more than 9,000 facilities that perform more than 30 million mammograms yearly.

The NIST Internet time services are being used by NASDAQ, a key component of our wonderful American system of financial integrity, for NASDAQ members to time stamp hundreds of billions of dollars worth of stock trades and other financial transactions that are conducted in business every single day.

The United States, for the last 35 years, has helped the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the FBI. During part of that time my father, for eight of those years, served as Director of the FBI.

□ 1115

The NIST helps improve the process of matching fingerprints found at crime scenes or collected from suspects with those that are on file. In cooperation with the American National Standards Institute, the NIST also developed a uniform way for fingerprint identification data to be exchanged between different jurisdictions and between scanning machines made by different manufacturers.

The Malcolm Baldridge National Quality Award, the Nation's highest honor awarded by the President of the United States to U.S. organizations for their performance excellence in quality achievement, is managed by the NIST, and the award criteria are used by thousands of companies, hospitals, and schools to improve their products and services all across the United States.

The total economic benefit of the NIST Baldridge National Quality Program, which receives only a small amount of Federal funding, is estimated at almost $25 billion for a stunning benefit-cost ratio of 207 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about something that is a laboratory that all Americans can be proud of. I came from a research organization years ago in New Jersey where I had a chance to also work in a lab. This lab is an asset to America. But, Mr. Speaker, it is part of an overall comprehensive and complex way that the United States chooses to do business not only in this country, but also to lead the world.

I found it interesting that just a few weeks ago there was a report issued by the Financial Times, which is a newspaper that reports on international monetary circumstances, and it reported that now the 25-member EU countries have a combined GDP that equals that of the United States of America, 25 member countries from the EU. But if you read on, you see that they now have a combined GDP that equals the United States where we were in 1985.

America truly is the world leader. We are the world leader in commerce and activities that create better lives for people. The EU is struggling. They are struggling because of high taxes, rules and regulations, and a single-payer system in health care, those things that we here in the United States Congress also debate and talk about.

And because we have a chance to have something like the NIST as well as a free-enterprise system that is vibrant here in America, because we shut off the heavy rules and regulations, the heavy taxation, and those things that would be related to a single-payer system for health care, we have been able to move America economically in the world marketplace.

So Republicans today come to the floor in full appreciation and respect with our colleagues to say we want to continue what this lab does, but we are also asking for them at the same time to recognize that growing medium and small business, ensuring that America stays competitive, and, most importantly, that we are prepared for the future where our competitors might be is what really this Congress should be doing.

Today is a small piece, part, a component of that competitiveness model that will keep America going, and I am proud to be a part of that.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, it is time we put some teeth behind our rhetoric about helping our manufacturers and promoting innovation and industrial competitiveness. While there are many things that must be done on many different fronts to see real improvements, passing the Technology Innovation and Manufacturing Stimulation Act today is one very positive action we can take for manufacturers in Ohio and across the Nation.

It also tells those involved in measurement science, standards and technology, and those working to contribute to public safety, industrial competitiveness and economic growth that we are behind their efforts.

As I said earlier, when we support the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, and the Technology Innovation Program, we are not only talking the talk, we are walking the walk. For this reason, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1429, IMPROVING HEAD START ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 348 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 348

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1429) to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 1429 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CASTOR. 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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 348 provides for consideration of H.R. 1429, the Improving Head Start Act of 2007, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The rules waive all points of order against the bill except those arising under clauses 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order and provides appropriate waivers for 12 amendments, all contained in the committee report.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 40 years Head Start has served as the premier educational and developmental program for more than 20 million American children and families. Head Start works. It works because it is a well-researched, comprehensive initiative that combines children's educational needs with health care and parent outreach.

This comprehensive approach to child health, nutrition and learning is one of our best tools to tackle the achievement gap in education for children living in poverty across our Nation.

The achievement gap begins far before children enter elementary school. Head Start tackles the achievement gap through cognitive, social and emotional child development, each of which is a key contributor to entering elementary school prepared to succeed.

Today 20 percent of America's 12 million children under age 6 live in poverty. We know that a family's income level greatly affects their children's access to educational opportunities. The reality of poverty for so many children, unfortunately, is tied to low success rates in our classrooms. This is true in my home State of Florida. In my community in the Tampa Bay area, over 5,300 children currently are served by Head Start, but many thousands more are on waiting lists and are eligible.

They are on waiting lists because for so many years previous Congresses have failed to reenact Head Start, and the White House has proposed flat-line budgets, so our kids merely have been treading water. With no improvements or increases in funding since 2003, and inflation going up, it has become more difficult to maintain the well-known, high-quality elements in Head Start.

The good news is that this new Congress will change that today and make the smartest investment for our country's future workforce. We are going to put more kids on the path to success when we pass this bill and rule today.

This bill will improve teacher and classroom quality, strengthen the focus on school readiness, expand access to thousands more children across America, strengthen comprehensive services, increase the number of children in early Head Start, because we are a lot smarter these days based upon the research that has been done on early child development and the development of the brain. We are going to allow homeless children to enroll, and we are going to do a better job, my colleague from Florida, for children who are just learning English.

On Monday, I paid a visit to the West Tampa Head Start Center and delivered books to the kids and teachers to mark the four decades of smashing success of this holistic, wraparound initiative that empowers all of us. These children are eager and ready to learn if we give them the tools.

We need to raise strong and healthy children. Head Start prepares children to succeed in school and in life. The administration's slow-motion cuts of Head Start over past years will now be reversed. The American people stood up in November and asked for change, and today we are going to stand up for them.

□ 1130

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is very important for the future of our children that they develop the skills and receive the education necessary to make them a success later in life. Unfortunately, many children begin their education without the proper foundation, putting them at a disadvantage that has long-term effects on their education.

We must do all we can so that low-income children do not begin their education at a disadvantage. That is why the Head Start program was created.

In order to give children the proper foundation they need to begin their education, the Head Start program provides comprehensive early childhood education development services. These services include child development, educational, health, nutritional, social and other activities. These services prepare children to enter kindergarten and for their continued educational success.

In fiscal year 2005, the Head Start program provided developmental services to over 900,000 children, 35,000 of them in my State of Florida. Most of the children that receive the critical developmental skills offered by the Head Start program come from low-income families, and at Head Start they receive the early educational foundation to do well in their later education and hopefully break the chain of poverty.

The underlying legislation being brought to the floor today builds on the success of the program and improves its weaknesses. It authorizes over $7 billion for fiscal year 2008, strengthens Head Start's academic standards by emphasizing cognitive development and topics critical to school readiness.

It is important that the children in Head Start receive the best education possible. There are, Mr. Speaker, several provisions in the underlying legislation that I believe will help with this goal. First, the bill seeks to ensure that a greater number of Head Start teachers are better trained and educated in early childhood development, particularly in fundamental skills such as language, pre-reading and pre-mathematics, within 2 years.

Competition encourages better quality. As recommended by a 2005 GAO study, the bill seeks to increase competition among Head Start grantees to help weed out poor performers and offer stronger programs.

The bill also seeks greater transparency and disclosure regarding how Head Start funds are spent. This will help to fight financial abuse and further ensure that Federal Head Start funds reach the disadvantaged children that they are meant to serve.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, Resident Commissioner FORTUÑO offered an amendment to this legislation to allow religious organizations to not ignore religion in their hiring practices. The provision was included in previous Head Start reauthorization bills. However, the majority on the Rules Committee blocked that amendment from consideration today by the full House.

Head Start has a proud history of inclusion of faith-based organizations. Approximately 80 grantees have religious affiliations. Without the Fortuño amendment, faith-based Head Start grantees may decide to stop offering Head Start programs. That would hurt the children in those programs.

In 2004, the Department of Health and Human Services issued regulations requiring any organization that receives direct financial assistance from the Department, such as Head Start, to not engage in inherently religious activities such as worship, religious instruction or proselytizing as part of the program or services funded by HHS. So objections to the Fortuño amendment, in my opinion, are unfounded.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I anticipate on the floor of the House today we will hear some debate over the role of faith-based organizations in Head Start. Republicans would like language that would repeal existing civil rights protections in this Head Start law that ensure the program's Federal funds discriminate, and we are opposed to that.

No citizen should have to pass a religious test to qualify for a publicly

funded job. That is exactly what some on the other side of the aisle will attempt to do today.

Religious organizations who run Head Start programs are not asking for this change. They have written us to oppose it. Head Start teachers and staff should be chosen because they are qualified and they are effective teachers who will help children succeed and thrive. Hiring and firing decisions should not be made because of a teacher's religion.

This is part of an ongoing attempt, I am afraid, by some on the other side of the aisle to make religion a wedge issue.

Democrats strongly support faith-based organizations running Head Start programs, and H.R. 1429 on the floor today specifically reaffirms that faith-based organizations may run Head Start programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), my colleague from the Rules Committee.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Florida for her national leadership on an issue of national importance, Head Start.

Later today I will be joining with my colleagues, Representative SPACE from Ohio, Representative HARE from Illinois, and Representative ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania to offer an amendment that will require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to pay special attention to the unique needs and challenges that our rural kids face to have access to Head Start.

This is a great program, as was described by my colleague from Florida, but there is a misconception oftentimes that Head Start is about urban America, poor kids from cities. In fact, there are many poor kids from rural America that benefit from access to Head Start, and as a federally funded national program, we know the different communities have different needs.

The National Advisory Committee on Rural Health and Human Services, in fact, acknowledged this when it issued a report that found several issues to be particular challenges for rural America in access to Head Start: transportation, workforce, enrollment fluctuation, performance standards, health requirements and financial matching.

What we know is that one size does not fit all, but what we also know is the opportunity for all is an essential American goal.

This amendment, when it is offered, is directing the Secretary to make certain that those special challenges that our rural kids face in America are included in an execution plan so that there will be opportunity for the rural kids as well as the urban kids.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and appreciate the gentleman yielding time.

To be blunt, the rule before us is not worthy of the bill we will be debating in just a short while. Let me be clear at the outset. I support the improving Head Start Act and will vote for its final passage later today. However, the rule before us restricts debate and provides very little opportunity to improve this bill.

While I appreciate the Rules Committee making in order a few Republican amendments, including ones offered by my Education and Labor Committee colleague, Mr. PRICE of Georgia; my former committee colleague, Mr. PORTER of Nevada; and my friend, Mr. PUTNAM, this rule is defined more by what it does not include than what it does include.

Yesterday, Mr. Fortuño submitted to the Rules Committee an amendment to protect the civil rights of faith-based organizations wishing to provide services to Head Start children. In the aftermath of September 11, Hurricane Katrina or any other tragedy, faith-based organizations have been among the first to reach out a hand in service to those impacted by the event. It does not take a large-scale catastrophe to rally faith-based organizations into action, however. These groups are working to assist their fellow Americans each and every day, focusing on issues from job training to child care and everything in between.

Too often the Federal Government has ignored or impeded the efforts of faith-based organizations willing to lend a helping hand in providing critical services to the neediest in our communities. Mr. Fortuño's amendment would have protected the rights of faith-based groups to fully participate in serving Head Start children without relinquishing their religious identities. And the majority turned it away.

Mr. Speaker, they turned it away even though the 1964 Civil Rights Act made clear when faith-based groups hire employees on a religious basis, it is an exercise of the group's civil liberties. They turned it away even though in 1987, the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously upheld this right. And they turned it away even though former President Bill Clinton signed four laws explicitly allowing faith-based groups to staff on a religious basis when they receive Federal funds.

In its place, they allowed us to debate an amendment that applauds the work of faith-based providers but fails to protect their civil rights. This hollow amendment may provide certain Members of the majority political cover, but in reality, it does nothing to protect the constitutional rights of faith-based organizations seeking to serve Head Start students.

This is just one example, the most significant of all, of how this rule is not worthy of the bill we will be debating later today, and so I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON), my colleague from the Rules Committee.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and of H.R. 1429, the Improving Head Start Act of 2007.

Head Start is vital for our children in high-need areas, providing them with programming critical to their cognitive development, from math and reading instruction, to nutritional and social services for students' families.

In 2006, over 900,000 children, almost all of them under 5 years old, participated in Head Start.

In my home State of Ohio, Head Start serves more than 38,000 young people, including more than 2,500 children in my congressional district alone. These children come from some of the most high-need families in our Nation, and Head Start does exactly what its name suggests. It gives these children a head start, helping them achieve at or above their age level by the time they leave the program.

Unfortunately, children in families facing difficult economic situations often begin school behind their wealthier peers. Head Start achieves amazing results for these children and is often the only program keeping them from falling behind.

Despite the crucial role Head Start plays in the lives of hundreds of thousands of American children, Congress has neglected them has neglected to reauthorize or adequately fund this program for the past 4 years.

This important legislation authorizes funding for Head Start through fiscal year 2012 and makes a number of long overdue improvements to the program.

Our bill increases funding for teacher and staff salaries and benefits and will improve the classroom environment by lowering the student-to-teacher ratio. These changes will give our hard-working teachers and other educational staff more opportunity to work with their students and improve their academic performance.

This legislation also helps program hire and retain qualified teachers and staff by increasing salary and benefits and supporting professional development plans. And this bill will expand access to 10,000 additional children.

This Congress is making a commitment to our children and the Head Start program, and it is critical that we do so. Research has shown that children attending Head Start are more likely to graduate from high school than other low-income children. Research has also proven that children who attend Head Start are less likely to enter special education, are less likely to repeat a grade and are less likely to end up in the criminal courts in adolescence.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will give more of our children the help and assistance they need. With passage of

this legislation, we are not only providing our children with the opportunity for a brighter future, we are building a brighter future for our country.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill so we can keep our promise to America's children.

□ 1145

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

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. While I appreciate the Rules Committee making in order several of the proposed amendments, including an amendment offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia to create a State demonstration program that allows up to eight States to coordinate Head Start with other State-run early childhood development programs, this rule unfortunately limits improving the Head Start Act further by not allowing for debate on several Republican amendments.

Although I oppose this rule, I do support the underlying bill, the Improving Head Start Act of 2007 to reauthorize the Head Start program. This legislation improves the Head Start Act by emphasizing that every child, regardless of their economic status, should have the best chance possible to succeed.

We all can agree on the need for Head Start and its successes. We must also recognize that Head Start can produce even greater results for children. Students who attend Head Start programs generally start school more prepared than those with similar backgrounds that do not attend Head Start. However, Head Start students continue to enter kindergarten well below national norms in school readiness. By moving to close the school readiness gap, this bill will improve results for almost 1 million Head Start students across almost all of the Nation.

Towards the goal of closing the readiness gap, the Improving Head Start Act of 2007 strengthens Head Start's academic focus while maintaining its comprehensive nature. The bill improves the academic focus of the program by establishing new quality standards that ensure enrolled children develop and demonstrate language skills; prereading knowledge, including an interest in and an appreciation of books, reading and writing either alone or with others; premathematics knowledge, such as recognition of numbers and counting; cognitive abilities related to academic achievement; and social development important for environments constructive for child development, early learning and school success.

The Improving Head Start Act of 2007 builds upon the reforms of previous reauthorizations of Head Start, as well as the requirements of the landmark No Child Left Behind Act, and the vision of President Bush and Secretary Leavitt. We all want to do what is best for our children, and I truly believe the underlying bill does that.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman from Florida if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. We have two speakers remaining.

Ms. CASTOR. Our side has no remaining speakers, except for my closing.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, but in opposition to this rule.

I would first like to talk a little bit about some of the unique history of Head Start that I think is important as we move into the discussions of the amendments and the bill itself.

Head Start is a moderately successful program. Because it's a moderately successful program, often it's oversold. It's only moderately successful, but it's very difficult to get any program to succeed in the highest-risk populations of America, as we learned in No Child Left Behind and other programs trying to reach those who have been left behind by the economic growth of America, by the opportunities in America, in the low-income urban communities and the low-income suburban communities.

To have modest success is actually a tremendous accomplishment in Head Start. So how did Head Start perform differently, and what was the concept behind it that made it unique?

On the left and on the right, there would be, for lack of a better word, a populist empowerment faction in both parties. In the sixties, the community action movement said we need to stop the top-down approach and do a more bottom-up approach and involve the communities in poverty themselves in making their own decisions.

That entails certain risks, because they may not, when you let people vote their own decisions and make their own decisions, do what government exactly wants them to do, or what college-educated Ph.D.s come into that community and think is best for that community.

One of the key debates last year when this came to the floor was whether the Head Start policy councils should allow the parents to have a vote. The bill was altered to take that vote away from parents and basically make the parents hood ornaments; say we have parental involvement, but take the breathing lifeblood of those Head Start programs away.

I am very pleased that in this Congress, after seeing the probable defeat on the House floor, had it not been blocked by the leaders of both sides, it is now in this year's bill. Parents will continue to have a vote and continue to make this a grassroots program.

But there is another part of this bill that I oppose, and there is an amendment made in order under this rule that makes it even worse, and that is to require 50 percent of the teachers to have a college degree. That sounds like a great goal, but if you understand that this is preschool, and part of the goal here was to get the parents involved, unlike what's happening in the elementary schools and the high schools in many of these urban and rural areas, the parents don't get involved.

Partly what happens in Head Start councils is parents get involved. Often they get hired as teachers and teachers' aides. They are from the community. There is research suggesting, and no research to the contrary, that the net impact of moving to this 50 percent requirement in 2013 is going to result in less teachers of color in the urban areas. That's the practical net result.

Fewer parents will go to literacy courses and evolve then into getting a GED and helping to teach their own kids. You will miss the magic of this program, which is empowerment and getting the parents involved, which is what we should be looking for in elementary schools. There is an amendment to take the 2013 goal down to 2011, I believe. That makes a bad clause worse. I hope that amendment gets defeated on the floor.

There is one other amendment in this bill that is a bad amendment. There is nothing wrong with the amendment, it's existing law. It's what I would call a fake faith-based amendment. If an organization follows all the secular rules in hiring and in principles, they have always been, always been, eligible for government grants. The dispute that has arisen in faith-based is not whether, if you have a secular board and don't impose any religious principles on your organization, you can't proselytize. That has already been ruled by the courts. You can't pray if you get government funds during the time that any program is funded by government. You can't refuse to cover somebody.

The question is can a faith-based organization that may have church rules, for example, can only males be preachers or priests? Can you have somebody who is homosexual in a church position in your church? Can you fire somebody for adultery, things that many, if not most, major Christian denominations, Orthodox Jews, Muslim organizations have as rules in their denominations? They are not eligible under the Democrat faith-based rule.

This is a legitimate debate. I grant that it's a legitimate debate, and we have had it on the House floor. But we should not pretend that we are protecting faith-based organizations, when we are, in fact, taking away the historic civil rights protection that has always been granted under, quote, faith-based. A religion is exempt from

normal rules in how they hire, because they believe they reflect their faith.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include into the RECORD an article by Ron Sider, who has written a book that was much ballyhooed in the last election cycle about the faith-based movement not just being conservative right-wingers.

[From First Things]

THE CASE FOR ''DISCRIMINATION''

(by Ronald J. Sider)

I'm a long-time Democrat. In 1972, I organized a group called ''Evangelicals for McGovern/Shriver'' and helped McGovern sweep—well, the great state of Massachusetts.

As a Democrat, I have been deeply dismayed by how out of touch with the American mainstream the party has proven to be on the issue of faith-based initiatives, particularly on the issue of the so-called hiring exemption. (For a discussion of other aspects of the initiative, see Joseph Loconte, ''Keeping the Faith,'' FT, May.)

A vast majority of Americans believe that as a society we have lost our moral moorings and that we must reaffirm the role of religious faith in nurturing persons of integrity and fostering a just, stable society. It is in that context that we must evaluate the Democratic leadership's opposition to allowing faith-based organizations that accept government funds to show preference in hiring to those who embrace the organization's basic religious beliefs and practices. Democratic President Bill Clinton signed three Charitable Choice bills that explicitly included this hiring exemption. Presidential candidate Al Gore embraced Charitable Choice. But when the Bush Administration's legislation expanding Charitable Choice moved to the Senate in mid-2001, the Democratic leadership blocked even the consideration of such legislation—largely on the charge that the hiring exemption amounted to employment discrimination.

In other words, the Democratic leadership has come to believe that religious organizations must give up their long-recognized right to hire staff who share their faith commitments in order to receive federal money that provides needed services to the public. In this, the Democrats are wrong.

To begin with, a religious organization's decision to hire staff who share its religious beliefs and practices is not an example of intolerant discrimination, but rather a positive act of freedom. In a free society, a wide variety of organizations—environmental organizations, feminist groups, unions—are left free to select staff who share their core commitments and who agree with their agenda. This right does not disappear if governments choose to request these private organizations to perform some desired tasks. Planned Parenthood, for example, does not lose its right not to hire pro-life staff simply because it has a government contract. It is precisely the denial of this right to religious organizations that would amount to intolerant discrimination instead of the promotion of a free and open society.

To equate this positive good with the evil of discrimination on the basis of things like race or disability is pure confusion. Whether we think that religion is a medieval superstition or a true and good contributor to social well-being, all who believe in religious freedom should insist that religious organizations be permitted to hire staff who share their religious beliefs.

The obvious fact is that the ability to choose staff who share a religious organization's core beliefs is essential if that organization wishes to retain its basic identity. As Justice William Brennan wrote in Corporation of the Presiding Bishop v. Amos (1987): ''Determining that certain activities are in furtherance of an organization's religious mission and that only those committed to that mission should conduct them is . . . a means by which a religious community defines itself.'' A Jewish organization forced to hire substantial numbers of Baptist staffers, for example, will not long remain a significantly Jewish organization.

Having staff who share a religious organization's essential religious beliefs shapes the group's identity in a variety of ways. Shared motivation, common values, a sense of community and unity of purpose, shared experiences of prayer and worship (even if they are outside work time in the organization) all contribute to an esprit de corps and shared organizational vision. As law professor Ira C. Lupu said in testimony before a House subcommittee (June 7, 2001), ''The sense of religious community and spirit on which [the] success of the group's efforts depend'' may be hampered if it is forced to hire those who do not share its beliefs.

This is important even when, for example, a faith-centered organization chooses to separate by location or time (and fund with private money) sectarian worship, instruction, and proselytization in a program in order to receive direct government grants. This is true for several reasons.

First of all, religious activities may be important to the social service program, even though they are voluntary, privately funded, and segregated from ''secular'' government-funded activities. In such programs, holding certain religious beliefs and practices is a legitimate qualification for a staff position, equally as valid as having the right skills and experience.

Second, enforced religious diversity can have the effect of stifling religious expression of staff within the agency, creating a climate of fear of offending other staff members with religious speech or actions. Since personal faith is very important to many who choose to work in a religious organization, such a climate can diminish staff motivation and effectiveness. Forced religious diversity can sap a program's spiritual vitality and lead to its secularization.

Third, staff often play multiple roles in small organizations. For example, an agency might seek someone to work part-time as a youth minister and part-time as a social worker for its youth mentoring program. Implementing a policy in which religion could be considered as a factor in hiring for some job duties but not others would lead to unnecessarily complicated and impermissibly entangling regulations.

But even leaving aside the effects of such regulation on religious organizations themselves, the rationale behind it makes little sense. The fact that a religious organization accepts some federal funds does not mean that it ceases to be an independent, autonomous entity and becomes an arm or agent of the state. Law, precedent, and common sense all argue that a private organization that accepts some government funds still retains its separate identity. This is clearly the case with colleges and universities that receive government funding, scholars engaged in federally subsidized research, and artists and artistic organizations funded by the National Endowment for the Arts. All of these receive government funding, and all maintain their autonomy from the government. Similarly, a religious organization that receives government funds to provide a public service that serves a public good would maintain its autonomy and not be co-opted by government.

Moreover, not only does allowing hiring preferences based on religious belief within religious organizations pose no social danger, it is the only way to avoid discrimination and governmental preference of one religious view over another. Using the typology of different types of faith-based organizations recently published by the Working Group on Human Needs and Faith-Based and Community Initiatives chaired by former Democratic Senator Harris Wofford helps explain this point.

''Faith-saturated'' and ''faith-centered'' programs both include substantial religious content in their programs and hire (primarily or exclusively) employees who share their beliefs precisely because their religious beliefs tell them that persons are spiritual as well as material beings and therefore the best results follow when spiritual and material transformation are combined. ''Faith-related,'' ''faith-background,'' and ''secular'' providers do not include significant religious content in their program or consider religious belief in their staffing because their worldview tells them that all that is needed to correct dysfunctional social behavior and social problems is socio-economic, material transformation. All these providers, not just the first two, are grounded in an explicit or implicit religious perspective. Secular providers work at least implicitly within a naturalistic worldview (nothing exists except the natural world) that functions in effect as a religious perspective. Functionally, faith-related and faith-background providers operate with deistic religious beliefs (God exists but never intervenes in the natural world of cause and effect). Naturalism and deism, however, are just as much particular religious worldviews as the historic theism that undergirds most faith-saturated and faith-centered programs.

Obviously, if government only funds some private providers of services (i.e., the naturalistic and deistic ones that do not explicitly use religious criteria for staff), government clearly discriminates among religions.

Thus far, I have argued that as a matter of principle religious freedom is such a fundamental right that it ought to prevail even if on occasion embracing that overriding principle has the secondary effect of, for example, reducing the number of job opportunities for a particular group. For example, the Catholic Church must, as a matter of principle, be free to live out its religious belief (which I do not share) that only men should be priests, even if the practice has the effect of reducing the number of job possibilities for women.

My last point offers an argument, not about principle, but about practical effect. The recent suggestion that extending the hiring exemption to faith-based organizations (FBOs) would in practice mean that African-Americans or gay Americans would suffer a loss of job opportunities is simply wrong.

There is a certain tension between two treasured values: on the one hand, protecting the religious freedom and identity of FBOs as they expand their effective services to the most needy; on the other, our society's conviction that except in the case of a narrow range of specific situations, employers should not discriminate on the basis of religion.

But do such hiring preferences really result in job deprivation? Hardly at all.

First, we are talking about a small percentage of the total jobs in the society. Second, many FBOs pay almost no attention to the religious beliefs of staff. Third, in the case of those evangelical Christian, Orthodox Jewish, and Muslim FBOs that do, virtually all the different religious groups have their own FBOs offering a hiring preference to people who share their own beliefs.

For very understandable historical reasons, African-Americans have been concerned that racial discrimination might find

cover under the hiring exemption based on religious belief. This is extremely unlikely to happen. FBOs working in minority communities are run either by people of the same racial group or by whites who have been at the forefront of fighting racial prejudice.

What about sexual orientation? Few FBOs ask about or select staff on the basis of sexual orientation. It is true that a number of FBOs do say that staff should not be sexually active outside marriage. But is that really so terrible—especially for FBOs working to overcome poverty in a society where a child growing up in a single-parent household is eleven times more likely to be persistently poor than a child growing up in a two-parent family?

Even if the hiring exemption in Charitable Choice were expanded to a lot more government funding streams, sexually (and openly) active gay Americans would face extremely little job deprivation. The number in that group is very small and the number of jobs affected is a minuscule fraction of the total number of jobs. Gay FBOs exist and others can be formed that give a hiring preference to those who share that ethical/religious belief. Surely the well-educated gay community does not want to block an enormously promising way to overcome poverty and social decay for millions of desperate Americans to avoid what in practice would at worst mean only the loss of a handful of possible jobs.

Constitutionally, Charitable Choice strikes the right balance between the no-establishment and free exercise clauses of the First Amendment. Morally, it offers promise for major progress in overcoming some of our most intractable social problems. Politically, Charitable Choice and the broader Faith-Based Initiatives have rightly become identified with the widespread sense that we have lost our way morally as a society. By remaining steadfastly opposed to allowing religious organizations to contribute to solving social problems, the Democrats harm our country as well as their future electoral prospects. Only at great peril dare Democrats be on the wrong side of today's widespread embrace of religious faith's crucial contribution to social wholeness. If that happens, they will deserve a repetition of 1972.

The fact is whether you are left or right in the faith-based movement, you have to agree that you have to keep the principles of religion if you are going to keep your spiritual vitality. Particularly in urban America and in rural America, the churches and the vitality is what needs to be brought into poverty and reaching out.

We can have a legitimate debate over whether government funds should go in there. I believe it would help the programs. It has been an historic right. But the amendment that is in front of us is not a faith-based amendment. It's only allowing faith-based groups to participate if they secularize and drop their unique faith.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a statement on the policy councils from Congressman DANNY DAVIS and me.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. HOWARD ''BUCK'' MCKEON,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLER AND RANKING MEMBER MCKEON: For more than forty years, one of the most unique and important aspects of the Head Start program has been its emphasis on parental involvement Head Start has enabled parents, as representatives on Head Start policy councils, to participate in making important decisions regarding budget, programming, and personnel. As the Committee plans to mark up its Head Start reauthorization bill this coming week, we believe that preserving this structure of governance is fundamental to the continued success of the program.

Under current law, Head Start boards of directors and policy councils share the responsibility of managing a Head Start program. This partnership helps to ensure that there is a system of checks and balances in place and that the important voices of experts in accounting, finance, and early education are balanced with the equally important voices of parents who have children in the program. Many of our constituents who are involved with Head Start have told us that policy council members, especially parents, often have a much greater day-to-day knowledge of the program than the board of directors and are thus better able to provide accountability. Indeed, a 2005 GAO report found that calls from parents are often the first signal to Head Start regional offices that a program is struggling with mismanagement.

As the Education and Labor Committee prepares for its markup, we want to ensure that it does not diminish the role of parent policy councils. We believe this would undermine the future success of the Head Start program and, in turn, the success of thousands of at-risk children and their parents. Like both of you, we believe there should be stronger accountability within Head Start programs. The 2005 GAO report, for example, cited a lack of oversight from the HHS regional offices and Head Start boards of directors as sizable obstacles to improved accountability. However, these reforms need not come at the expense of parental involvement in the program. Any Head Start reauthorization bill must preserve the current oversight role of the policy councils with regard to board actions in key areas such as budget, programming, and personnel, if they are to maintain their current vital role within the program.

Again, we ask that the chairman's mark of the Head Start reauthorization bill retain the current shared governance structure of the policy councils and board of directors. The current structure has helped to successfully prepare hundreds of thousands of low-income children to enter kindergarten and empowered thousands of parents to take greater roles in the lives of their children and communities. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact Jill Hunter-Williams with Rep. Davis at 225–5006 or Brett Swearingen with Rep. Souder at 225–4436.

Sincerely,

Danny K. Davis; Donald M. Payne; Robert C. Scott; Linda T. Sánchez; John F. Terney; David Wu; John A. Yarmuth.

Mark Souder; Ric Keller; Todd Russell Platts; Rob Bishop; Timothy Walberg; Raúl M. Grijalva; Virginia Foxx.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, we do have one final speaker before my closing remarks.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of the rule and strong support of the reauthorization of the Improving Head Start Act of 2007.

As a former member of the Education and Workforce Committee over the last 10 years, I have been heavily involved in Head Start programs, the reauthorization process in previous Congresses, and had an opportunity to visit many of the Head Start centers throughout my congressional district throughout western Wisconsin. They are doing a terrific job not only helping our children, typically, who are very high-risk, high-need children, get off to literally a head start when it comes to their individual development and education, but also working very closely, as my friend from Indiana just highlighted previously, the close partnership with the parents of those children, which is crucial to the success of this program.

I want to commend the members of the committee for producing this product, in particular Chairman MILLER and chairman of the subcommittee, DALE KILDEE, along with Ranking Member CASTLE and Ranking Member BUCK MCKEON. I know a lot of them have collaborated and worked closely to produce this.

There are two features in particular that I want to highlight and commend. One is making sure we get the measurements of these kids done right. I led the effort in previous Congresses to see if we could suspend the National Reporting System. This was based on studies that the National Academy of Sciences had made asking us to slow down in this assessment and standard practice until they could develop what they feel are the proper forms of measurement for kids at this age, because if we get that wrong, they said, we could actually do more harm to the children with improper measurements and assessments than doing good.

I am glad to see that this legislation now recognizes that suspension of the National Reporting System gives the National Academy of Sciences a chance to report back with recommendations and guidelines on what proper measurements of these children should be.

The second feature is requiring programs to consult with child care health experts in developing proper nutrition and physical education programs for kids at this age.

In light of childhood obesity and type 2 juvenile diabetes, it's going to be important that we do everything we can to make sure that our kids are getting off to the right start when it comes to quality-of-life issues, make sure that they are not going to start smoking or taking drugs, but also taking the proper nutrition and involved in the proper physical activities to make sure that

they have healthy bodies to go along with the healthy minds that Head Start is meant to produce.

Those two provisions in particular I commend, and I encourage a strong bipartisan vote for this important bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague and friend from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic majority pays lip service to their support of religious people and faith-based groups, but now they are here today, in this House, enacting a piece of legislation that I believe is a shot across the bow to all faith-based organizations that are involved in social services in this country. The Head Start bill today says that if you participate in the grant process, you will not be able to hire like-minded people to work in your child-care facility.

The Democrats are saying that a bureaucracy in Washington, D.C., has more wisdom to decide who you can and can't hire than the hundreds, thousands of small businesses that run these Head Start programs. The Democrats are essentially saying, with this legislation, while we thank you for your tireless dedication and recognize that you are an integral part of this process, we don't trust you to make fair choices in the employees that you hire.

Don't be misled. This is in direct contradiction to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Supreme Court, both of which came to the conclusion that faith-based organizations had the right to hire employees on a religious basis. Faith-based organizations such as churches, synagogues and other faith-based charities are a central part of the fabric of communities all across America. Many of these organizations provide assistance and services to the neediest members of society, offering a helping hand to the less fortunate among us. Many faith-based organizations can and want to make a vital contribution to the Federal assistance programs.

The landmark 1964 Civil Rights Act explicitly protects the rights of religious organizations to take religion into account in their hiring practices. In fact, the Civil Rights Act made clear that when faith-based organizations hire employees on a religious basis, it is an exercise of the organization's civil liberties and does not constitute discrimination under Federal law.

The freedom to hire those who share religious beliefs was upheld in a unanimous 1987 Supreme Court decision, Corporation of the Presiding Bishop v. Amos, in which the Court observed, ''A law is not unconstitutional simply because it allows churches to advance religion, which is their very purpose. For a law to have forbidden 'effect' . . . it must be fair to say that the government itself has advanced religion through its own activities and influence.''

Now, in an attempt to appease Republicans and conservative Democrats, an alternative amendment will be provided by the gentleman from North Carolina. This amendment, in effect, praises the work of faith-based organizations, but tells them they have to give up their right to hire who they want to hire to participate in Head Start.

□ 1200

Current Federal law protects the Civil Rights Act hiring protections for faith-based organizations and providers. And, indeed, as was stated earlier by a previous speaker, President Bill Clinton signed four laws protecting religious organizations in this context.

Now, I want to close by just pointing out a very, very simple fact. There is a reason why on the floor today the amendment to correct this problem will not be allowed, and the reason is because it will pass. A majority of this Congress, Republicans working with Blue Dog Democrats, would pass the Fortuno amendment which would protect these faith-based religious organizations. We had many of the Blue Dogs vote with us on this issue in the past. But, alas, under this rule, and it is why I am imploring my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''no'' on this rule, that amendment will not be allowed and we will be asked to stifle the freedom of religion in the United States.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Again, I thank my friend, Ms. CASTOR, for the time and her courtesy, and all those who have participated in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that I can amend this restrictive rule to make in order the amendment offered by Congressman PRICE of Georgia, which seeks to make regulations for emergency rear door exits and safety belts on vehicles used to transport children effective upon enactment of H.R. 1429. This extremely important amendment was denied by the Democrats in the majority last night in the Rules Committee.

In 1992, Congress required the issuance of regulations related to rear door emergency exits and safety restraints on Head Start transportation. Since the final rule for these new regulations was published in 2001, the effective date has been delayed three times.

Mr. Speaker, Congress required these regulations in order to ensure the safe operation of vehicles by Head Start agencies. Currently, the leading cause of death for children ages 3 to 7 is motor vehicle traffic crashes. Further delaying these requirements means allowing Head Start grantees to transport children using vehicles that are not designed specifically for the safe transport of children.

If the previous question is defeated, the Price amendment would be made in order and this delay would be put to an end. This issue, Mr. Speaker, needs to be resolved, and it needs to be resolved now and this authorization bill is clearly the most appropriate forum in which to do so. Any further delays in the implementation of these crucial safety regulations for children may endanger the lives of children.

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 (Mr. PASTOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Improving Head Start Act of 2007 and this rule so that we infuse Head Start with the necessary investments and program enhancements that will sustain Head Start for years to come. We will chart a new course in the right direction by ensuring family incomes do not impede a child's access to educational opportunities.

The fact that the administration and the past few Congresses did not keep the promise to America's children is unfortunate. We have lost ground. But the good news is that this new Democratic Congress is charting a new direction. This includes wise investments in the education and health of our kids, which are certain to pay dividends for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important day for America. The Congress is going to keep the promise made 4 decades ago to children who are born with the same potential but, because of their life circumstances, are in need of a little extra attention, health care, nutrition, the guiding hand of a knowledgeable, talented, devoted teacher, and a true head start.

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. 348

OFFERED BY REP. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 4 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Price of Georgia or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows:

Page 36, after line 12, insert the following (and make such technical and conforming changes as may be appropriate):

''(3) EMERGENCY EXIT DOORS.—

''(A) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 1310.12(a) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, shall become effective on the effective date of this paragraph.

''(B) COVERED VEHICLES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any vehicle used

to transport children for a Head Start program after effective date of this paragraph, shall be subject to a requirement under such section (including a requirement based on the definitions set forth or referenced in section 1310.3 or any other provision set forth or referenced in part 1310 of such title, or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling) concerning rear exit doors.''.

(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 form Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

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

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

Ms. CASTOR. 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, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 348 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 348, if ordered; and adoption of H. Res. 350, by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 194, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

YEAS—226

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

NAYS—194

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
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
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
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
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Engel
Fattah
Ferguson
Gillibrand
Lampson
McMorris Rodgers
Ortiz
Pitts
Schmidt
Sullivan

□ 1231

Messrs. REGULA, BILIRAKIS, BURGESS, WALSH of New York and HUNTER 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. 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 226, nays 196, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

YEAS—226

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

NAYS—196

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
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
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
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
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Davis, Jo Ann
Engel
Fattah
Ferguson
Gillibrand
Lampson
McMorris Rodgers
Ortiz
Pitts
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised we are at the 2-minute mark.

□ 1239

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION AND MANUFACTURING STIMULATION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 350, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 189, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

YEAS—226

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