

## ADDRESSING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Energy and Commerce legislation that addresses greenhouse gas emissions. We have heard a lot of fear-mongering here on the floor of the House of Representatives and a lot of misinformation trying to scare voters and consumers into believing that somehow their taxes are going to go up. That is not true.

As a matter of fact, this is a carefully crafted bill that provides lots of exemptions to energy-intensive industries to trade to vulnerable industries that will really make a difference in people's lives. But, frankly, to stand still is to lose, and that is why so many companies, like Johnson & Johnson, ConocoPhillips, have endorsed this legislation.

Energy-intensive industries have endorsed this legislation because they know that if we are going to move forward and stay competitive as a country and if we are going to protect the interests of our consumers and the environment, we need a new platform. This bill provides that.

I support the legislation, urge my colleagues to do so too, and not to listen to fear-mongering.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1886, PAKISTAN ENDURING ASSISTANCE AND COOPERATION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2410, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2010 AND 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 522 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 522

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1886) to authorize democratic, economic, and social development assistance for Pakistan, to authorize security assistance for Pakistan, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; (2) the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Ros-Lehtinen of Florida or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. 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. 2410) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and the Peace Corps for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, to modernize the Foreign Service, 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. 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 Foreign Affairs 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 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 part C of the report of the Committee on Rules. 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. 3. In the engrossment of H.R. 2410, the Clerk shall—

- add the text of H.R. 1886, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 2410;
- confirm the title of H.R. 2410 to reflect the addition to the engrossment of H.R. 1886;
- assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and
- conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend, Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 522.

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

There was no objection.

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

H. Res. 522 provides for consideration of H.R. 1886, the Pakistan Enduring Assistance and Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2009, and H.R. 2410, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011. Both bills are debatable for 1 hour each, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The rule on H.R. 1886 self-executes as a manager's amendment to resolve jurisdictional concerns in the bill and legislation providing for Afghanistan-Pakistan security and prosperity enhancement. It also makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute authored by Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN, which is debatable for 30 minutes.

The rule for H.R. 2410 makes in order 27 amendments listed in the Rules Committee report. Each amendment is debatable for 10 minutes, except the manager's amendment, which is debatable for 20 minutes. The rule includes a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is faced with many challenges on the world stage. It is critical that Congress put forth the necessary funding to help rebuild our diplomatic capabilities abroad and mitigate the damage that was done under the previous administration's leadership.

H.R. 2410, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011, is the first foreign relations-related authorization bill to reflect essential democratic priorities since 1993. As such, it provides a new direction forward and vital resources to boost our diplomatic capacity, improve our relations around the world, protect our national security, and make use of America's smart power, rather than rely on the military only solutions of past Congresses and the previous administration.

H.R. 2410 and H.R. 1886, the Pakistan Enduring Assistance and Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2009, together, set forth a progressive foreign affairs agenda that emphasizes diplomatic, economic and social efforts at change, not just the use of military force.

For years the Department of State has been denied critical resources to

fulfill its core diplomatic missions in furthering our global interests and protecting our national security. In neglecting diplomacy, we have missed opportunities to prevent and mitigate conflicts around the world.

Our diplomatic activities are woefully underfunded, undermanned, and underutilized. We must rebuild our diplomatic capacity to meet the needs of our increasingly complex global relations. Diplomatic, economic and social assistance is a much wiser and less expensive investment than war. Rather than relying on either hard power or soft power, we must, instead, emphasize smart power.

Promoting democracy, human rights, the rule of law and the development of civil society is a matter of leadership requiring us to think beyond unilateral military solutions and to, instead, embrace a much more comprehensive approach to our relations with the international community. This rule enables us to consider legislation to do just that.

The first legislation on this rule, the Foreign Relations Act, advances crucial and laudable programs. The Department of State is authorized to hire more than 1,500 Foreign Service officers, ensuring that our overseas posts will be staffed with eager and knowledgeable workers committed to promoting American culture, values, and policies.

Critical multilateral assistance is authorized to fund our obligations to international organizations, including the United Nations and global peacekeeping operations. This effort demonstrates the United States' commitment to working with our friends and allies as a true partner in peace and cooperation.

I'm particularly pleased with the increased funding authorization for the Peace Corps, enabling a dramatic expansion in the number of volunteers and countries served. Peace Corps volunteers exemplify our national commitment to improving the world, devoting their lives to helping the world's poorest people build communities and lift themselves out of poverty. As one of our Nation's most treasured and effective international programs, we must ensure that it attracts top quality volunteers and can reach into the farthest corners of the world.

Improvements in refugee and migration assistance are a critical part of this legislation. The United States has a long history of commitment to humanitarian issues, and this bill authorizes the funds necessary to improve resources and programs to effectively help families reunite and resettle.

I fully support section 235, relating to Iraqi refugees, whom the United States has a special obligation to help. There are more than 4.7 million Iraqis currently displaced within their own country and in neighboring states. Sadly, however, this situation has not improved much. And yet the principal reason, I believe, that this crisis has

not received the attention that it should is because Iraqis are not living in refugee camps. Instead, they are a mobile population scattered throughout the region. This fact alone has made this humanitarian crisis virtually invisible to the international community. However, for those Iraqis who remain stranded, jobless, and deprived of essential services, with conditions worsening by the day, this deepening crisis only threatens to further destabilize the entire region. Section 235 of this legislation is an important step towards fulfilling our obligation to assist the Iraqi people recover from years of war and conflict.

If a picture is really worth 1,000 words, then all one must do is look into the face of the Iraqi refugee, as I have, who has had a family member murdered, kidnapped or tortured, and their own life threatened, to know that the United States must respond. I'm, therefore, grateful that my language, introduced in legislation, was included in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule also includes H.R. 1886, the Pakistan Enduring Assistance and Cooperation Enforcement Act. This legislation takes our Pakistan policy in a new direction, affirming the United States' commitment to a sustained partnership with Pakistan.

Since 2001, the United States has provided over \$12 billion to Pakistan, without specific goals or objectives. Frankly, the situation has only gotten worse since that time.

By providing over \$6 billion in 4 years in democratic, economic and social development assistance, this bill demonstrates our determination to help Pakistan build a stable, democratic and prosperous future.

□ 1045

This funding will provide critical resources for Pakistan to address the fundamental needs of its citizens.

Through the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund, the United States is also committed to helping Pakistan combat terrorism and the Taliban insurgency. At the same time, mindful of the past history of neglecting oversight, this legislation provides a range of transparency, evaluation, and accountability standards to ensure that our money and efforts are being applied effectively and efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, as I am concerned about the situation of Iraqi refugees, I am also concerned about the situation of Pakistan's refugees. According to news reports, more than 3 million people in Pakistan's northwest region have been uprooted due to ongoing fighting. Like the Iraqi refugee crisis, the Pakistan refugee problem, if not handled properly, could become a ticking timebomb with ramifications far beyond what we can conceive today.

It is imperative that the mistakes of the previous administration with regard to Iraq are not made again. I am pleased that the United States has recently committed \$200 million on top of

a previous commitment of \$110 million, but we must not think that this is the end of our responsibility. The United States must seize this opportunity and implement a comprehensive plan to address this growing humanitarian crisis.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule that paves the way to considering essential legislation to put our foreign policy on the right path towards improving our relations around the world. I urge adoption of the rule and passage of the underlying legislation.

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

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

First I would like to say a word about the session of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, OAS, held last week. It was an embarrassment. Fidel Castro in Cuba wants the U.S. to apologize to him for having kept the U.S. market and its millions of tourists and billions of dollars in financing from him and for having denied him full diplomatic recognition for decades.

He also wants the international community to kneel before him and apologize, which is what the OAS did last week. Fidel Castro has been recruiting advocates, spies, defenders, cronies, and servants for years. The ideological and psychological fascination and dependency that Hugo Chavez has on Fidel Castro has allowed Castro to utilize Chavez's billions of petro dollars to purchase many important defenders. It is part of the public record that a suitcase of Chavez cash heading to Mrs. Kirchner in Argentina was recently intercepted by authorities before reaching its intended destination.

Castro has purchased advocates and spies through the years via the always-present threat of blackmail after trips to totalitarian Cuba, where the regime tapes visitors in compromising situations, as confirmed by Interior Ministry defector Roberto Hernandez del Llano and Cuban counterintelligence defector Major Roberto Ortega.

Castro also serves as a banker for illicit money possessed by those who seek to avoid detection by the anti-laundering mechanisms set up by the international community. It matters not if the money's source is political corruption or narcotrafficking.

Through his mastery of the semantic of anti-American Marxism-Leninism, he has also conned others into being his spies. No other state sponsor of terrorism—no other state, in fact—has had more spies arrested and convicted in the United States in the last decades as Fidel Castro's dictatorship.

Let us remember Ana Montes, one of the top analysts at the Defense Intelligence Agency who was arrested in 2001 and subsequently convicted of espionage in Federal court and whose treason led to the deaths of many, including U.S. Special Forces Sergeant

Gregory Fronius. And just last week, Walter and Gwendolyn Myers, a long-term State Department official and his wife with access to classified documents, were arrested for spying for their beloved hero, the Cuban tyrant.

Hugo Chavez's absolute dependency on Fidel Castro for every major decision, even for his phrases and gestures in international forums, is unprecedented. While the Soviet Union used to send Castro economic aid and also orders and instructions, Chavez sends Castro billions of dollars and receives orders from him.

What the world witnessed, first at the April Summit of the Americas and then at last week's meeting of the OAS, was a culmination of years of preparation in the purchase and cultivation of advocates and defenders by Fidel Castro. Castro's defenders know full well that chapter II, article 3d of the Charter of the Organization of American States requires the existence of representative democracy in all of the countries of our hemisphere and that the Inter-American Democratic Charter of 2001 carefully spells out the collective steps to be taken when an American republic's democracy is even threatened. They know that Cuba, under Castro, was the only country in our hemisphere where free elections have not been held in over 50 years and where dungeons are full of nonviolent political prisoners who are subjected to hell on Earth each day of their lives. They know that under Castro Cuba is a personal island-estate, a ranch, a personal landholding or homestead, a totalitarian fiefdom owned by one man with a brother who enjoys the title of head of State and carefully carries out his brother's orders.

At the OAS meeting of last week, we witnessed an example of the Obama administration's diplomatic incompetence and its appeasement of the enemies of the United States. The administration went along and agreed to violate the OAS Charter and the OAS Inter-American Democratic Charter in an action that constituted a grotesque and unmerited betrayal of the oppressed people of Cuba.

The Obama administration says that the OAS resolution was a great victory because even though paragraph 1 of the "resolved" clause unilaterally lifted the exclusion of the Cuban military dictatorship, in paragraph 2, the dictatorship was allowed to initiate a process of dialogue to reenter the OAS in accordance with the practices, purposes, and principles of the OAS. In other words, in the first sentence, the OAS ripped up and threw in the garbage can the practices, purposes, and principles of the OAS, including its charter and the Inter-American Democratic Charter. And then in the next sentence, it invited the Cuban military dictatorship back in in accordance with the practices, purposes, and principles of the OAS. Some victory. I mention this in the context of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act because

the American taxpayer should not be paying for almost 60 percent of the putrid embarrassment which is the OAS.

I recognize that on funding international organizations, the administration will get its way, just like the Bush administration would get its way whenever someone in the OAS would propose ending the exclusion of the Cuban military dictatorship and the administration would simply say, That's a nonstarter. But here is the heart of the issue with regard to U.S.-Cuba policy: The U.S. Congress must continue to condition access by the Cuban regime to the billions of dollars in U.S. tourism and massive investment in trade financing to the liberation of all political prisoners, without exceptions; the legalization of all political parties, without exceptions, labor unions and the press; and the scheduling of multiparty elections. That is critical leverage for a democratic transition to take place in Cuba when Fidel Castro dies, for he is the ultimate source of absolute personal totalitarian power in that enslaved island, like a modern day Caligula or Nero, and that moment is approaching.

We must keep in mind the effect of unilateral concessions such as last week's shameful OAS action on Fidel Castro. How does he react to such unilateral concessions? The repression is more intense than ever; the brutality, more savage than ever. The alliance with Chavez, the Iranian dictatorship, the Syrian regime, Middle Eastern terrorists, and with the North Korean dictatorship is closer than ever. That is what must be kept in mind about unilateral concessions to the Cuban military dictatorship.

Now, specifically with regard to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, earlier in the year Secretary Clinton testified before the House Foreign Relations Committee that she had challenged the State Department to reform and innovate and save taxpayer dollars. I found the Secretary's statement to be quite appropriate. Unfortunately, the majority has decided to ignore that challenge and instead today has brought forth legislation that authorizes increased spending by 35 percent without increased transparency, accountability, and efficiency.

This legislation will also increase U.S. taxpayer funding authorized for the United Nations by nearly one-third without requiring the United Nations to undertake necessary reforms to improve efficiency and stop blatant corruption.

While failing to place accountability standards in this bill, the majority decided to include provisions in the Pakistan Assistance Act—which is also being brought to the floor with this one rule—that will micromanage U.S. policy toward Pakistan. In a letter to the Armed Services Committee, Secretary of Defense Gates and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mullen wrote that "the degree of conditionality and limitations on security as-

sistance to Pakistan" in the legislation "severely constrains the flexibility necessary for the executive branch and the Department of Defense given the fluid and dynamic environment that exists in Pakistan."

This rule bringing forth two pieces of legislation limits the number of amendments that the House will be allowed to debate. Out of the 85 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee, the majority decided to make 27 amendments in order. I understand that the majority has a responsibility to move legislation and manage the time on the floor, but if we look at the amendments the majority made in order, they do not fully address the scope and range of issues of concern to House Members. For example, amendments that would prohibit funds from being used by the State Department to encourage U.S. courts to dismiss claims brought against European insurance companies to recover compensation from Holocaust-era insurance policies, or, for example, to re-list the North Korean tyranny as a state sponsor of terrorism were prohibited from being debated.

I don't understand why the majority blocks a debate on such important amendments. I don't know if they're afraid of debate or protecting the Members from tough votes or afraid of the democratic process, or all of the above.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, my good friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of the rule authorizing the Foreign Relations Act to come to the floor, H. Res. 522. This rule covers both H.R. 2410, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011, and H.R. 1886, the Pakistan Enduring Assistance and Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2009.

These are both critical measures. H.R. 2410 provides the resources necessary for the President to realize his vision of making vigorous diplomacy a cornerstone of our strategy to promote U.S. national security.

By wisely investing resources to strengthen our diplomatic capabilities, we can help prevent conflicts before they start and head off the conditions that lead to failed states. This approach is a much more cost-effective one than providing massive amounts of humanitarian aid, funding peacekeeping operations or, in the most extreme circumstances, deploying U.S. troops into harm's way.

I think the Rules Committee has crafted a fair rule in regard to the bill, one that continues our efforts to include a number of amendments from the Republican side.

With respect to H.R. 1886 regarding Pakistan, I do not need to remind my

colleagues of the challenge to U.S. national security posed by the situation in that country.

□ 1100

We cannot allow al Qaeda and any other terrorist group that threatens our national security interests to operate with impunity in the tribal regions or any other part of Pakistan. Nor can we permit the Pakistani State and its nuclear arsenal to be taken over by the Taliban. H.R. 1886 was designed to address these threats by supporting democracy, enhancing U.S. economic assistance, and providing the Pakistani military with the tools they need to fight the terrorists.

I am pleased we could work out a consensus on this important bill with our colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services as reflected in the amendment made in order by the rule. And I'm also pleased that the rule makes in order a Republican substitute. This way we can discuss the best way forward to ensure that we get the results we need in this ongoing effort to combat those who threaten our Armed Forces, our allies, and even our homeland.

I urge all my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule.

Let me just say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, in the 1990s, I served as chairman of the International Operations and Human Rights Subcommittee, at first having served as ranking member to Tom Lantos. Then when the House went Republican, we switched and I became the chairman of that committee. And one of the responsibilities of that committee was to write the Foreign Relations Act, the State Department Reauthorization Act, for the country. And we worked very hard, Mr. Lantos and I, very diligently in crafting a bill that was, A, truly bipartisan and, B, open to virtually every amendment that Members wanted to offer.

I remember bringing a bill to the floor, Mr. Speaker, where every day Members just had to file their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a preprinting requirement, so in the morning we would wake up and find out what amendments might be offered, and then we would deal and dispatch positively or negatively with those amendments. The process was open, transparent and fair.

Today we have a very much closed rule, except on matters where there is consensus. Sure, there are some Republican amendments. But on areas where there is significant and fundamental disagreement, especially an amendment that I had hoped to offer to authorize the office for Global Women's Issues, I had been precluded that opportunity. And I want to say to my col-

leagues I didn't do that when I chaired the subcommittee, and I worked very hard in a bipartisan way with my friends, and I do consider you on the other side of the aisle friends, to ensure that we all got to express our voice and vote on things that mattered, that we all had an opportunity to express ourselves.

In Committee, I offered an amendment to establish a Global Office on Women's Issues. It lost in a party-line vote. Every Democrat voted against it; every Republican voted for it. That legislation would have established a new Office for Global Women's Issues led by an ambassador-at-large, designed to coordinate and advise on activities, policies, programs, and funding related to women's empowerment internationally. The amendment would promote activities designed to expand educational opportunities and job training for women, equal pay for equal work, microfinancing and microenterprise programs for women, property inheritance rights for women, an improvement of maternal mortality, expand pregnancy care centers, combat forced abortions and forced sterilization, to enhance our efforts in the area of sex and labor trafficking particularly of women and other forms of violence against women, seeking an end to genital mutilation, stop child marriage, and promote changes in male attitudes and behavior that are detrimental to women. That was all prescribed in the legislation, and obviously other things could be included as well, consistent with core human rights norms that all human life, Mr. Speaker, is sacred and precious and worthy of protection regardless of age, sex, race, color, creed, disability, wantedness, or condition of dependency. My amendment sought to hold harmless unborn children and their mothers from the violence of abortion.

The Smith amendment is abortion neutral and states that the new office shall not engage in activities to author the laws or the policies of foreign countries with regard to how abortion is regulated or permitted. Abortion neutral. I would like it to be a pro-life office that says it time to empower and embrace and enfranchise unborn children.

I say to my colleagues, We live in 2009. We no longer have any doubts about the humanity of an unborn child. Unborn children are just like you and I except they're young, they're immature, and they're dependent. And their human rights are violated with impunity not just in this country but around the world. Sadly, the Obama administration, and I say this with great sadness, Mr. Obama is well on his way to becoming the abortion President. Virtually everything he has done through Executive order and through appointments and through other policies promote the killing of unborn children and the wounding of their mothers.

So I rise in opposition to this rule, Mr. Speaker. Whether this body chose

to vote up or down on my amendment, we should have had the opportunity. It saddens me greatly because, again, I have great affection for the chairman, Chairman BERMAN, and for his staff, with whom I have worked very closely on human rights issues. This is a human rights issue.

There could be a consensus about the new office that's being created, that has already been created, and that this gives statutory affirmation to for women's issues. But, unfortunately, we will not have that opportunity.

I will remind my colleagues that Alveda King, Dr. Martin Luther King's niece—

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Dr. Martin Luther King's niece, Alveda King, has had two abortions. She now heads up an organization called the Silent No More Awareness Campaign, and she speaks out and says that this is the new civil rights movement, protecting the unborn child but equally protecting women from abortion. It is violence against women. It is violence against children.

The new Global Office on Women's Issues ought to at least be neutral, I would say affirm the unborn but at least neutral when it comes to respecting unborn human life.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my colleague and a good member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the rule and H.R. 2410, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011. I would like to thank Chairman BERMAN and the House Foreign Affairs Committee for their continued insight, leadership, and their focus on diplomacy in the realm of foreign affairs and for bringing this much-needed reform legislation to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, during the Bush administration, the Department of Defense acted as our primary foreign liaison, much to the detriment of our relationships worldwide. This bill corrects the damage done over the past 8 years by providing the State Department with much-needed resources that will once again make diplomacy the centerpiece of our outreach effort.

This bill authorizes funding for the State Department and USAID to help prevent, navigate, and peacefully resolve foreign crises. This bill strengthens our own Nation by putting forth the image of America that we want the world to see: a hardworking nation rooted in tolerance and innovation. It reflects our commitment to intellectual diplomacy and allows the United States to lead by example.

For instance, by doubling the amount of volunteers in the Peace

Corps, we can double our response to humanitarian and international development needs. By creating the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation, we would allow more students, regardless of their economic background, to experience foreign cultures.

This legislation creates 1,500 foreign service jobs at the State Department with another 700 at USAID over the course of fiscal years 2010 and 2011. It funds language training programs, sorely neglected for years due to underfunding.

As the Representative of the Second District of Colorado, we have a large Tibetan and Tibetan Buddhist community, and I'm particularly appreciative that this bill establishes a Tibet section in the American Embassy in Beijing and a United States consulate in Lhasa, Tibet. These offices will follow political, economic, and social developments inside the country and report on human rights. It also establishes a Tibetan scholarship program that will enhance cultural exchange possibilities for American students and develop increased understanding of the region as a whole.

Another crucial element of modernizing the State Department is fighting the discrimination against the LGBT community worldwide, including in Iraq. This legislation requires the State Department to monitor and track violence, criminalization, and restrictions on fundamental freedoms, basic human rights, consistent with U.S. law. It requires the State Department to demand foreign governments to change or repeal discriminatory laws that criminalize homosexuality as well as requiring reports on related violence and discrimination. This will ensure that our foreign counterparts heed our rejection of intolerance and ensure that all people are granted the dignity they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I also applaud H.R. 1886, the Pakistan Enduring Assistance and Cooperation Enhancement, or PEACE, Act. It demonstrates America's commitment to foreign diplomacy and codifies the principle that social and economic development is critical to fighting terrorism and promoting peace.

Both bills bring to mind T.H. White's idea that "might is not right." Military intervention is not as strong a diplomatic tool as fostering understanding.

I urge my colleagues to support and vote "yes" on the rule and the bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that Pakistan is at a very critical juncture. We have radical militants. We have radical madrasas that are graduating an ever-increasing number of jihadists out of those schools, and we have a weak government with nuclear weapons.

This Pakistan bill is a good attempt to guide our engagement in Pakistan in a way that gives us the best chance to see that our aid is spent in a constructive and responsible fashion, which hasn't been the case. I commend its author, Chairman BERMAN.

As to the rule, I think it is problematic. The State Department authorization bill, quite simply, spends money we don't have, over a third increase at a time when we're borrowing money from China and elsewhere. Amendments to cut this amount were not made in order. I think that was a mistake.

I am very disappointed, let me add, though, at the addition done by the Rules Committee of a flawed trade provision. Don't get me wrong. Trade can do far, far more than aid for Pakistan's economic development and social stability, which is in our interest. The problem is that this provision is far too restrictive and burdensome as to do any good. In fact, it may be harmful to trade. At a time when Pakistan is perhaps the greatest threat facing us, this is no time for window dressing and business as usual. This preferential trade provision as it came out of Rules Committee is simply unacceptable.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. BERMAN. I again thank my friend from Florida for yielding me some additional time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use this time to deal with one of the points made by my friend from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) and then more substantially to the issue raised by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART cited a letter signed by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense that was sent a number of weeks ago, long before a series of changes were made in this bill. At the time that letter was sent, we had a very elaborate resolution of disapproval process for the Presidential determinations. That has been struck. We had a very high waiver standard vital to national security interests. That has been struck. We had a great dispute that was existing over how the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Cooperation Fund should work. Those issues have all been worked out with the House Armed Services Committee. The House Armed Services Committee has worked through all of these issues with us. They are reflected in the Pakistan bill. This is the committee to whom the Secretary's letter was addressed. A number of changes have been made. My friend's comments relate more to the Pentagon's view of this bill before all those changes were made than they do now.

□ 1115

The issues I would really like to focus on are the issues raised by the gentleman from New Jersey. This is a State Department authorization bill.

The first thing was to put together this bill to say we are not going to use this piece of legislation to change the substantive law on the issue that is so controversial for which disagreements are so strong in this House. This is not going to be a vehicle for changing the law on that subject. So, when a number of the groups came with a compelling case—the pro-choice groups—that we should include a provision in this bill that prohibits any President in the future from imposing an executive order, such as the Mexico City policies, I said I would love to. I support that position, but we're not going to use this bill to do it.

The gentleman from New Jersey, in his heart, is not truly driving at the Office of Global Women's Issues. This is an office that, in one form or another, has been around since 1975. Their purpose is to promote education for women and girls around the world and to promote political empowerment, like the right to vote for women and dealing with problems of violence against women. There is no basis for assuming that this office is going to do anything to promote or to lobby for abortion.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Moreover, in the manager's amendment, which is made in order by this rule that we are now debating, I said let us establish in policy our statement of neutrality on this issue. We include in the manager's amendment a provision which says nothing in this section, and in particular, the duties of the Office of Global Women's Issues, shall be construed as affecting in any way existing statutory prohibitions against abortion. There will be no change whatsoever in existing statutory prohibitions against abortion or in existing statutory prohibitions on the use of funds to engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or policies in effect in any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated or prohibited.

That means the Siljander amendment, the Helms amendment and the Leahy amendment, which construct the current state of the law with respect to U.S. efforts on this issue abroad, remain in effect and unchanged, and there is nothing in the statutory institutionalization of an already existing Office of Global Women's Issues that will change any of that. We reaffirm that by this statute.

What the gentleman from New Jersey wants to do—he didn't quite say it, but he acknowledges it when asked about it—is change the law. That's legitimate. He can have his efforts; but for those of us who say let's not use this as a vehicle one way or the other and for those of us who have rejected efforts that we, personally, support and to which I am very much committed in

the pro-choice community regarding this issue, there is no basis for saying that this bill is defective because it doesn't serve either side's agenda on this particular issue.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I had three amendments that were brought before the Rules Committee yesterday, and for the life of me, I can't figure out why the Rules Committee didn't make these amendments in order. Let me just talk to you about these three amendments. Then I'd like for the Rules Committee to comment on them, if they would.

First of all, there is a man named Benon Sevan, who has been indicted in the Oil-for-Food scandal with Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein was kicking millions of dollars to this guy in the Oil-for-Food scandal. This guy has been indicted. He is hiding in Cyprus right now, and the U.N., with our money, is going to pay his legal bills, and they're almost \$1 million already.

Why should the American taxpayer be paying the legal bills of Mr. Sevan, who was involved in the Oil-for-Food scandal that we all know about? Why should the United States taxpayer be paying his legal fees, especially when he is hiding out in Cyprus?

Well, that was one of the amendments, and I hope you'll explain to me why the American taxpayer should be paying for that.

The second amendment deals with liquidated assets that we give to enterprise organizations around the world. We give hundreds of millions of dollars to organizations around the world to help the economies of various countries. When those enterprise funds and organizations are liquidated, they take that money, and they put it into foundations or into other organizations within those countries. Right now, there is \$900 million that is sitting out there of American taxpayer money that is going to foundations in other countries, and we don't believe all of that money should go there, because it is not for its intended purpose. So, if they want to do that, we think we should get at least half of our money back, which would be \$450 million.

For the life of me, I can't figure out why the Rules Committee wouldn't want to get at least half of our money back that's not being used for its intended purpose. It makes no sense to me, so I hope they'll explain that to me.

Lastly, Jerusalem in Israel is our best ally in the Middle East. Since the 1967 war, Israel has maintained that united Jerusalem is the indivisible, eternal capital of Israel. On November 14 of 2005, Congress mandated that the embassy be moved to Jerusalem. We mandated that our embassy be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem in 2005, but we did give the President waiver au-

thority under certain circumstances. Every single year, there has been a waiver granted that does not allow our embassy to be moved to Jerusalem.

I think that's wrong. It's time to change that. My amendment would have said that we move our embassy and that we start building the embassy in Jerusalem now just as it was proposed and passed by this Congress in 2005.

So I would like for my Democrat colleagues on the Rules Committee to explain to me why these three amendments were not made in order: one dealing with something we've already done, which was to order our embassy in Israel to be moved to Jerusalem. We've already ordered that.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I hope you will explain.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN), my colleague and fellow Floridian.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying legislation, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 2009. This bill will allow us to advance our foreign policy and our national security goals, and I believe very strongly in those goals.

I would also like to briefly speak about one provision in the bill that will help to ensure the safety of many Americans. As many of us know, June 1 is the beginning of hurricane season, and there are many ways to be prepared. Hurricane hunter planes, used by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and by the Air Force, fly into hurricane areas to more accurately predict where a hurricane is going. However, certain countries are not allowing these planes to fly into their airspace. If one country obstructs our hurricane preparedness efforts, it could be the difference between life and death. This legislation puts in place measures so that the State Department can resolve this issue as soon as possible and can help protect our Americans.

I would like to thank the chairman for allowing us to work on this issue and on all of the others with me and with others. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the point made by the distinguished chairman as to the strings on the military aid to Pakistan, I hope and expect that that will be engaged in during the debate with the ranking member, who very clearly in the Rules Committee pointed out that the strings are still excessive.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. LEE).

Mr. LEE of New York. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule and the underlying bill. The legislation we're set to consider today is the latest demonstration of Washington's failure to understand how the middle class lives in these difficult economic times.

Try, for instance, to explain the logic in granting a 23 percent increase to overseas foreign service officers to the workers in my district who are either taking pay cuts or who are losing benefits as their families in my district are doing their best to make ends meet. When Washington spends money, it does not have to fund these salary increases. It is not just the disconnect on spending that is cause for concern.

In the last month alone, gas prices in my district have been up over 41 cents. These are resources coming from individuals who are struggling in my district to make ends meet. Now Democratic leaders are pushing for an ambitious national cap-and-trade tax. This new energy tax will cost between \$200 and \$300 a month for struggling families. This affects not only families but small businesses, ranchers and farmers. I can't think of a worse way to deal with our pressing energy needs than to have a tax situation.

We need to be looking at an all-of-the-above strategy, be it nuclear power, wind or solar. We need not be looking at trying to tax right now, which will push businesses further away and which will create a loss of jobs in our communities. Whether it's the excessive spending in the measure we are considering today or whether it's this new national energy tax, Washington continues to grow more and more out of touch with middle-class America and with the families of my district.

I urge my colleagues to vote down the rule and to oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time do both of us have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would inquire of my friend if he has any additional speakers.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Then I would reserve at this time and would allow that you go forward.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Thank you.

I yield 2 minutes again to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding.

I just want to say to my pro-life friends on the Democrat side of the aisle: think consequences.

In late April, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton testified one of our hearings—and this is the question I posed to her—Is the Obama administration

seeking in any way to weaken or to overturn pro-life laws and policies in African nations and in Latin American countries either directly through multilateral organizations, including the United Nations, the African Union or the Organization of American States, or by way of funding NGOs like Planned Parenthood?

Secretary of State Clinton answered that the administration was “entitled” to advocate abortion “anywhere in the world.”

She also went on to redefine the words “reproductive health,” which are found in many documents and in many laws around the world, in a way completely contrary to the accepted definition by the previous administration and by many others to now include abortion. So every time you see those words now in a document, to the Clintons and to the Obamas, they mean “abortion on demand.”

The Office of Global Women’s Issues should be all about promoting human rights for women. Promoting violence against children and promoting the wounding of their mothers by advocating abortion is not human rights. It is the contrary. It is the exact opposite.

I hope my colleagues will realize that the amendment that my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the committee, Mr. BERMAN, is offering simply restates current law. It says the new office will follow the law. Did anybody expect that the office would not follow the law? Of course they would. Well, hopefully, they would.

We need to make sure, we need to ensure that this new office, which will be a command and control center, for women’s rights and empowerment and not become an office for NARAL, for Planned Parenthood or for others in the promotion of child deaths around the world. Let’s hold harmless the precious lives of unborn children. Let’s mitigate maternal mortality and all of the other crises affecting women, not the killing of unborn babies.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), my good friend.

Ms. CLARKE. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2410, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. This authorization includes provisions that keep our country safe, that advance human rights, and that promote gender equality across the globe.

In the 110th Congress, I introduced H. Res. 1504 in response to a 2007 report by the United Nations’ Office on Drugs and Crime and the World Bank, linking drug trafficking to rising crime rates in Caribbean nations.

□ 1130

The measure calls for increased cooperation between the U.S. and Carib-

bean officials to combat drug trafficking and promote counterterrorism. CARICOM, made up of 15 countries, including Trinidad and Tobago, Haiti and Jamaica, serves as our Nation’s third border. Drug traffickers and criminals use these nations as transit points en route to the United States, making us less safe and contributing to a deterioration of the human welfare and social and economic development of those nations. This authorization acknowledges this problem and authorizes the President to incorporate CARICOM into the Merida Initiative. This will provide CARICOM with the technical and logistical support needed to combat drug trafficking and promote counterterrorism.

Also included in this authorization is the enactment of the Shirley A. Chisholm Educational Exchange Program. I was an original cosponsor of the stand-alone bill, H.R. 416. This program provides scholarships for CARICOM students to study at American colleges and universities and requires that, upon program completion, participants either return to the CARICOM or seek a job that directly benefits CARICOM nations and their people. This exchange program will create a safe and economically vibrant Caribbean Basin and keep us safe here at home.

The authorization also includes language that creates the Office of Women’s Global Affairs with the fully empowered ambassador-at-large. According to the Center for Development and Population Activities, gender equality is essential for development, democracy, and global progress.

Thank you for yielding time, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and underlying bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) has 5 minutes. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule. I am very disappointed that the Rules Committee did not rule my amendment in order. My amendment would have required the State Department to wait for a response from the CIA before issuing a visa to an applicant when a Security Advisory Opinion has been requested.

National security is a primary function of the Federal Government under the Constitution, and after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, our Nation has had to take a closer look at our policies and create a more layered approach to security, including visas. However, as tourism has once again increased, so have the waiting times for some visas.

Earlier this year, the Department of Homeland Security initiated a review

of the State Department visa approval process, Mantis applicants in particular. The committee staff was finally briefed last week on changes that had already been implemented. According to details supplied during the briefing, DHS determined that the waiting period for Mantis visas was too long. The primary reason cited was lack of staff.

Instead of simply increasing the staff and resources needed, DHS recommended and implemented several policy changes—a small window for certain intelligence agencies to respond before State could clear the visa. This is insane.

Let me be clear. What we’re talking about is allowing some foreigners to enter our country before our intelligence agencies have fully vetted their visa applications. Again, what we’re talking about is allowing some foreigners to enter our country before our intelligence agencies have fully vetted their visa applications.

I’m very concerned about these changes, and I urge my colleagues to join me in investigating this issue. It’s an important aspect of our national security, and I am disappointed that my amendment was not allowed to receive debate and a vote on the floor today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I’m prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time. Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the ranking member, Mr. DREIER.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it seems like a long time ago, but I would like to begin by congratulating my friend from Miami for his very thoughtful and very passionate opening statement. It’s very important, Mr. Speaker, that we get this bill right because it clearly has an impact on every bilateral, regional and multilateral relationship that we have in the world. And I hope very much that at the end of the day, we will be able to get it right.

I would like to take my time to talk about just one of those very important bilateral relationships that we have, and that is the relationship with what Colin Powell described as the most misunderstood country in the world. I’m talking, Mr. Speaker, about the fourth most populous country in the world, the largest Muslim population in the world, and of course, by virtue of that, the largest Muslim democracy in the world, that being Indonesia.

Now, as we look at the changes that have taken place over the past 11 years in Indonesia, it is absolutely remarkable and extraordinarily impressive. The 32-year reign of Suharto came to an end in 1998, and since that time, we have seen democracy take hold and build.

We all know that democracy is a work in progress. We in America know

that our democracy continues to be a work in progress and Indonesia's is as well. The challenge of ensuring that the military comes under civilian rule is one with which they're still grappling. And if you think about this country, 17,000 different islands and hundreds of languages and ethnicities, and yet they have been able to cobble together what President Yudhoyono described to some of us as the convergence of modernity, Islam, and democracy.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are continuing to this day to work on that relationship through our House Democracy Assistance Commission, where we're working to build the parliament which, again, a little more than a decade ago was a sham organization, and today it is growing and building well. Other institutions, including the very important rule of law in Indonesia, are continuing to build as well.

So there are challenges. We all know that. And I hope very much that we will be able to continue to encourage the kind of reform that is taking place there. So at the end of the day, I have to say on this measure that we're dealing with, as Mr. DIAZ-BALART has pointed out so well, there are some important amendments that some of my colleagues have spoken about that were not made in order. So I'm going to urge my colleagues to join with us in opposition to this rule because Mr. SMITH, the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, and others, argued that we should have an open amendment process that would allow a free-flowing debate on all of these issues.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule that paves the way to improving our relations around the world.

As I listened to the ranking member, my good friend on the Rules Committee, I thought that he was going to support the rule because he's so impressed with the work that was put forward in this bill that covers developing democracies, which he has been such a tremendous champion of over a period of time.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I'll yield for 5 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. I think it could be even better if we were to have an open amendment process.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, clearly it covers what you like, and I'm delighted. After years of neglect, now is the time to inject the critical resources that will enable the Department of State and other foreign policy agencies to carry out their important work of rebuilding lasting partnerships with our friends and allies.

The underlying bills include important provisions to fulfill our obligations to the United Nations, to peacekeeping efforts, to humanitarian aid

and refugee assistance, and to building effective counterterrorism and arms control policy, and yes, to do everything in our power to avoid unwanted pregnancies in the first place. These bills are a great leap forward.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 2410. I especially want to express my appreciation to the Chairman, Members and staff of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for crafting a bill that will allow the State Department and our embassies around the world to close the diplomacy gap and carry out their missions more effectively.

I especially wish to thank Chairman BERMAN and his staff for working with me to include language in the managers' amendment to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to address global hunger and food security, issues very close to my heart and also a priority for the Committee.

A wide range of federal departments and agencies have jurisdiction over policies and programs addressing global hunger and food security, often lacking coordination and a coherent vision. A comprehensive strategy will increase the impact of the resources we invest in these programs and ensure that U.S. policies and programs contribute in a more substantial way to reducing global hunger and increasing food security around the world.

Advancing such goals is not just a humanitarian and development priority, it also strengthens our national security. Every child who receives a meal in school, every farmer who can make a decent living from the land, every mother who raises a well-nourished child, every family that has hope for the future creates a more stable country, region and world, less prone to recruitment by those who would sow terror or the exploitation of old hatreds and prejudice.

I salute the Chairman and the Committee for including this provision in the managers' amendment and in the House bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 522 will be followed by 5-minute votes on motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 453 and motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 454.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 183, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

YEAS—238

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Adler (NJ)  
Altmire  
Andrews

Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow

Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry

Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bocchieri  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castle  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Clarke  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Giffords  
Gonzalez  
Gordon (TN)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Halvorson  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill

Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
Johnson (TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kilroy  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
Kissell  
Klein (FL)  
Kosmas  
Kratovil  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lipinski  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Luján  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Markey (CO)  
Markey (MA)  
Massa  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McMahon  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (NY)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler (NY)  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Nye  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone

Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Perriello  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis (CO)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Teague  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Wexler  
Wilson (OH)  
Wu  
Yarmuth

NAYS—183

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Biggart  
Billbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bright  
Broun (GA)

Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Cao  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chaffetz  
Childers  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Crenshaw

Culberson  
Dahlkemper  
Davis (KY)  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Donnelly (IN)  
Drier  
Driehaus  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Ellsworth  
Emerson  
Fallin  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen

Gallegly	Lummis	Roe (TN)
Garrett (NJ)	Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (AL)
Gerlach	E.	Rogers (KY)
Gingrey (GA)	Manzullo	Rogers (MI)
Gohmert	Marchant	Rohrabacher
Goodlatte	Marshall	Rooney
Graves	McCarthy (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Guthrie	McCauley	Roskam
Hall (TX)	McClintock	Royce
Harper	McCotter	Ryan (WI)
Hastings (WA)	McHenry	Scalise
Heller	McHugh	Schmidt
Hensarling	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Herger	McMorris	Sessions
Hoekstra	Rodgers	Shadegg
Hunter	Mica	Shimkus
Inglis	Michaud	Shuster
Issa	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Jenkins	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Johnson (IL)	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, Sam	Minnick	Smith (TX)
Jones	Moran (KS)	Souder
Jordan (OH)	Murphy, Tim	Stearns
Kaptur	Myrick	Taylor
King (IA)	Neugebauer	Terry
King (NY)	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Kingston	Olson	Thornberry
Kirk	Paul	Tiahrt
Kline (MN)	Paulsen	Tiberi
Lamborn	Pence	Turner
Lance	Petri	Upton
Latham	Pitts	Walden
LaTourette	Platts	Wamp
Latta	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
Lee (NY)	Posey	Whitfield
Lewis (CA)	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)
Linder	Putnam	Wittman
LoBiondo	Radanovich	Wolf
Lucas	Rehberg	Young (AK)
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Young (FL)

the resolution, H. Res. 453, 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 motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 453.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 359, nays 60, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

YEAS—359

NOT VOTING—12

Bono Mack	Lewis (GA)	Schock
Davis (TN)	Loeb sack	Sullivan
Ellison	Mack	Woolsey
Granger	Sánchez, Linda	
Kennedy	T.	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker Pro Tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1203

Messrs. POSEY, ROGERS of Alabama, SCALISE, PETRI, MANZULLO and BARTON of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

Stated for:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 317, I missed the vote due to traffic congestion. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to honor the achievements and contributions of Native Americans to the United States, and for other purposes.

RECOGNIZING AMERICORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to

Abercrombie	Crowley	Israel
Ackerman	Cuellar	Jackson (IL)
Adler (NJ)	Cummings	Jackson-Lee
Alexander	Dahlkemper	(TX)
Altmire	Davis (AL)	Jenkins
Andrews	Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)
Arcuri	Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.
Austria	Davis (KY)	Kagen
Baca	DeFazio	Kanjorski
Bachus	DeGette	Kaptur
Baird	Delahunt	Kildee
Baldwin	DeLauro	Kilpatrick (MI)
Barrett (SC)	Dent	Kilroy
Barrow	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kind
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	King (NY)
Bean	Dicks	Kirk
Becerra	Dingell	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Berkley	Doggett	Kissell
Berman	Donnelly (IN)	Klein (FL)
Berry	Doyle	Kosmas
Biggart	Driehaus	Kratovil
Bilbray	Edwards (MD)	Kucinich
Bilirakis	Edwards (TX)	Lance
Bishop (GA)	Ehlers	Langevin
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Ellsworth	Larson (CT)
Blackburn	Emerson	Latham
Blumenauer	Engel	LaTourette
Blunt	Eshoo	Lee (CA)
Boccieri	Etheridge	Lee (NY)
Boehner	Fallin	Levin
Bonner	Farr	Lewis (CA)
Boozman	Fattah	Lipinski
Boren	Filner	LoBiondo
Boswell	Fleming	Lofgren, Zoe
Boucher	Forbes	Lowe
Boustany	Portenberry	Lujan
Boyd	Foster	Lummis
Brady (PA)	Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel
Braley (IA)	Frelinghuysen	E.
Bright	Fudge	Lynch
Brown (SC)	Gallegly	Maffei
Brown, Corrine	Gerlach	Maloney
Brown-Waite,	Giffords	Manzullo
Ginny	Gonzalez	Marchant
Buchanan	Gordon (TN)	Markey (CO)
Butterfield	Granger	Markey (MA)
Calvert	Graves	Marshall
Camp	Grayson	Massa
Cantor	Green, Al	Matheson
Cao	Green, Gene	Matsui
Capito	Griffith	McCarthy (CA)
Capps	Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)
Capuano	Guthrie	McCauley
Cardoza	Gutierrez	McCollum
Carnahan	Hall (NY)	McCotter
Carney	Hall (TX)	McDermott
Carson (IN)	Halvorson	McGovern
Cassidy	Hare	McHugh
Castle	Harman	McIntyre
Castor (FL)	Harper	McKeon
Chaffetz	Hastings (FL)	McMahon
Chandler	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Childers	Heinrich	Rodgers
Clarke	Heller	McNerney
Clay	Herseth Sandlin	Meek (FL)
Cleaver	Higgins	Meeks (NY)
Clyburn	Himes	Melancon
Cohen	Hinche	Mica
Cole	Hinojosa	Michaud
Connolly (VA)	Hirono	Miller (FL)
Conyers	Hodes	Miller (MI)
Cooper	Hoekstra	Miller (NC)
Costa	Holden	Miller, George
Costello	Holt	Minnick
Courtney	Honda	Mitchell
Crenshaw	Inslee	Mollohan

Moore (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Stupak
Moore (WI)	Rogers (MI)	Sutton
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tanner
Moran (VA)	Ross	Tauscher
Murphy (CT)	Rothman (NJ)	Taylor
Murphy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Teague
Murphy, Patrick	Ruppersberger	Terry
Murphy, Tim	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Murtha	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Nadler (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (PA)
Napolitano	Salazar	Tiberi
Neal (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Tierney
Nunes	Sarbanes	Titus
Nye	Scalise	Tonko
Oberstar	Schakowsky	Towns
Obey	Schauer	Tsongas
Olver	Schiff	Turner
Ortiz	Schmidt	Upton
Pallone	Schock	Van Hollen
Pascrell	Schrader	Velázquez
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Vislosky
Paulsen	Scott (GA)	Walden
Payne	Scott (VA)	Walz
Perlmutter	Serrano	Wamp
Perriello	Sessions	Wasserman
Peters	Sestak	Wasserman
Petri	Shea-Porter	Schultz
Pingree (ME)	Sherman	Waters
Platts	Shimkus	Watson
Polis (CO)	Shuler	Watt
Pomeroy	Shuster	Waxman
Posey	Simpson	Weiner
Price (GA)	Sires	Welch
Price (NC)	Skelton	Wexler
Putnam	Slaughter	Whitfield
Quigley	Smith (NE)	Wilson (OH)
Rahall	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Rangel	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Rehberg	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Reichert	Snyder	Woolsey
Reyes	Souder	Wu
Richardson	Space	Yarmuth
Rodriguez	Speier	Young (AK)
Roe (TN)	Spratt	Young (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Stark	

NAYS—60

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)	McHenry
Akin	Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary
Bachmann	Goodlatte	Myrick
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Broun (GA)	Herger	Olson
Burgess	Hunter	Paul
Burton (IN)	Inglis	Pence
Buyer	Issa	Pitts
Campbell	Johnson (IL)	Poe (TX)
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich
Coble	Jones	Rohrabacher
Coffman (CO)	Jordan (OH)	Rooney
Conaway	King (IA)	Roskam
Culberson	Kingston	Royce
Deal (GA)	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Lamborn	Shadegg
Duncan	Latta	Stearns
Flake	Linder	Thornberry
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Tiahrt
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—14

Bartlett	Hoyer	Mack
Bono Mack	Kennedy	Peterson
Davis (TN)	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Gohmert	Loeb sack	T.
Hill	Lucas	Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker Pro Tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1211

Messrs. COFFMAN of Colorado, ADERHOLT and JOHNSON of Illinois changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.