

Sherman	Sutton	Wasserman
Shinkus	Tanner	Schultz
Shuler	Taylor	Waters
Shuster	Teague	Watson
Simpson	Terry	Watt
Sires	Thompson (CA)	Waxman
Skelton	Thompson (MS)	Weinert
Slaughter	Thompson (PA)	Welch
Smith (NE)	Thornberry	Westmoreland
Smith (NJ)	Tiahrt	Wexler
Smith (TX)	Tiberi	Whitfield
Smith (WA)	Tierney	Wilson (OH)
Snyder	Titus	Wilson (SC)
Souder	Tonko	Wittman
Space	Towns	Wolf
Speier	Turner	Woolsey
Spratt	Upton	Wu
Stark	Van Hollen	Yarmuth
Stearns	Velázquez	Young (FL)
Stupak	Visclosky	
Sullivan	Walz	

NAYS—2

Kucinich Paul

NOT VOTING—23

Abercrombie	Dreier	Marshall
Bachmann	Forbes	McMorris
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Rodgers
Bean	Herger	Richardson
Boehner	Hinojosa	Tsongas
Buyer	Inslee	Walden
Cardoza	Linder	Wamp
Davis (AL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Young (AK)

□ 1633

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3619, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 853 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 853

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. 3619) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010, 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, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further

amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. 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, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. 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. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MATSUI. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 853 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Homeland Security Committee.

The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee shall be considered as adopted and shall be considered as read.

The rule waives all points of order against the committee amendment.

The rule makes in order the amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution and waives all points of order against all amendments except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI.

The rule makes in order 13 amendments, including all six of the Republican amendments that were submitted for consideration. In the case of sundry amendments reported by the committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the house en gros and without division of the question. The Chair may not entertain a motion to rise unless offered by the Chair of the Committee on Transportation or his designee and may not entertain a motion to strike the enacting clause.

I want to thank both Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairman THOMPSON for the good work their committees have done on this bill. Thanks to these two committees, we are here today to strengthen the Coast Guard's ability to implement its responsibilities. It is critical that the Coast Guard has the necessary funds, resources, and personnel to carry out the missions we need it to conduct.

H.R. 3619 increases the authorized end strength for military personnel in the Coast Guard by 1,500 to a total of 47,000 personnel. It will also permanently increase to 6,700 the allowable number of officers in the service.

The legislation also establishes marine safety as a core mission of the Coast Guard. It responds directly to the many shortcomings in Coast Guard acquisition efforts that the committee has examined over the last several years. For example, it prohibits the Coast Guard's use of a private sector lead system integrator, requires the Coast Guard to develop life-cycle cost estimates and prohibits contractor self-certification.

The Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 will strengthen our Nation's Coast Guard by making important investments and key changes now, the benefits of which we will see for years to come.

This bill also includes legislation that I offered earlier this year, and I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairman CUMMINGS for including this important language in this bill. There is an urgent need for the reforms I've outlined in the Cruise Vessel Safety and Security Act. For far too long, American families have unknowingly been at risk.

Currently, cruise ships operate under foreign flags of convenience and are not required under U.S. law to report crimes occurring outside of our territorial waters. Leaving our territorial waters does not mean that cruise ships should be allowed to operate without basic laws that protect American citizens.

My legislation requires that all crimes that occur aboard cruise ships be reported to the Coast Guard and to the FBI. Without proper screening processes and accountability, these

reprehensible and violent acts will be allowed to continue.

Under the status quo, criminals are left unpunished, and victims are left to fend for themselves. Unclear lines of jurisdiction are no longer an excuse for risking the safety of the millions of Americans who board cruise ships each year.

I first became aware of the need for increased protections for Americans when one of my constituents, Laurie Dishman, wrote to me for help in April of 2006. Laurie was the victim of a sexual assault while on a cruise vacation. She was given no assistance by the cruise line in properly securing evidence of the assault; no assistance in identifying her attacker, who was an employee of the cruise ship; and no assistance in prosecuting the crime once back on shore. Devastated, Laurie reached out to me.

I immediately called for hearings on this issue and began to work on the legislation that is now a part of this Coast Guard authorization bill. The congressional hearings, chaired by Chairman CUMMINGS, made apparent the gross inadequacies of current cruise safety provisions. Because of these hearings, it was discovered there has not been a single conviction of an accused rape on a cruise ship in recent history.

With ongoing news coverage of recent rapes on cruise ships, it is clear that legislation is both urgent and necessary. Many of my colleagues have come to me with similar stories of constituents who have gone missing, been sexually attacked, or gone days, weeks or years without getting resolution. My legislation establishes stringent new standards to ensure the safety and security of passengers on cruise vessels.

Its reforms include requiring that vessel personnel be able to preserve evidence of crimes committed on the vessels and provide appropriate medical treatment to the victims of sexual assaults. Security, safety and accountability must all be strengthened to hold criminals accountable and end the cycle of serious crimes on cruise ships.

As this crucial legislation moves forward, it serves as proof to the victims of cruise crimes that progress is being made towards ensuring the safety of all Americans abroad. Laurie Dishman is here today to witness her cause move forward, and I want to thank her for her extraordinary courage and leadership.

This has been a long, difficult road for all cruise victims and their families. These reforms are truly common-sense and are even supported now by the Cruise Line Industry Association. That is why this measure is a victory in the fight for cruise passenger rights.

In much the same way, the Coast Guard Authorization Act is a major victory for people across our country who depend on the Coast Guard to keep their families safe.

□ 1645

Passage of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 will allow many important reforms to be enacted and will help protect Americans across the Nation.

Coast Guard authorization is long overdue. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this rule and 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 friend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Always Ready. That's the motto of the United States Coast Guard. Since its establishment in 1790 by Alexander Hamilton, the Coast Guard is the only branch in our military that is always deployed.

As part of the Department of Homeland Security, the Coast Guard is tasked with maritime law enforcement, search and rescue for those in peril at sea, patrolling and protecting our ports, harbors and sea borders, marine environmental protection, helping manage offshore spills, facilitating maritime navigation and commerce, and so much more. In times of war, the Coast Guard also deploys with other service branches overseas.

The underlying legislation, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010, being brought to the floor today authorizes approximately \$10 billion for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2010. It increases the authorized end-strength by 1,500 members to a total of 47,000 personnel. The legislation also authorizes additional Coast Guard maritime security response teams to assist in detecting explosives and drug interdiction.

The Coast Guard is currently undergoing the largest single acquisition program in its history in order to upgrade and modernize its surface and air assets. The program currently known as Deepwater includes 91 new cutters, 124 new small boats, and 247 new or modernized airplanes, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles.

According to the most recent acquisition program baseline, the Deepwater acquisitions are projected to cost \$24 billion and take 25 years to complete. The underlying legislation includes \$1.2 billion for acquisition of new vessels, aircraft and support systems under the Deepwater program for 2010.

The legislation also requires the Coast Guard to be responsible for the enforcement of any Federal security zone established around terminals and around tankers transporting "especially hazardous materials." The bill requires the Secretary of Homeland Security, through the Coast Guard, to conduct a pilot program in the maritime environment for the mobile biometric identification of suspected individuals to enhance our border security.

The legislation establishes a pilot program to test and deploy preventa-

tive radiological or nuclear detection equipment on Coast Guard vessels and fixed locations in port areas. It establishes a congressional nomination system for admission to the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut. That process is similar to those already in place for the other service academies. Mr. Speaker, in south Florida we are all admirers of the Coast Guard. We see it day in and day out save lives and help citizens.

While I support this important underlying legislation, I oppose the rule by which it is being brought to the floor. The last time that a Coast Guard authorization bill was enacted into law, the Republican majority at the time brought the legislation to the floor with a rule that allowed consideration of the bill under a modified open process, a modified open rule. That type of rule allows any Member of the House to offer any amendments to the legislation without having to receive the approval of the Rules Committee as long as the amendment is preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That's why it is known as a modified open rule; any amendment can be brought forward, but you have to preprint it.

Even though we historically considered this bill under a modified open rule, today the majority has brought that precedent to an end. It has decided that that precedent should be disregarded and that the right of Members to offer amendments should be restricted. Yesterday afternoon in the Rules Committee, we in the minority asked for the traditional modified open rule, and yet the majority voted it down on a party-line vote. I thought that was somewhat ironic. The last time the House considered this legislation under the traditional modified open rule, we were criticized for offering a modified open rule. That was called restrictive. Well, now we have again—unnecessarily and breaking with precedent—a structured rule; in other words, only those amendments made in order can be considered.

So here we are, Mr. Speaker, yet again with another example of how the current majority restricts, unnecessarily and unfortunately, the procedural rights of all Members of this body.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my next speaker, I just want to say there were only six amendments to the bill submitted to the Rules Committee from the minority side of the aisle, and all six were made in order under this rule. It doesn't get more bipartisan than that.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. I thank my friend and colleague for yielding and rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, Senator SUSAN COLLINS and I toured the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

Mindful of the assault on the USS Cole, during a security briefing with the Coast Guard, I asked what sort of protections were in place to defend against threats from small boats. The response made my jaw drop. We were told that small boats were advised to observe a 100-foot security perimeter around large ships—as if an imaginary “Do Not Cross” sign would deter terrorists bent on mimicking the USS Cole attack and blowing themselves up.

Clearly, small boats continue to pose a critical security risk and deserve serious attention. The manager’s amendment to the underlying bill contains a provision which I authored requiring the Coast Guard to conduct a study assessing whether transponders—such as radio frequency ID tags—on small boats can effectively mitigate the threat of small boat attacks in major ports. Such a system already exists in Singapore, and Coast Guard Commandant Thad Allen has suggested it may work in the United States. Transponders are not the only way to address the small boat threat and they may not be the best, but they have the potential to greatly increase situational awareness in U.S. ports.

Beyond the small boats provision, this bill contains two other measures I believe are critical. One is a requirement for an Inspector General’s report evaluating port operation centers’ relationships with State, local, and regional fusion centers. The other is a requirement for DHS to conduct a review of the potential consequences of an attack on a gasoline or chemical cargo ship in one of America’s ports.

I thank Chairman OBERSTAR for including my small boats provision, and I thank the Rules Committee, especially my California colleague and friend, Ms. MATSUI, for bringing this bill to the floor.

Vote “aye” on the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to my friend, Ms. MATSUI, that when she says the amendments that were asked to be made in order before the Rules Committee were made in order, yes, that’s correct. The tradition, as I pointed out earlier, of this House for many decades with regard to this legislation—especially since it’s legislation that enjoys such widespread and bipartisan support—the tradition is that Members didn’t have to go and beg the Rules Committee for authorization to have their amendments debated if they simply preprinted those amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That was another important tradition in this House that has been violated unnecessarily, that has been reversed, ended unnecessarily by the new majority. That’s what I pointed out.

I would like to yield 5 minutes to my good friend, Mr. LOBIONDO of New Jersey, the ranking member of the Coast Guard and Maritime Subcommittee.

Mr. LOBIONDO. I thank my friend from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

I would like to start off by thanking Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MICA and Mr. CUMMINGS for their bipartisan effort to look at all the serious issues that are involved with this legislation and to bring together a pretty good product. But I am disappointed, as Mr. DIAZ-BALART is, because the traditions of this very bipartisan committee have been changed with the basis of the rule being closed. And while I understand and am appreciative that Republican amendments were made in order, I think that it is sad that such a long tradition—when the Republicans were in the majority, it was either an open or a modified open rule. It is almost a little bit amusing, but more sad than amusing that Republicans were criticized for even having a modified open rule just with a preprint requirement, and now there is no open rule at all.

I am going to support the bill. I have a few considerations that we will be talking about when the amendments come up. But once again, I am disappointed with the rule.

I do want to talk about one of the amendments that we will be talking about tomorrow—I think it is very timely—on the issue of piracy and how we deal with piracy, because just today there were two pirate attacks. Now, fortunately they were not on U.S. flag vessels. One, I believe, was on a Panamanian vessel—we think it was a cargo ship—where there were 26 hostages taken. The other attack was on an Italian ship. Fortunately, my understanding is that a Belgium warship was nearby and was able to aid and assist the Italians in thwarting the pirates. But this only brings to light the serious nature—and we can all recall with horror when pirates took a U.S. flag vessel. If it were not for the heroics of the captain, the crew, and a Navy SEAL team, we could have had a devastating consequence. Because of that pirate attack on a U.S. flag vessel, our committee—again, in a very bipartisan way, with Mr. MICA, Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. CUMMINGS—looked at what we could do. We all believed that the best answer to this would be for Coast Guard or Navy personnel to be on U.S. flag ships, but we understand the reality that that’s not going to happen. So we entered into a bipartisan agreement, which was in the underlying bill before someone on the majority—and I think from the Judiciary Committee—got involved with this issue. The underlying bipartisan agreement basically said that if attacked by a pirate ship, a U.S. flag vessel crew member could take action to defend the crew, could defend who was on the ship against the pirates and not be held liable; a commonsense approach. The Judiciary language complicates it and makes it almost impossible. It puts a crew member in an incredibly difficult situation to determine the legal entanglements in his own mind as he’s being fired upon with an automatic weapon or a rocket-propelled grenade launcher. If you think about the intensity of the

moment, this is an attack on America. An attack on a U.S. flag vessel is an attack on the America. Why wouldn’t we let the crew member have the opportunity to defend U.S. interests without liability?

I think a bipartisan approach that was reached was exactly what this House is all about in understanding U.S. interests and what’s best for the United States of America. The amendment tomorrow will deal with this further when the whole body will have an opportunity to listen to this debate and to make up their own minds whether it’s going to be right to put a crew member in that impossible situation of having to decide, through the legal entanglement of a series of checkmarks in his own mind as they’re coming under attack, whether to protect the crew and the ship.

Once again, I thank my colleagues who have worked on this bill. I am disappointed with the rule. I will be voting against the rule, but I will be supporting the underlying bill.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, who is the Chair of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, Mr. CUMMINGS.

□ 1700

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank Ms. MATSUI for yielding to me.

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 853, which would provide a structured rule to allow for consideration of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010, H.R. 3619. I thank Mr. OBERSTAR and certainly Mr. MICA, and I thank Mr. LOBIONDO for his bipartisan efforts. Clearly, the bill is a work of just phenomenal bipartisanship.

H.R. 3619 is legislation that would provide an authorization for the United States Coast Guard, the fifth branch of our Armed Forces. I note that, unlike the Department of Defense services, the Coast Guard has not been authorized since 2006.

This legislation increases the authorized funding level for the service, as well as the number of military personnel allowed to be in the service. The legislation also addresses a number of other Coast Guard and maritime-related issues that have been considered by the Coast Guard Subcommittee and the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure over the past 3 years, including acquisition reform, fishing industry safety and implementation of the Coast Guard’s marine safety program.

H.R. 3619 also includes the text of H.R. 3360, the Cruise Vessel Security and Safety Act of 2009, which was ordered reported by the Transportation Committee on July 30, 2009, and which would institute a number of new safety measures intended to assure that cruise vessels carrying passengers to and from the United States are as safe as possible.

Specifically, this legislation would include standards for the design and

equipping of cruise vessel staterooms and cabins. It would require ships to employ trained medical personnel who can adequately treat the victims of sexual assault. The legislation would also make available on the Internet information on the number of crimes reported on each cruise line. H.R. 3360 was offered by Congresswoman MATSUI, and I applaud her for her diligent and very hard work on this legislation.

I also commend the victims of incidents on cruise ships, several of whom I know are watching today, including Laurie Dishman, who is here with us now. All of them testified before our subcommittee and helped inform the development of this legislation.

Adoption of H. Res. 853 would also make in order for consideration the manager's amendment offered by the chairman of the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Congressman JIM OBERSTAR, as well as 12 other amendments.

I urge the adoption of H. Res. 853 so that we can move to provide a long overdue authorization for the Coast Guard, our thin blue line at sea.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for the time, and want to commend the chairman for his work on this bill, as well as the ranking member.

I rise in strong support of the Coast Guard Authorization Act. This bill makes important strides in strengthening the modern day mission of our Coast Guard. It is such a privilege to represent the fine young men and women who serve our country at Cape Disappointment in my own district.

Also included in this bill is language clarifying the rule related to the taxation of interstate waterway workers. In an effort to address an unfair tax situation of waterway workers, whose jobs require them to work in multiple States, I authored legislation in the 106th Congress called the Transportation Employment Fair Taxation Act. This legislation barred States from taxing a nonresident waterway worker who performs regularly assigned duties while engaged as a master, officer or crewman on a vessel operating on the navigable waters of more than one State.

As the House report for this legislation stated, the purpose of this legislation was to prohibit any State from taxing the income of a nonresident interstate waterway worker. The Senate version of this legislation was signed into law on November 9, 2000.

Unfortunately, a 2006 decision by one State's tax court is wholly inconsistent with the intent of the 2000 law. Due to the use of the word "of" instead of "in," the court believes it only applies

to the waterways that are owned jointly by more than one State. This was clearly not the intent of the 2000 law. The legislative history and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD make clear it was not the intent of the law, and I happen to know a little about that intent because I authored the legislation.

This legislation today makes a slight wording change to clarify that the law is intended to apply to all interstate waterway workers on all waterways. It is my sincere hope that this minor change will make clear that States are prohibited from taxing the income of a nonresident interstate waterway worker, period. I want to make clear that this was the intent of the law I authored in 2000, and this legislation before us today will reinforce that congressional intent.

Again, I thank the gentlelady for the time, and recommend passage.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the gentleman. I rise in opposition to the rule. We have at the moment about 10 percent unemployment in the United States of America. Some of the oldest laws of our Republic are the cabotage laws, which reserve coastwise commerce for American-made, American-owned, American-crewed vessels. They also required that all repairs to those vessels take place in the United States of America, except for emergency repairs, and certainly prohibited the rebuilding of any vessel overseas.

In recent years, I have supplied to the United States Coast Guard photographs of a ship that was clearly rebuilt in the People's Republic of China. Just yesterday, I supplied to the Rules Committee those same photographs, a vessel that any amateur could look at and clearly see this isn't an emergency repair. It is the rebuilding of an American-flagged Jones Act vessel in the People's Communist Republic of China.

Having brought this to the attention of the Commandant, he said that the law reads, and I want people to hear this, A vessel is deemed to have been rebuilt in the United States only if the entire rebuilding, including the construction of any major component of the hull or superstructure, is done in the United States.

That seems pretty clear to me. Apparently it was not clear to the Marine Inspection Office of the Coast Guard. So I asked the Commandant of the Coast Guard for a clarification. "Why don't you come up with something, Mr. Commandant, that your folks will understand?"

He came up with a very simple amendment that said 10 percent of the weight of the vessel, if you are changing out 10 percent of the weight of the vessel, that is clearly a rebuild. It has to be done stateside.

I regret that an amendment drafted by the United States Coast Guard was rejected by the Rules Committee. I am

told it was a concern about some foreign treaties, and I would remind Members this is language that goes back to 1956, prior to GATT.

So I am going to rise in opposition to this rule.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would have thought with a Democratic majority that we would have been about trying to repeal things like NAFTA, things like most-favored-nation status for China, and those things that limit American job opportunities here within our own country.

I am deeply disappointed in the ruling of the Rules Committee. Obviously, we need to get this bill to the floor, but we ought to be taking steps every chance we get to bring jobs home to America. The Rules Committee decided otherwise in a vote last night.

I thank the gentleman very much for the opportunity.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the next speaker, I just want to say that many of us on the Democratic side are sympathetic to the amendment offered by my colleague from Mississippi. We all think that we should build critical national security assets here at home in the United States.

However, there are also some concerns about whether the Taylor amendment would have exposed our country to reprisals at the WTO. Trade issues are very delicate right now with the world economy struggling so much. We should deal with the issues brought up by Mr. TAYLOR, but we should do so at a time when we are certain that we do not do more harm to our economy than good.

These issues certainly deserve more discussion and attention. My colleagues and I look forward to working with Mr. TAYLOR to address this very, very important topic.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER).

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010. This important legislation will not only provide vital resources to one of our Nation's key security and law enforcement services, but also has the potential to bolster the maritime shipping industry and create much-needed jobs.

The legislation requires the Great Lakes Maritime Research Institute to carry out studies of the maritime shipping system of the Great Lakes. My language, included in the manager's amendment, requires these studies to include an analysis of the number and types of jobs that rely on the shipping system and how they are distributed across key demographics. This information will help legislators better assess and respond to the needs of the

Great Lakes marine transportation and labor force.

The Great Lakes shipping industry is a key component of our regional and national economic well-being. My language will provide vital information that will help develop the Great Lakes workforce and help us anticipate and meet future workforce challenges.

I urge my colleagues to support the Coast Guard Authorization Act.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. TAYLOR brought out a very relevant and important example of why it was appropriate and important to follow what has been a decades-long tradition of allowing all Members with amendments to introduce them for consideration by the entire House simply by preprinting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. TAYLOR should not have had to go to the Rules Committee and wait, and then ask, request, permission to have his amendment considered. In addition to having to wait and then ask for permission, he was denied permission to have his amendment considered, which is an important amendment.

He explained it in detail before the Rules Committee. In representation of his constituents and having developed an expertise throughout many years of service here, he communicated with the Coast Guard and basically came to an agreement on interpreting existing law, law that was passed before we entered into GATT and the international commitments that were referenced by my dear friend Ms. MATSUI. Existing law before those commitments is what Mr. TAYLOR is trying to refine, to technically make clear, in pursuance of the interests of his constituents and our Nation.

That idea should have been able to be debated. His proposal should be able to be debated and considered by the entire House. It is another example, and a concrete example, an important example, of why I believe it is inappropriate, Mr. Speaker, to limit the procedural rights of the Members of this House.

I thank my friend Ms. MATSUI for her courtesy, and all of those who have participated in this debate. I want to point out, and then I will reserve our time again—I believe you have more speakers—that when I refer to the breaking of tradition by the majority, in this instance the reversal of the tradition that allowed for Members to preprint their amendments and have them considered by the entire House, when we maintained that tradition, when we followed that tradition that is now reversed, we were criticized for not allowing in this instance a fully open rule, again because we maintained the tradition of the preprinting requirement known as the modified open rule, and we were criticized by the then-minority. And they promised, Mr. Speaker, to open the process further, to improve the process, to make it more transparent.

Well, that was another promise broken, because instead of improving,

making more transparent the process that we were criticized for, instead of improving that process, they have further closed it. It is unfortunate.

I reserve my time.

□ 1715

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a comment before I yield.

This legislation before us today is bipartisan and widely supported. It was reported by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee by voice vote. During that bipartisan markup process, only two amendments were offered, and both were adopted by voice vote. The working relationship between Chairman OBERSTAR and Ranking Member MICA is well known because they work together, and that is what we're trying to do today. Today's rule is structured the way it is so to continue this tradition of working issues out before they become political in nature.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORINE BROWN).

Ms. CORINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to start off by thanking Chairmen OBERSTAR and CUMMINGS and Ranking Member MICA for all of their hard work on this bill.

We've given the Coast Guard so much responsibility, and they have been up to every challenge. The Coast Guard has been protecting our shores for more than 200 years and have done an outstanding job. The Coast Guard was the first agency to react to the terrorist attacks on September 11, and was the only agency in the Bush administration to actually do their job during the evacuation and disaster of Hurricane Katrina. Today, we are finally providing the crucial agency the resources it needs to complete its new expanded mission.

As a Member from the State of Florida, which has 14 ports and numerous cruise lines, I have particular interest in the cruise industry. The cruise industry is an important economic engine in the State of Florida. Florida ranks first in the Nation for cruise industry expenditures, with over \$6 billion in direct spending, accounting for 33 percent of the total industry direct spending. Cruise industry spending generates more than 127,000 jobs and wages totaling over \$5 billion in income to Floridian workers, and over 5 million passengers embarked from Florida's five cruise ports in 2007.

Before coming to Congress, I owned, really, three travel agencies, and I can tell you that cruises are one of the most cost-effective, safe, and enjoyable vacations one can take. In fact, I just recently sent my mother on a cruise.

The cruise industry is highly regulated by the State, the Federal Government, and international laws. They ensure that their passengers are safe and have a sound security record. It is apparent from the FBI statistics that crimes against U.S. passengers on cruise ships are rare.

A leisure cruise is one of the most popular vacation options because of its excellent safe record and a high quality of service provided on board.

I look forward to working with the committee members to continue to ensure that safety and well-being of passengers on cruise ships is maintained.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule in support of H.R. 3619, the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act. I'd like to thank my colleague from Minnesota, Chairman OBERSTAR, and his staff for their hard work on this bill.

Michigan's First Congressional District borders three of the five Great Lakes and contains 1,613 miles of shoreline, more than any other congressional district in the continental United States. The Coast Guard is not only the largest military resource in the area and a key defender of the Great Lakes, but is also of utmost importance to securing commerce routes and assisting the navigation.

I'd like to address a few provisions in the bill. First, the bill recognizes the need for a Coast Guard presence on the Great Lakes by authorizing \$153 million for a new Great Lakes icebreaker. During the winter months, 17 million tons of commerce moves through the Great Lakes, and icebreakers play an important role in keeping our channels open.

Ice-breaking capacity on the Great Lakes has dropped dramatically over the past few years. The Coast Guard Cutter *Acacia*, stationed in Charlevoix, Michigan, was decommissioned on June 7, 2006, after 60 years of service. The Canadian Government also recently decommissioned two of its icebreakers on the Great Lakes without replacing them. Without a sufficient cutter presence, the island communities, businesses, and individuals that rely on the Great Lakes shipping are put at risk. It's critical that Congress provide the funding for a new Coast Guard cutter and ensure the Coast Guard can meet its operational responsibility on the Great Lakes.

Secondly, I appreciate that section 1323 of the bill includes the authority to transfer the old Coast Guard facility and surrounding acres in Marquette, Michigan, to the city. In 2008, the city of Marquette sold 1.5 acres of Lake Superior waterfront property to the Coast Guard for \$1 to construct a new facility. The city also committed \$170,000 to reroute bike trails, make roadway improvements, and make infrastructure improvements in order to prepare the property for a new Coast Guard facility. In exchange, an agreement was reached between the city and the Coast Guard to transfer land that was then occupied by the Coast Guard to the city upon completion of the new facility. In August 2009, the Coast Guard

moved into a new facility. As such, remediation of the old parcel should be done by the Coast Guard without delay; however, remediation is not scheduled until fiscal year 2013. I hope the chairman and the Coast Guard will work with me and the city of Marquette to see that remediation is completed in a more timely manner. The city generously lived up to its end of the deal and we must ensure the Coast Guard does the same.

I also appreciate the inclusion of a provision that would facilitate a land transfer between the Coast Guard to the Cornerstone Christian Academy in Cheboygan, Michigan, of six acres of property the Coast Guard deems as excess property. This land is supported by the Coast Guard, the academy, and the Cheboygan community.

Finally, I appreciate Chairman OBERSTAR's past support for inclusion of a provision in the 2008 Coast Guard reauthorization bill to return a historic Fresnel lens to the Presque Isle Lighthouse station in Presque Isle, Michigan. I know the Coast Guard reauthorization bill passed by the Senate committee includes this language, and I hope the chairman will work with me on the issue as the bill goes forward. I hope an agreement can once again be reached on this matter.

Again, I thank the chairman for his work on crafting this bill. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I look forward to continuing to work with everyone on the Coast Guard issues.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my friend, Ms. MATSUI, for her courtesy during this debate with regard to this important underlying legislation that's being brought to the floor. I also thank Chairman OBERSTAR and Ranking Member MICA, as well as Chairman CUMMINGS and Ranking Member LOBIONDO.

I'd like to, before proceeding, yield 5 minutes to my friend from Miami, Florida, the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, for his leadership on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that today and tomorrow the House is debating the Coast Guard Authorization Act. The U.S. Coast Guard has over 42,000 men and women serving in active duty. These proud individuals are tasked with 11 specific missions ranging from coastal security to drug interdiction and marine safety. It is our duty to ensure that they are fully funded and equipped to carry out these responsibilities.

As the Representative of south Florida and the Keys, I know just how important their mission is. My congressional district contains over 265 miles of U.S. coastline and includes the largest coral reef system in the continental United States. Two of the largest Coast Guard sectors in the U.S., Sector

Miami, commanded by Captain James O. Fitton, and Sector Key West, commanded by Captain Pat DeQuattro, are located in my congressional district.

The men and women serving these Coast Guard sectors play key roles in fighting the flow of illegal drugs to our country. They deny smugglers the use of air and maritime routes into our country, and in fiscal year 2009, the U.S. Coast Guard seized 29,485 pounds of cocaine. But determined drug smugglers are using very sophisticated ships and technologies, and it will become increasingly difficult to prevent their illegal activities without providing the Coast Guard the fundamental resources that it needs. South Florida is an all-too-convenient transit hub for many of these smuggling operations, and I commend our local Coast Guard sectors for their ongoing efforts to fight the flow of illegal drugs into our neighborhoods.

As my constituents well know, the Coast Guard also saves thousands of lives every year. According to the latest statistics published by the Coast Guard, in 2008, Coast Guard Search and Rescue responded to 24,000 cases and saved 4,000 lives. Sector Miami responded to 858 Search and Rescue cases this year, with 1,410 lives saved and over \$12 million in property saved.

This year, Sector Miami also established the Coast Guard's first Cruise Ship Center of Expertise. This center provides a unique partnership between the Coast Guard and the cruise ship industry so that they're better able to meet the compliance with international safety standards as well as maritime security and environmental standards.

Ensuring that the brave men and women have the tools that they need in the Coast Guard to effectively patrol our coasts is one of my priorities. In Sector Key West, this past year alone, the Coast Guard was able to respond to 300 law enforcement cases as well as 645 rescue and search cases. At this sector, also, many treasured natural wonders are contained there, and they also responded to 152 pollution reports in the protection of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.

Sector Key West was also instrumental in coordinating with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, and the State and local agencies in the successful artificial reefing of the 520-foot ex-USS *Vandenberg*. This was the second largest ship to become an artificial reef in the U.S.

Since the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Coast Guard has served as the primary agents responsible for our Nation's maritime security. This year, they even deployed six patrol boats and 400 personnel to help protect Iraq's maritime oil infrastructure, train Iraqi naval forces, and enforce U.N. sanctions in the Arabian Gulf.

We can all agree that the brave men and women of our oldest, continuous seagoing service deserves more than

just our respect and admiration. They deserve the appropriate funding to carry out their important missions. I urge all Members to recognize the crucial need to protect our Nation by strengthening the United States Coast Guard so that they may continue to live up to their motto, "Always Ready."

I thank the Speaker and I thank my good friend and colleague, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for yielding me the time.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. No, and I will wrap up my remarks shortly.

Ms. MATSUI. I have no speakers on my side. I'm prepared to close.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, again I thank my friend, Ms. MATSUI.

Over the past few months, the American people have written and called their Members of Congress, or they've made their opinions known at town hall meetings, asking their Congress Members whether they will pledge to read bills before they vote on them. The reason is that the people were outraged finding out that the majority has forced Congress to vote on a number of sweeping and often very expensive bills without giving Members time to understand or even to read them. For example, we were forced to vote on the final so-called stimulus bill, on the omnibus appropriations bill; or on the cap-and-trade bill, that one we were provided at 3 in the morning, and then a few hours later it was here on the floor. In some instances, much less than 24 hours.

□ 1730

That's no way to run this House. Our constituents are rightly upset. I think they should be. The distinguished Speaker said, "Members should have at least 24 hours to examine bills and conference reports before floor consideration." It's even on her Web site. Yet time and again, the distinguished Speaker and the majority leadership have refused to live up to their pledge.

That is why a bipartisan group of 182 Members of Congress have signed a discharge petition to consider a bill that would require that all legislation and conference reports be made available to Members and the general public for 72 hours before being brought to the House floor for a vote.

So that's why today I'll be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so we can amend this rule and allow the House to consider that legislation, H. Res. 554, a bipartisan bill by my friends and colleagues, Representatives BAIRD and CULBERSON.

Now, Members may be concerned that this motion would jeopardize the Coast Guard reauthorization bill, but I want to make clear the motion I am making provides for separate consideration of the Baird-Culberson bill within 3 days so that we can vote on the Coast Guard bill, and then once we're done, consider H. Res. 554.

I would ask, thus, Mr. Speaker, for the previous question to be defeated.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 853 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. On the third legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV and without intervention of any point of order, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 554) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that legislation and conference reports be available on the Internet for 72 hours before consideration by the House, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) One hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; (2) an amendment, if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee and if printed in that portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII at least one legislative day prior to its consideration, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit which shall not contain instructions. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 554.

(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.

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

The rule before us today is a fair rule that includes a bipartisan group of Democratic and Republican amendments. All of the Republican amendments submitted to the Rules Committee are made in order by this rule. Furthermore, the underlying legislation strengthens and reforms a key component of our Nation's security forces.

Coast Guard authorization has been long in coming. That delay has meant inadequate authorization levels for ever-increasing demand. One of the good things this bill would do is encourage a larger, more educated merchant marine workforce by establishing a maritime career recruitment training and loan program. It will modernize the Coast Guard by reorganizing senior leadership and by establishing a firm foundation for a robust marine safety program. U.S. cruise ship passengers will also receive enhanced safety and security protections thanks to this legislation.

In total, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 will strengthen our Nation's Coast Guard and our national security for years to come.

I urge passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying bill—H.R. 3619, the Fiscal Year 2010 Coast Guard Authorization Act.

I would like to commend the Rules Committee for approving a Rule that will allow for a robust debate. I am particularly pleased that it provides 20 minutes of debate on the port security title of the bill.

Over the past few weeks, we worked closely, and on a bipartisan basis, with Chairman

OBERSTAR, Chairman CUMMINGS, Ranking Member MICA, and Ranking Member LOBIONDO to bring this critical security bill to the floor as expeditiously as possible.

The bill that we are considering today builds on H.R. 2830, the Coast Guard Authorization bill that the House approved by a vote of 395 to 7 last Congress. Unfortunately, despite strong bipartisan support, that measure was not ultimately enacted into law.

Like that bill, H.R. 3619 provides long-overdue resources to an agency that has been underfunded for many years, while providing the Coast Guard new tools to secure our Nation's maritime environment in this post-9/11 world.

With respect to port and maritime security, H.R. 3619 provides key new resources to help the Coast Guard execute this homeland security mission. Specifically, it provides 1,500 additional Service Members, more Maritime Security Response Teams and Canine Detection Teams.

The bill also includes an important Coast Guard acquisition reform provision that requires the Coast Guard to take over the management of the 25-year, \$24 billion Deepwater program.

Finally, I am pleased that the bill fosters greater diversity at the Coast Guard Academy—one of the Nation's fine military academies. Specifically, a provision I authored with Chairman CUMMINGS would, for the first time, allow Members of Congress to nominate candidates for the Coast Guard Academy. It also directs the Coast Guard to establish programs to identify young adults from Minority Serving Institutions who may be candidates for becoming Coast Guard officers.

Passage of H.R. 3619 will provide the Coast Guard with a cadre of diverse, bright candidates from non-coastal areas of the nation and has the potential of helping to improve the culture within the Coast Guard Academy.

In closing, I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 853, if ordered; and suspension of the rules with regard to House Resolution 836, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 171, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 809]
YEAS—236

Ackerman	Baca	Berman
Adler (NJ)	Baldwin	Berry
Altmore	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Andrews	Becerra	Bishop (NY)
Arcuri	Berkley	Blumenauer

Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
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

NAYS—171

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)

Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Bartlett
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)

Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Abercrombie
Barrett (SC)
Bean
Biggert
Buyer
Cardoza
Davis (AL)
Dreier
Forbes

NOT VOTING—25

Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Hinojosa
Inslee
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
McCauley
Murtha
Obey

□ 1800

Messrs. RYAN of Wisconsin, CASSIDY, ISSA, and MASSA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 192, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 810]

YEAS—213

Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio

Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—192

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Payne
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger

Costa
Costello
Crenshaw
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallon
Flake
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)

Pence	Royce	Stearns	Brady (PA)	Gordon (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt	Souder	Upton
Petri	Ryan (WI)	Sullivan	Brady (TX)	Granger	McCarthy (NY)	Schock	Space	Van Hollen
Pitts	Scalise	Tanner	Braley (IA)	Graves	McClintock	Schrader	Speler	Velázquez
Platts	Schmidt	Taylor	Bright	Grayson	McCollum	Schwartz	Spratt	Visclosky
Poe (TX)	Schock	Terry	Broun (GA)	Green, Al	McCotter	Scott (GA)	Stark	Walz
Posey	Sensenbrenner	Thompson (PA)	Brown (SC)	Green, Gene	McDermott	Scott (VA)	Stearns	Wasserman
Price (GA)	Sessions	Thornberry	Brown, Corrine	Griffith	McGovern	Sensenbrenner	Stupak	Schultz
Putnam	Shadegg	Tiahrt	Brown-Waite,	Grijalva	McHenry	Serrano	Sullivan	Waters
Rehberg	Shimkus	Tiberi	Ginny	Guthrie	McIntyre	Sessions	Sutton	Watson
Reichert	Shuler	Turner	Buchanan	Hall (NY)	McKeon	Sestak	Tanner	Watt
Roe (TN)	Shuster	Upton	Burgess	Hall (TX)	McMahon	Shadegg	Taylor	Waxman
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Walz	Burton (IN)	Halvorson	McMorris	Shea-Porter	Teague	Weiner
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Westmoreland	Butterfield	Hare	Rodgers	Sherman	Terry	Welch
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield	Calvert	Harman	McNerney	Shinkus	Thompson (CA)	Westmoreland
Rooney	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)	Camp	Harper	Meek (FL)	Shuler	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Ros-Lehtinen	Snyder	Wittman	Campbell	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Shuster	Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Roskam	Souder	Wolf	Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Melancon	Simpson	Thornberry	Wilson (OH)
Ross	Space	Young (FL)	Cao	Heinrich	Mica	Sires	Tiahrt	Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—27

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Perlmutter
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Radanovich
Bean	Hinojosa	Rangel
Biggert	Insliee	Richardson
Buyer	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (MI)
Cardoza	Lowe	Velázquez
Davis (AL)	McCaul	Walden
Dreier	Murtha	Wamp
Forbes	Pascrell	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1807

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR TEEN READ WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 836.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 836.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 811]

YEAS—405

Ackerman	Baldwin	Blackburn
Aderholt	Barrow	Blumenauer
Adler (NJ)	Bartlett	Blunt
Akin	Barton (TX)	Bocciari
Alexander	Becerra	Boehner
Altmire	Berkley	Bonner
Andrews	Berman	Bono Mack
Arcuri	Berry	Boozman
Austria	Bilbray	Boren
Baca	Bilirakis	Boswell
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Boucher
Bachus	Bishop (NY)	Boustany
Baird	Bishop (UT)	Boyd

Brady (PA)	Gordon (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt	Souder	Upton
Brady (TX)	Granger	McCarthy (NY)	Schock	Space	Van Hollen
Braley (IA)	Graves	McClintock	Schrader	Speler	Velázquez
Bright	Grayson	McCollum	Schwartz	Spratt	Visclosky
Broun (GA)	Green, Al	McCotter	Scott (GA)	Stark	Walz
Brown (SC)	Green, Gene	McDermott	Scott (VA)	Stearns	Wasserman
Brown, Corrine	Griffith	McGovern	Sensenbrenner	Stupak	Schultz
Brown-Waite,	Grijalva	McHenry	Serrano	Sullivan	Waters
Ginny	Guthrie	McIntyre	Sessions	Sutton	Watson
Buchanan	Hall (NY)	McKeon	Sestak	Tanner	Watt
Burgess	Hall (TX)	McMahon	Shadegg	Taylor	Waxman
Burton (IN)	Halvorson	McMorris	Shea-Porter	Teague	Weiner
Butterfield	Hare	Rodgers	Sherman	Terry	Welch
Calvert	Harman	McNerney	Shinkus	Thompson (CA)	Westmoreland
Camp	Harper	Meek (FL)	Shuler	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Campbell	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Shuster	Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Melancon	Simpson	Thornberry	Wilson (OH)
Cao	Heinrich	Mica	Sires	Tiahrt	Wilson (SC)
Capito	Heller	Michaud	Skelton	Tiberi	Wittman
Capps	Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Slaughter	Tierney	Wolf
Capuano	Herger	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)	Titus	Woolsey
Carnahan	Herseth Sandlin	Miller (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Tonko	Wu
Carney	Higgins	Miller (TX)	Smith (TX)	Towns	Yarmuth
Carson (IN)	Hill	Miller, George	Smith (WA)	Tsongas	Young (FL)
Carter	Himes	Minnick	Snyder	Turner	
Cassidy	Hinche	Mitchell			
Castle	Hirono	Mollohan			
Castor (FL)	Hodes	Moore (KS)	Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Murtha
Chaffetz	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Pascrell
Chandler	Holden	Moran (KS)	Bean	Gutierrez	Radanovich
Childers	Holt	Moran (VA)	Biggert	Hinojosa	Richardson
Chu	Honda	Murphy (CT)	Buyer	Insliee	Rogers (MI)
Clarke	Hoyer	Murphy (NY)	Cardoza	Lofgren, Zoe	Walden
Clay	Hunter	Murphy, Patrick	Coble	Lowe	Wamp
Cleaver	Inglis	Murphy, Tim	Davis (AL)	Lungren, Daniel	Young (AK)
Clyburn	Israel	Myrick	Dreier	E.	
Coffman (CO)	Issa	Nadler (NY)	Forbes	McCaul	
Cohen	Jackson (IL)	Napolitano			
Cole	Jackson-Lee	Neal (MA)			
Conaway	(TX)	Neugebauer			
Connolly (VA)	Jenkins	Nunes			
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Nye			
Cooper	Johnson (IL)	Oberstar			
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	Obey			
Costello	Johnson, Sam	Olson			
Courtney	Jones	Olver			
Crenshaw	Jordan (OH)	Ortiz			
Crowley	Kagen	Pallone			
Cuellar	Kanjorski	Pastor (AZ)			
Culberson	Kaptur	Paul			
Cummings	Kennedy	Paulsen			
Dahlkemper	Kildee	Payne			
Davis (CA)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pence			
Davis (IL)	Kilroy	Perlmutter			
Davis (KY)	Kind	Perriello			
Davis (TN)	King (IA)	Peters			
Deal (GA)	King (NY)	Peterson			
DeFazio	Kingston	Petri			
DeGette	Kirk	Pingree (ME)			
DeLaunt	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pitts			
DeLauro	Kissell	Platts			
Dent	Klein (FL)	Poe (TX)			
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kline (MN)	Polis (CO)			
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kosmas	Pomeroy			
Dicks	Kratovil	Posey			
Dingell	Kucinich	Price (GA)			
Doggett	Lamborn	Price (NC)			
Donnelly (IN)	Lance	Putnam			
Doyle	Langevin	Quigley			
Driehaus	Larsen (WA)	Rahall			
Duncan	Larson (CT)	Rangel			
Edwards (MD)	Latham	Rehberg			
Edwards (TX)	LaTourette	Reichert			
Ehlers	Latta	Reyes			
Ellison	Lee (CA)	Rodriguez			
Ellsworth	Lee (NY)	Roe (TN)			
Emerson	Levin	Rogers (AL)			
Engel	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)			
Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher			
Etheridge	Linder	Rooney			
Fallin	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen			
Farr	LoBiondo	Roskam			
Fattah	Loeb	Ross			
Filner	Loeb	Rothman (NJ)			
Flake	Lucas	Roybal-Allard			
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Royce			
Fortenberry	Luján	Ruppersberger			
Foster	Lummis	Rush			
Fox	Lynch	Ryan (OH)			
Franks (AZ)	Mack	Ryan (WI)			
Frelinghuysen	Maffei	Salazar			
Fudge	Maloney	Sánchez, Linda			
Gallegly	Manullo	T.			
Gallegly	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta			
Garrett (NJ)	Markey (CO)	Sarbanes			
Gerlach	Markey (MA)	Scalise			
Giffords	Marshall	Schakowsky			
Gingrey (GA)	Massa	Schauer			
Gonzalez	Matheson	Schiff			
Goodlatte	Matsui				

NOT VOTING—27

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Murtha
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Pascrell
Bean	Gutierrez	Radanovich
Biggert	Hinojosa	Richardson
Buyer	Insliee	Rogers (MI)
Cardoza	Lofgren, Zoe	Walden
Coble	Lowe	Wamp
Davis (AL)	Lungren, Daniel	Young (AK)
Dreier	E.	
Forbes	McCaul	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Less than 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1816

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution.

S. RES. 315

In the Senate of the United States, October 21, 2009.

Whereas Cliff Hansen worked as a cattle rancher and was inducted into the National Cowboy Hall of Fame as a “Great Westerner;”

Whereas Cliff Hansen served as governor of the State of Wyoming from 1963–1967;

Whereas Cliff Hansen served the people of Wyoming with distinction in the United States from 1967–1978; and

Whereas Cliff Hansen was the oldest former Senator at the time of his death: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Cliff Hansen, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Cliff Hansen.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing