Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, trade is a complex issue. But some things are very clear—We need a fair playing field for our workers and businesses and we need a new trade model, with enforceable standards and rules to eliminate unfair trade practices.

So why are we continuing to seek to expand a trade policy that has proven time and time again to be harmful for American workers, businesses, farmers and communities? And why are we seeking to expand the Andean Trade Preference Act or ATPA when there appears no substantive reason to extend the preferences.

According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS), we have a $10 billion and growing trade deficit with the four ATPA nations, Colombia, Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador. American farmers and workers have been directly harmed by the ATPA as can be seen with our asparagus and fresh-cut flower industries. According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, these domestic producers have been affected by lower prices and many growers have gone out of business as a result.

Under the ATPA, flower imports from Colombia and Ecuador receive duty-free treatment, seven though the workers who grow, harvest, and package these flowers routinely experience a number of labor rights and human rights violations. By law, the ATPA is supposed to condition these trade benefits on improvements in worker rights in these countries. However, labor rights violations in the flower industry and other sectors, including violations of the right to freedom of association, continue unchecked.

Where is the enforcement from the Bush Administration? Where is the outrage from this Congress.

Also promised to us when the ATPA was enacted in 1991 was a reduction in coca production in the four ATPA countries. However, in Colombia, according to the CRS, coca crop size estimates remain mostly unchanged since the enactment of the ATPA and in Peru coca crop cultivation has actually grown. Colombia remains the source of roughly 90 percent of the cocaine entering the U.S. In a 2001 report to Congress, the U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service said that they "do not believe that Peruvian asparagus production provides an alternative economic opportunity for coca producers and workers—the stated purpose of the Act." And all this is on top of the fact that Colombia has an appalling horrific record on labor and human rights—Leading the world in the number of unionists murdered year after year.

So why are we seeking to give Colombia further trade preferences?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1830, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1900

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2829, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 517 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 517

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. 2829) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2829 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 California (Ms. MATSUI) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MATSUI. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 517 provides for consideration of H.R. 2829, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act for 2008 under an open rule.

Under this rule, all Members of the House are afforded the opportunity to offer any amendment that is germane and otherwise complies with House rules. In fact, I want to point out to Members that this is the sixth appropriations bill this year to be considered under an open rule.

In November, the American people demanded a change in direction in Washington and a change in priorities. The past 6 months have been an important down payment on our commitment to change. This new Congress must continue to restore our focus on a domestic agenda that helps all Americans.

To that end, today the House takes up the seventh of its annual Appropriation bills where we will continue this progress in taking America in a new direction.

I applaud Chairman SERRANO, Ranking Member REGULA, and the committee for developing a bill that reflects this needed change in priorities and for doing so through a strong, bipartisan process.

This bill aims to spur job creation and make the economy work for everyone by restoring cuts to small business loans, strengthening consumer protections and rejecting a proposal to reduce capital and financial services to underserved communities through CDFI.

In addition, the funding in the underlying bill will help our citizens to vote through upgrades to voting machines and voter registration databases. It ensures a fair tax system by enforcing the Tax Code for everyone, not just those who play by the rules. By focusing on basic priorities like these, we can help restore the American people's faith in our government again.

The programs funded by this bill demonstrate our commitment to serving all Americans, regardless of economic or social background. The $21.4 billion bill includes: $66.8 million for the Consumer Product Safety Commission to protect the public from injury or death from more than 15,000 types of consumer products;

$247.7 million for the Federal Trade Commission to investigate sub-prime lending, ID theft, and other deceptive practices;

$908 million for the Securities and Exchange Commission to enhance securities law enforcement;

$313 million for the Federal Communications Commissions to oversee the changing telecom environment, ensure the continued livelihood of Universal Service Fund and prepare for the transition to digital television;

$139.8 million to combat terrorist financing;

$5.9 billion for the Federal Courts, including $830.5 million for defender services, because every American should

have access to quality legal representation.

The bill also includes $582 million for the Small Business Administration to help small businesses prosper. Of this, $100 million is for Small Business Development Centers, or SBDCs, which is the highest ever funding level for this program. These centers provide management assistance to current and prospective small business owners. In addition, they support existing businesses and assist start-ups with high-quality, no-cost counseling and affordable training programs.

This support for our small businesses helps invigorate local economies by helping the very small businesses that are firmly rooted in our communities both succeed and grow. There are now 63 main SBDCs, at least one in every State, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, Samoa and the U.S. Virgin Islands, with a network of more than 1,100 service locations.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill made in order under this open rule is a well-crafted piece of legislation. I appreciate that the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee worked together to produce such a product. The bill ensures taxpayer fairness, protects the right to vote, and funds programs critical to supporting our Nation's small businesses.

I urge all Members to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I express my appreciation to my very good friend from Sacramento, Ms. MATSUI.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the rule. I know that this is a rule that follows the 200-year tradition that we have had of appropriations bills as privileged resolutions. They have the ability to come to the floor without a rule at all, but if items are protected in the bill, they have to provide waivers from the Rules Committee, and that is what has been followed here. We did this when the Republicans were in the majority and the Democrats are following suit here.

But there are a number of concerns that have come to the forefront. To me, the most important concern, Mr. Speaker, is one that I raised upstairs in the Rules Committee last night.

The Committee on Ways and Means had put into place a very important program in September of 2006 which deals with an issue that is near and dear to every single American who pays taxes. That issue is ensuring that every single American pays their taxes. I don't like paying taxes. But I do it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't like the fact that there are people out there who don't pay their taxes when they are supposed to do it. The challenge of collecting taxes is a very, very important concern of, as I said, every American who does pay their taxes. Collecting taxes is a very important thing, too. Making sure that people do comply with the law is, I believe, an imperative that we need to do all we can to enforce.

Unfortunately, this appropriations bill that we are bringing forward is one that actually eliminates a program that has been extraordinarily effective. It is a program, Mr. Speaker, that has been utilized now by the Federal Government and by 40 of the 50 States. What does it consist of? Simply contracting with private collection agencies, PCAs, to ensure that people who are deadbeats, who are not paying their taxes, actually pay their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, this issue does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee. I see Mr. RANGEL here and other members of the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. MCCRERY sent a letter to us in the Rules Committee saying that he believed that this rule should not allow protection for a point of order to be made against the provision about which I am speaking.

□ 1915

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly about the need for us to make sure that the Ways and Means Committee can have the jurisdiction, and, frankly, keep in place this collection process. So far, $19.4 million has been collected from people who have not paid their taxes by these private collection agencies, and the projection is that over the next 10 years in excess of $1.5 billion will be collected by the Federal Government from these people who have been deadbeats and have not paid their taxes. So I think it is very unfortunate that this bill proceeds with this, and the fact that this rule does not provide us with an opportunity to address that has led me to oppose it.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is going to be an effort to defeat the previous question, and if that is done, our colleague from Nebraska Mr. TERRY is going to offer an amendment to the rule that would make in order a provision that would allow for the rejection of the cost-of-living adjustment.

I know there is a lot of talk around here about that issue, so we are going to be having a vote on that. Our colleague from Nebraska, as I said, Mr. TERRY will in fact be the author of that amendment if we did defeat the previous question on this issue.

Having said that, I do want to say there are a number of items in this bill that I think are very good and important. I am particularly proud of having worked for a number of years on the issue of financial literacy training for students and for adults as well.

We see this proliferation of advertising, Mr. Speaker, that continues to come down from a wide range of entities, and it can be confusing. Unfortunately, there are many young people today who really don't have the grasp of the financial instruments that are options to them out there. For that reason, I believe that something in this bill that is very good is the effort to focus on the increase of financial literacy training.

Mr. Speaker, I want to praise my colleagues, especially Mr. REGULA, who has taken on this responsibility here as the ranking member of the subcommittee, and Mr. SERRANO, who is chairing the subcommittee. I praise them for working together in a bipartisan way on some other items that are very important.

As I said, I believe that interdicting illicit drugs is a very important issue. This drug trafficking issue was a topic of discussion in the last debate that we had on the Andean Trade Preference Act that we are going to be voting on later this evening, and I believe that there are, again, many, many other items that are included in this bill that are good and decent and appropriate measures.

But I just am very, very concerned about this issue, as I said, Mr. Speaker, of this notion of people abusing the tax provisions and not, in fact, paying their fair share of taxes. So I feel strongly that taking advantage of these private collection agencies is, in fact, the right thing to do. I know there is concern voiced about that, because people don't like being harassed. But you know what, Mr. Speaker? If they are not paying their fair share of taxes, I believe steps should be taken to try and get them to do that. So this is going to lead me to oppose the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Greensboro, North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding. We are in disagreement about the proposed COLA.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the proposed cost-of-living allowance increase because it is ill-timed. I represent constituents, as do many of you, who earn $25,000 to $35,000 annually, and they read that the Congress approves a COLA increase for themselves. Not good.

According to recent polls, Americans don't like the Congress. Our numbers, lower than President Bush's numbers, are in the tank. To enact this COLA proposal will do nothing, in my opinion, to improve our already diminished reputation.

Mr. Speaker, my fiscal philosophy is very simple: Taxpayers pay our salaries, and beyond that, in my opinion, they owe us little more. I have refused a congressional pension, so when I leave the Congress I will receive not one brown penny of congressional pension money, because I don't believe taxpayers owe me a congressional pension just because I served in the Congress. By the same reasoning, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe they owe us a

cost-of-living allowance increase at this time. Do we deserve a cost-of-living allowance increase? Probably. Is now the time to enact a cost-of-living increase? Probably not.

Mr. DREIER, my good friend, you and I are in disagreement on this, but we can do so agreeably, hopefully.

Anytime you are talking about money, Mr. Speaker, sometimes emotions become frayed, and volatile activity may result. But I don't want to offend anybody, especially the gentleman who yielded to me. But I feel very strongly about this, and I thank you, Mr. DREIER, for having yielded to me.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me just thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding and thank her also for her steady and solid work on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying Financial Services appropriations bill. I would like to thank my friend Chairman SERRANO for his leadership and commitment to consumer issues in this spending bill and for his work on Cuba. To that end, I want to raise an issue I know that the chairman and I agree on, and that is ending the travel ban to Cuba.

I intended to offer an amendment to prohibit the Office of Foreign Asset Control from enforcing the travel ban for students, but was unable to for procedural reasons. Allowing student travel to Cuba for students to study will go a long way to foster peace and security in our region and, quite frankly, sets a good example for the type of connections and collaboration that we need to foster understanding between different cultures and countries.

Students are some of the best ambassadors, highlighting the best in our country. For the life of me, it makes no sense and I do not understand why, first of all, why this embargo exists when Americans have the right to travel wherever they so desire. That is fundamental in our democracy. But why we would keep our young people from going to Cuba to study? It makes no sense. Young people can study in China. They can study in Vietnam. Why in the world can't they study in Cuba?

We are going to continue to work on that until our young people have that right to travel and study wherever they so desire. This is an important issue, and, again, I am going to continue to work to lift this inconsistent and costly travel ban, but also to end this very ill-advised and ineffective 40-year embargo against Cuba.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to my very good friend from Omaha, Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I rise not only in opposition to the rule, but respectfully request that my colleagues join me in voting ''no'' on the previous question.

I have drafted an amendment that would freeze our salaries for this year, much like we voted to do in the last year. We are not going to have the opportunity then to have a straight-up vote on that amendment during this appropriations bill. So our one opportunity to voice our opinion on the COLA, the cost-of-living increase, which is somewhere probably around 2.5 percent, I don't know the number itself, but that happens automatically unless we have a straight-up vote to suspend it, and we are going to be denied that opportunity. So I respectfully request that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in voting against the previous question.

Now, let me state some of the reasons why I think it is important that we freeze our salaries again for next year.

First of all, I don't think we deserve it. Our approval rating with the American public is 14 percent, according to Gallup, the lowest in the history of polling. Obviously we are doing something wrong if the people have such little confidence in us.

I think there are a variety of reasons why the people have less confidence in us now than they even did last year, and I think one is because of maybe the viciousness and the partisanship is probably at an all-time record high. We have our political opponents that think we are down and want to put their heels on our throats and keep us that way, and I am not sure that is what the American people want.

But then let's look at effectiveness. In the major bills that have come through the House of Representatives, the congressional leadership, and I say that in toto, House and Senate, have gotten very few bills to the White House for signature. In fact, we have done a variety of resolutions and bills, many of them condemning what Republicans had done in the past. But out of 60 bills that have gone through the House in our first 6 months, since January 4, 2 have been signed into law, and that is it.

Now, if we were on a baseball team, and we hit 2 out of 60, or less than 1 percent, a .033 percentage, we would be sent down to Single A ball for such a pathetic percentage. So we are not performing well enough to deserve it.

Now, I do want to bring up one other aspect. Usually what happens with the cost-of-living increase is we have a token vote on the previous question, and there is an arrangement basically for the votes to be there to allow the previous question to go forward for the rule, with a gentleman's agreement that those who vote ''yes'' won't have to pay for it in the elections. But the reality of that is that is off the table.

This is just one of the many ads run against Republican incumbents who voted for the previous question last year. This is paid for by the Democrat Congressional Committee against Incumbents Who Vote for the Previous Question.

So I think it is important to warn everyone that comes here that is going to vote on the previous question, which is the vote for a congressional pay freeze for our next year's salaries, that if you are a Republican, DCCC is going to run ads against you, and since that agreement is off the table, if you are on my friend's side of the aisle over here, the Democrat side, the agreement is off also if you vote for it. Maybe the Republican National Congressional Committee will be running ads against you for voting for a pay raise, and maybe it is because we haven't made the Bush cuts permanent that will raise taxes on American families, or maybe it is just because of the lack of productivity in the House that protects our families. There are a variety of reasons.

But the reality is there is no such agreement left, folks. Vote against the previous question and protect yourself.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my fellow Members to oppose the previous question, and I welcome my colleague from Nebraska. It has been a lonely exercise for me the last few years, and I am glad to have someone else join me on the floor and make this request, because I do think having some transparency and having accountability and having an up-or-down vote on the COLA makes a lot of sense.

These are difficult times in our Nation. We are fighting terrorism on so many fronts, our economy faces some challenges, and our future budget deficits continues to be projected in the future at great levels.

So I don't think this is the right time for Members of Congress to be allowing a pay raise to go through without even an up-or-down vote. We need to show the American people we are willing to make some sacrifices. We need to budget and live within our means and make careful spending decisions based on our most pressing priorities.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us send a signal to the American people that we recognize there is a struggle today for some in today's economy. Vote ''no'' on the previous question so we can have an opportunity to block the automatic cost-of-living adjustment to Members of Congress. Regardless of how Members feel about this issue, they should all be willing to make their position public and on the record. A ''no'' vote will allow Members to vote up or down on the COLA.

If the previous question is defeated, I also would intend to offer an amendment to the rule, and my amendment would block the fiscal year 2008 automatic cost-of-living pay raise for Members of Congress. Because this amendment requires a waiver, the only way to get to this issue is to defeat the previous question. So therefore I urge Members to vote no on the previous question.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to my very good friend from Lubbock, Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. And I was listening to the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee talking about people not following the rules, people that are avoiding their income taxes. Quite honestly, I want to bring a point up tonight that is about not obeying the rules. So I rise in opposition to this rule.

We spent a lot of time a few weeks ago talking about earmarks. Fortunately, we were successful in eliminating the secret slush funds of earmarks being reined in. So this is one of the ways we worked on controlling spending in an environment right now where the Democrats have already passed legislation that would increase spending by $50 billion this year, $20 billion in this current appropriations cycle.

But when we were talking about earmark reform, we really were only talking about 1 percent of our spending. If we are going to win the battle on spending, we have to focus on more than just earmarks.

One of the things that is very important is that we have a process in Congress. We say we are going to authorize programs, and then we say we are going to take time out and then fund them in the appropriations process. Tonight we are going to take up this bill, and it is called an appropriations bill. That is how we spend the money.

But one of the things we said in the House rules is a project or program has to be authorized before it can be appropriated. But you know what the very first thing that we do is? We say, oh, Congress is not going to play by the rules during this appropriations process. We are going to fund projects that aren't even authorized.

The American people understand the term ''authorization.'' Many of you have a credit card or a checking account. On your checking account, you have authorized signatures. On your credit card, you have authorized users. Unfortunately for the American people tonight, we are talking about using a credit card, because we are spending more money than we have.

One of the things that is an alarming number to me is it was recently reported that Congress is going to appropriate over $100 billion of unauthorized expenses. I don't think the people back in America, the people certainly back in the 19th District of Texas, think Congress ought to be spending $100 billion on programs that aren't even authorized.

Here are just a few examples of those. Tonight in this bill, for example, there is $23 billion worth of spending that is, what? Not authorized. Some of those projects are $100 million for a Community Development Financial Institutions Fund. That program was last authorized in 1998.

□ 1930

There is $315 million for the Election Assistance Commission. That authorization expired in 2005.

A lot of people say Congress may be just too busy to authorize these new programs. Well, you know what, if we are too busy to look at whether these current programs are relevant, whether they are efficient, or whether we should be doing them, then we are probably too busy. But by the way, we haven't been too busy to authorize just in 6 months over $600 billion in new programs.

So what we are spending money tonight on is projects that we didn't take the time to evaluate whether these projects are worthwhile and worthy of spending the American taxpayers' money on. And in the meantime, we have been very busy passing brand new programs to the tune of $228 billion, which is why this Democratic leadership is going to hand the American people a gift of the largest tax increase in American history.

If we are serious about leaving more money in the American taxpayers' pockets so that those families can pay for health care and gasoline and other things that are essential to those families, we are going to have to leave more money in their pockets, and we certainly can't do that by runaway spending. Spending money on projects that we haven't reviewed to determine whether those programs are worthwhile, relevant today, and whether some efficiencies could accrue in some of those programs and could be combined, and that we could do it better and spend less money.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of letting the American people have more of their money and against a rule that is going to appropriate money that we haven't even authorized.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief comment regarding the Members' COLA which, as Members know, is provided for not in this bill but directly through the Treasury Department based on a predetermined formula.

When we had a debate last year, Members on our side of the aisle objected to the rule on the grounds that Members should not receive a cost of living increase until average Americans did through an increase in the minimum wage.

I am happy to report that the Democrats kept their promise. No COLA was permitted in the long-term funding that Democrats passed earlier this year to resolve last year's appropriations gridlock. As a result of the new majority's leadership, we passed the first increase in the minimum wage in almost 10 years. It goes into effect on July 24, just less than a month from now.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD extraneous material, including the amendment to be offered by Mr. TERRY if, in fact, we do defeat the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. If I may inquire of my friend from Sacramento, how many more speakers do you have remaining?

Ms. MATSUI. I have no further speakers. Do you have additional speakers?

Mr. DREIER. I have no further speakers, but I understand there is some amendment here to the rule that you want to talk about, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I will be offering an amendment that adds a new section to the rule that allows the House to consider a current resolution providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July.

I wanted to apprise the gentleman from California regarding that.

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

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

I am just a little confused about this amendment. I know that the Budget Act calls for us to have completed our appropriations work in the House by the 4th of July, and the promise that was made by the Democratic majority was that all of the appropriations bills would be done by the 4th of July break. I will say that I am a little confused.

I would be happy to yield to my friend as to what this proposed amendment would, in fact, entail.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, this is necessary because of a technical provision in section 309 of the Congressional Budget Act that prevents the House from considering any adjournment resolution for a period longer than 3 days unless all of the annual appropriations bills have been passed by the House.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, again, I remember there was a promise made that the work on House appropriations bills would be completed by the July 4 break. It sounds to me as if there is an attempt being made to really go beyond and not comply with that promise that was made. There seems to be some kind of requirement here that we amend the rule to make this happen.

I would be happy to yield to my colleague or to the gentleman from Florida, my Rules Committee colleague.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Does the gentleman remember that you did the exact same thing last year?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, I would say last year there was not a commitment that was made that we would complete all of our appropriations work by the July 4th break.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I would be happy to further yield.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Does the gentleman remember the last couple of weeks here who participated in causing the delay?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, and I would be happy to further yield to my friend, I would say that we have been going through the appropriations process. We are in the minority. There is a new majority. A promise was made to the American people that work on the appropriations process would be completed by the July 4th break. I am just a little confused here as to how it is that we got to this point.

This is now an amendment to the rule that is being propounded, and I would just like to say that I think by virtue of doing this we are simply, Mr. Speaker, underscoring the fact that the work has not been completed. If a finger of blame is being pointed, I guess at our side, we have delayed the process of completing the appropriations work, all I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this was a commitment that was made at the beginning of the 110th Congress. And obviously, with the explanation just provided by my friend from Sacramento, this has not happened.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. Thank you for yielding.

I was in my office and I heard you make the assertion that a ''promise'' had been made to finish all of the appropriations bills by July 4.

I am the chairman of the committee. I certainly made no promise. We indicated that it was our plan and our intent. But I would point out we have had several hundred amendments offered by Members of the minority party. We have spent approximately twice as much time debating each of the bills the last 3 weeks than was the case a year ago, despite the agreement between the two leaderships that there would be every effort made to try to handle these bills in a timetable that was consistent with last year's activities.

And so I simply want to make quite clear that there was no ''promise.'' And even if there had been, which there was not, the majority cannot be held accountable for the fact that your Members introduced 188 amendments to a single bill. One Member introduces 188 amendments to a single bill which is simply filibustering by amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the distinguished Chair of the Appropriations Committee for his explanation.

I will say, however, what we have done is we have followed the standard appropriations process. In fact, as we look at the rules that have been passed out so far through the appropriations process, in the last Congress, we made in order every single amendment that was proposed to the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, and as the gentleman knows, only three of 23 amendments that were submitted to the Rules Committee when it came to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee bill were made in order which did in fact limit the debate.

All I would say, Mr. Speaker, is my friend from Sacramento has come forward and said she is going to offer an amendment to the rule. I am concerned about it, the fact that it was not included in the rule and it has just come to our attention.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply point out, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to the fact that we have effectively endured filibuster by amendment by the minority for the past 3 weeks, in addition to that fact, we have two other practical facts to face.

When we took over this Congress, we had to deal with last year's budget because the folks who controlled the Congress last time just didn't happen to get around to passing the appropriations bills last time. So we had to spend the first month of this session doing the work that they left over from the last session. They had passed not a single portion of the domestic part of the budget. They had not passed a single domestic appropriation bill. So first we had to run that cleanup brigade.

Then we had to deal with the fact that in order to hide the full cost of the war, the President declined to request funding for the Iraqi war in the regular defense bill which was supposed to be finished last year. So we had to take the next 3½ months to clean up that mess left over from last year. So I would say it is really the pot calling the kettle black to somehow suggest that the majority party has failed in its responsibility because it has not met a so-called mythical promise.

We laid out what the plan was, and given the fact that the first 4 months of this session was essentially spent cleaning up their mess, I think we have done pretty well.

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

I would say to my very good friend from Wisconsin, welcome to the challenge of governing, as he knows very, very well.

The fact of the matter is there was, in fact, at the beginning of this Congress, a statement made. And what has been proposed by my colleague from Sacramento is an amendment to the rule to deal with the Budget Act. All of a sudden, we are going to just waive the responsibility here to deal with this question, and I just think that the procedure around which we are now taking this action on this amendment underscores that our colleagues are having a little bit of difficulty governing.

Let me just say that I am opposed to this rule for a number of reasons. I would like to restate the concern that I raised earlier.

I had a chance to speak with our colleague from New York, the distinguished Chair, of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL. I told him of a letter that was sent to the Rules Committee from Mr. MCCRERY which raised concern over the fact that there are people out there who are completely abrogating their responsibility to pay their fair share of taxes. They are not complying with the law. And in September of 2006, private collection agencies were enlisted by the Federal Government to begin the collection of taxes from deadbeats who are not paying their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, 40 other States, 40 other States have enlisted private collection agencies, and they have been successful, and at the Federal level, we have, as of March of this year, seen $19.47 million collected so far, and the projection is that under these private collection agencies in the next decade, we will see between $1.5 billion and $2.2 billion in taxes that are owed to the Federal Government paid.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, if we pass this rule, we are undermining the ability of the Ways and Means Committee to take on its responsibility for this issue. So I will urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule so, in fact, we will have an opportunity to do the right thing when it comes to this issue.

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

□ 1945

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a comment on the Members' COLA once again, that the Members' COLA was calculated by a predetermined automatic formula. This legislation does not address Members' COLA. Changes to Members' COLA formula should be addressed in authorizing legislation from the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect and deserve the best services their government can offer and their tax dollars pay for. This $21.4 billion bipartisan bill provides significant support to our small businesses, helps guarantee our citizens' right to vote, and works to close the tax gap. It is a good bill. I believe through simple measures such as these, we can restore our citizens' faith that the government can, and is, working for them again.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MATSUI

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the rule at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. MATSUI:

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

SEC. _____. It shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider concurrent resolutions providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, this amendment adds a new section to the rule that allows the House to consider concurrent resolutions providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 517 OFFERED BY MR. TERRY OF NEBRASKA

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

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. 2829) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in section 3 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2829 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.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 1 is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

''Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act and notwithstanding section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31), the percentage adjustment scheduled to take effect under such section for 2008 shall not take effect.''

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and 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 on the amendment and the resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on the amendment to H. Res. 517, if ordered; adoption of H. Res. 517, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1830.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

YEAS—244

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Carter
Castor
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herger
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—181

Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Berkley
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boyda (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)

Courtney
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Doggett
Donnelly
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Goode
Gordon
Graves
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
Kildee
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Latham
LaTourette
Linder
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Napolitano
Paul
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Shuler
Shuster
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Sutton
Taylor
Terry
Tiberi
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Cardoza
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Harman
Hunter
Lofgren, Zoe
Ortiz
Sessions

□ 2020

Messrs. EDWARDS, MARSHALL, ROGERS of Michigan, MOORE of Kansas, SPRATT, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Messrs. WALZ of Minnesota, MICHAUD, CARNAHAN, HALL of Texas, ELLISON, BISHOP of New York, WELCH of Vermont, TAYLOR, WILSON of South Carolina, ALLEN, KILDEE, INSLEE, LANGEVIN, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee and Ms. HOOLEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. EMANUEL, KNOLLENBERG, CROWLEY, FERGUSON, ISSA, MARKEY, JACKSON of Illinois, SULLIVAN, CALVERT, SHADEGG, GARRETT of New Jersey, CAMPBELL of California, KINGSTON, PENCE, GARY G. MILLER of California, HERGER, FEENEY, AKIN, CANNON, UPTON, CAMP of Michigan, GALLEGLY, SAXTON, BURGESS, SMITH of New Jersey, BURTON of Indiana, GILLMOR, MARCHANT, BUYER and EHLERS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 581]

AYES—225

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
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
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
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
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
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.
Johnson, Sam
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
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
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
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
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
Young (AK)

NOES—198

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
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
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
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
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
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
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
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)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Blunt
Cardoza
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Harman
Hunter
Lofgren, Zoe
Ortiz
Sessions

□ 2026

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 206, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

AYES—213

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
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
Carnahan
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
Doyle
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
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
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
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
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
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—206

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
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
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
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
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
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, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
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
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
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)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Cardoza
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Gillmor
Harman
Hunter
Lofgren, Zoe
Ortiz
Pickering
Sessions
Sutton
Watt
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2032

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1830, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1830, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays 59, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

YEAS—365

Ackerman
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez