannon	Gilchrest	LoBiondo
Capito	Gohmert	Lucas
Carter	Goode	Lungren, Daniel
Castle	Goodlatte	E.
Cazayoux	Granger	Mack
Chabot	Graves	Manzullo
Childers	Hall (TX)	Marchant
Coble	Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (CA)
Cole (OK)	Hayes	McCaul (TX)
Conaway	Heller	McCotter

McCrery	Putnam	Smith (NJ)
McHenry	Radanovich	Smith (TX)
McHugh	Ramstad	Souder
McKeon	Regula	Stearns
McMorris	Rehberg	Sullivan
Rodgers	Renzi	Tancredo
Mica	Reynolds	Terry
Miller (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Murphy, Tim	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Musgrave	Roskam	Upton
Myrick	Royce	Walberg
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Walsh (NY)
Nunes	Sali	Wamp
Paul	Saxton	Weldon (FL)
Pearce	Scalise	Westmoreland
Pence	Schmidt	Whitfield (KY)
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (NM)
Pitts	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Platts	Shadegg	Wittman (VA)
Poe	Shimkus	Wolf
Porter	Shuster	Wu
Price (GA)	Simpson	Young (AK)
Pryce (OH)	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Cantor	Peterson (PA)	Waters
Costa	Pickering	Weller
Cubin	Richardson	Wexler
Gingrey	Tierney	
Mitchell	Walden (OR)	

□ 1501

Messrs. KUCINICH and THOMPSON of California changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 650, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” and on rollcall 654, I would have voted “yea.”

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 203, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 655]

YEAS—216

Abercrombie	Carney	Edwards (MD)
Ackerman	Carson	Edwards (TX)
Allen	Castor	Ellison
Altmire	Chandler	Ellsworth
Andrews	Clarke	Emanuel
Arcuri	Clay	Engel
Baca	Cleaver	Eshoo
Baldwin	Clyburn	Etheridge
Barrow	Cohen	Farr
Bean	Conyers	Fattah
Becerra	Costello	Filner
Berkley	Courtney	Foster
Berman	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Berry	Crowley	Giffords
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Gillibrand
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Gonzalez
Blumenauer	Davis (AL)	Gordon
Boren	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Boswell	Davis (IL)	Green, Gene
Boucher	Davis, Lincoln	Grijalva
Boyda (KS)	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Hall (NY)
Braley (IA)	Delahunt	Hare
Brown, Corrine	DeLauro	Harman
Butterfield	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Capps	Dingell	Higgins
Capuano	Doggett	Hinche
Cardoza	Donnelly	Hinojosa
Carnahan	Doyle	Hirono

Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre

McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—203

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

Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrist
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich

Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourrette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi

Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg

Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi

Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Cannon
Costa
Cubin
Gingrey
Pence

Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Richardson
Scott (VA)
Thompson (MS)

Tierney
Waters
Weller
Wexler

□ 1511

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.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE
SENATE

A further message from the Senate
by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, an-
nounced that the Senate has passed
with an amendment in which the con-
currence of the House is requested,
bills of the House of the following ti-
tles:

H.R. 3068. An act to prohibit the award of
contracts to provide guard services under the
contract security guard program of the Fed-
eral Protective Service to a business concern
that is owned, controlled, or operated by an
individual who has been convicted of a fel-
ony.

H.R. 5571. An act to extend for 5 years the
program relating to waiver of the foreign
country residence requirement with respect
to international medical graduates, and for
other purposes.

The message also announced that the
Senate has passed bills of the following
titles in which the concurrence of the
House is requested:

S. 3605. An act to extend the pilot program
for volunteer groups to obtain criminal his-
tory background checks.

S. 3606. An act to extend the special immi-
grant nonminister religious worker program
and for other purposes.

EFFECTIVE CHILD PORNOGRAPHY
PROSECUTION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The un-
finished business is the question on
suspending the rules and concurring in
the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R.
4120.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
question is on the motion offered by
the gentlewoman from California (Ms.
ZOE LOFGREN) that the House suspend
the rules and concur in the Senate
amendment to the bill, H.R. 4120.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the
opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being
in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0,
not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 656]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw

Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrist
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson

Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourrette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty