this time. So until further notice or until his arrival, it would be my intent to have the gentleman accept me in his stead.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1401, RAIL AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 270 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 270

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. 1401) to improve the security of railroads, public transportation, and over-the-road buses in the United States, 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 and 20 minutes, with one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. 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 Homeland Security now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 1401 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The 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 my colleague and co-Chair of Florida's congressional delegation, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, or his designee, my friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have up to 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 270.

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, House Resolution 270 provides for consideration of H.R. 1401, the Rail and Public Transportation Security Act of 2007 under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour 20 minutes of general debate. One hour is to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, except those arising under clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI.

The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security shall be considered as an original bill for purposes of amendment and shall be considered as read.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill.

Importantly, the rule makes in order the eight amendments printed in the report accompanying this rule and waives all points of order against such amendments. The amendments may be offered only in the order printed in the report and by the Member designated in the report or his or her designee.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to commence debate on this very essential piece of legislation. Five years have passed since the terrorist attacks of September 11. While we in this body have done a great deal of talking about Homeland Security, our record on the issue suggests otherwise.

Under Republican control, the majority maintained that mandating certain security enhancements was not necessary at the time. Democrats, on the contrary, believe that they are and will not allow this need to go unmet any longer.

The fact that this bill was reported favorably out of the Homeland Security and Transportation and Infrastructure Committees with near unanimity and the cosponsorship of the ranking Republican member of the Homeland Security Committee suggests that our concerns are almost universal in this body.

Moreover, this rule makes in order a total of eight amendments, half of which will be offered by the Members of the minority party. The rule and the process further prove that Democrats refuse to allow partisanship to supersede our responsibility to protect the American people.

Congress's prior reluctance to mandate certain security enhancements out of fear that it might rock the administration's boat has left us woefully behind the curve when it comes to rail and mass transit security. That is why I am very pleased that the Rail and Public Transportation Security Act makes the necessary investment in these absolutely critical enhancements.

The bill requires that the administration develop a security plan for all forms of covered transportation. The bill also creates a system and methods under which all agencies tasked with the responsibility of protecting our country can work together.

We don't stop there. The bill requires the Department of Homeland Security to expand its coordination network through enhanced communication and cooperation at all levels of government.

It requires DHS to develop security training programs for railroad and public transportation employees and extends whistleblower protections to all providers, public or private, who provide covered transportation services.

Under this bill, the number of surface transportation security inspectors will increase by six times by the year 2010, and the bill mandates that the administration issue regulations requiring enhanced security measures for the shipment of security sensitive materials and requires that these shipments not go through highly populated areas.

□ 1245

Perhaps most importantly, this bill pays for these improvements and authorizes $7.3 billion in security enhancements to make America safer.

Mr. Speaker, the Government Accountability Office has determined that the United States must provide much more leadership and guidance in constructing a rail and security transit plan. This bill answers that challenge and fills the void left by the administration's failure to secure all modes of transportation in this country.

It, just like the rule, is worthy of the support of this body. I urge my colleagues to support both.

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. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At about 9 a.m. on July 5, 2005, three bombs went off within 50 seconds of each other in the London underground. Less than an hour later there was another explosion in one of London's double-decker buses. The bombings killed over 50 people and injured approximately 700.

On March 11, 2004, the Spanish people also faced an attack on their rail system. Like the attacks in London, in that attack the terrorists exploded multiple bombs on four trains packed with early morning commuters. The attacks killed almost 200 and left at least 1,800 injured in Madrid.

Mr. Speaker, those attacks were a warning to us on this side of the Atlantic that just as terrorists can take advantage of our airlines to carry out cowardly acts, they can do the same with our public service transportation systems. With this in mind, the House of Representatives last year passed comprehensive rail and mass transit security legislation. The legislation was included in H.R. 5814, the Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007. Unfortunately, the session of Congress ended before that important legislation could be enacted into law.

Public transit moves more people on a given day than any other mode of transportation worldwide. Transit sustains the economic vitality of any community. In heavily populated areas like Miami-Dade County, one of the counties that I am honored to represent, many people depend on public transit for cost efficiency and convenience. The provision of safe transit requires a significant investment in technology to protect infrastructure, equipment, workers and, of course, the passenger. H.R. 1401 makes it possible for Congress to invest in public transportation security.

And in my district, Miami-Dade Transit is also responsible for the evacuation of the general public, including disabled persons, in moments of crisis. This bill provides critical funding for evacuation improvements. Miami-Dade County would be eligible for funds, regardless of whether the evacuation is due to terrorism or natural disasters.

Although Miami-Dade Transit has a fleet of over 360 paratransit vehicles and over 1,000 buses and approximately 45 miles of rail, they do not have mobile communication service equipment. This means that all modes do not have a way to communicate with each other during an evacuation procedure. This bill takes into account those needs and provides for security improvements to stations' surveillance equipment, public awareness campaigns, and GPS systems.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill includes risk-based grants. In their final report to Congress, the 9/11 Commission criticized the existing process for allocation of Federal homeland security assistance grants, recommending that the distribution not, I quote, ''remain a program for general revenue sharing.'' Given the limited resources of Federal aid, distributing grants based on risk is really the only appropriate way to apportion grants. In order to ensure that our taxpayer funds are spent as efficiently and effectively as possible, we need to focus our resources at those sectors under the greatest threat.

When I was a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, I worked hard to ensure that Homeland Security grant funds are distributed through risk-based assessments. I commend the Homeland Security Committee for following through on the recommendation of the 9/11 Commission and including risk as the primary motive for distribution of grants in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met to report out a rule for this legislation. The rule that we are now debating closes out several important and germane amendments. Two amendments by my friend, Mr. MICA, the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, were excluded by the majority on the Rules Committee, even though they were germane and, obviously, from a key committee with jurisdiction. Another of my Florida colleagues, Representative GINNY BROWN-WAITE, offered an amendment last night that would have strengthened protections for all sensitive security information related to rail and mass transit plans and procedures. That amendment also was blocked by the majority on the Rules Committee. I think it was unnecessary and unfortunate for the majority in the Committee on Rules to continue to close the legislative process in the 110th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, one thing, an additional point I would like to make, I would like to point out to my colleagues that the majority is now including in this section 2 language which allows the Speaker to postpone consideration of the bill at any time in every rule. It is including that language now in every rule.

It is interesting, since this is a structured rule, which means that the bill will be considered in the Committee of the Whole. This is very precedent-setting because in previous Congresses this language has never been included on structured rules. It is typically only included on a closed rule or a modified closed rule where the bill is being considered in the House and not in the Committee of the Whole. And in previous Congresses it was only included when debate was scheduled to last more than the traditional 1 hour in the House. So I find this strange, because when the House is in the Committee of the Whole, it can simply rise and postpone consideration. I find it curious as to why the new majority is extending this authority now to all rules, even when it doesn't seem necessary. Could it be that the majority is intending to quash the minority's lone procedural guarantee, the motion to recommit? I am afraid that that may be exactly what it amounts to, Mr. Speaker, because there is no other procedural excuse for this language being included in a structured rule. It is not necessary for the Speaker to have this authority unless they want to postpone consideration just prior to the vote on the motion to recommit. This is just another example, Mr. Speaker, of the seemingly small, yet significant, precedents that the new Democratic majority is setting, creating new ways to silence the voice of the minority.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. And I would say to my friend from Florida that, in his concerns about the motion to recommit and the time to see it, I am sure my friend is mindful that when a motion to recommit comes to the House floor that it comes without the Members of the House having had an opportunity to know the substance of the motion to recommit.

I might add, that period of time, particularly in the last 2 months, we have seen that when the minority has presented the motion to recommit, that what winds up happening is even Members of the minority don't know what is in the motion to recommit. Therefore, it seems more than reasonable that a sufficient amount of time be given for that purpose. And I also think in the interest of fairness that we have been considerably fair in accepting more motions to recommit than have our friends in the minority.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yielding myself such time as I may consume before yielding to my good friend from New York, it is important to note when, again, seemingly small but significant precedents are changed. This is a precedent change. We have not seen it for many, many years. With regard to the motions to recommit, what we have seen in this Congress is that they often have been passing. But that is more precisely because the membership, when finding out the merits of the motions to recommit on a bipartisan basis have been supporting them.

But, no, it is of concern, and it is important to note that if there is a step being taken, as it seems that it is being taken, to limit that very important, often sole procedural remedy available to the minority which is the motion to recommit, that it is very disturbing.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished friend from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding. And I stand here today, first, to commend the chairman of the full committee, Mr. THOMPSON, for the bipartisanship he has shown, the level of

cooperation he has demonstrated in bringing this bill through the committee process and to the House floor today. This was work that was begun in the last Congress, and now it has been brought to its fruition, and I commend the gentleman for that.

As Mr. DIAZ-BALART indicated, there were serious rail attacks in Britain in 2005, in Spain in 2004 and, of course, in India. And there is no doubt that terrorists certainly would be considering to use rail and transit as a base for future attacks here in this country. So this legislation is needed. It is constructive and on balance, it is very positive. For instance, it authorized the use of VIPER teams. It does base funding on threat and risk. And it addresses very, very key areas of vulnerability.

Having said that, I wish the same spirit of bipartisanship that had prevailed at the committee level had prevailed in the Rules Committee, because there are a number of amendments which were not ruled in order. In fact, there was no amendment ruled in order which was offered by a member of the Homeland Security Committee, specifically, an amendment by Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN, which would have, I believe, addressed deficiencies in the whistleblower language which would have protected classified national security information.

The amendment by Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE, who will be speaking on it herself in a few moments, would have certainly prevented the disclosure of sensitive security information on Freedom of Information requests, and two amendments by Mr. DENT as far as screening travelers entering the U.S. and interdicting terrorists at the border. All four of these amendments would have been very constructive. I supported them strongly. At the very least, they deserved a full debate here on the House floor today. So for that reason I will oppose the rule.

Having said that, I do support the underlying legislation, and I do commend Chairman THOMPSON for his efforts and certainly subcommittee ranking member and former chairman, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN, for the efforts that he put into this in the previous Congress.

This is legislation whose time has come. Unfortunately, it was not allowed the opportunity to even be better than it is.

So having said, while I support the underlying legislation, I must reluctantly oppose the rule today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Rules Committee, my good friend from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from the Rules Committee for yielding time on this very, very important issue.

Today is a great day, and I rise in support of the rule and the underlying resolution in this matter to improve our security on our rail and busway systems throughout this country.

□ 1300

When I was running for this office, this was a very, very important and significant issue to many people who I represent throughout Northeast Ohio. We have many passengers and others who utilize these services who, unfortunately, despite evidence of vulnerability and potential attack, have been exposed to the ongoing danger of our failure to secure these systems. I also am proud to see that in this bill we have protections for whistleblowers that will improve the likelihood of secure and safe transit systems within our country.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure and privilege to yield 4 minutes to my distinguished friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, early in this session the majority promised to implement all the 9/11 Commission recommendations. Yesterday, the Rules Committee, which is controlled by the majority, had the opportunity to deliver on that promise by making two of my amendments to this legislation in order. It failed to do so, and the security of our rail and bus passengers and, in fact, our border security in general will be all the worse as a result.

The 9/11 Commission advised the President to direct the Department of Homeland Security to ''design a comprehensive screening system'' that would target ''particular, identifiable suspects or indicators of risk'' and give border officials ''the resources to establish that people are who they say they are, intercept identifiable suspects, and disrupt terrorist operations.'' They concluded that targeting travel is at least as powerful a weapon against terrorists as targeting their money. That is the 9/11 Commission report, recommendation 14, page 385. And it recommended that a terrorist travel intelligence collection and analysis program, which had ''produced disproportionately useful results,'' should be expanded.

The first of these amendments involved the Advance Passenger Information System, or APIS as we commonly refer to it. Today, under this program, air and sea carriers collect passenger and crew biographical data and transmit this data to Customs and Border Protection while the vessel or aircraft is en route to the United States. This is an important tool in CBP's efforts to identify suspect or high-risk passengers before, that is before, they enter the country.

As terrorists are just as capable of taking a Greyhound bus across border as they are landing at LAX, I thought that my amendment, which would have required bus and train companies transporting passengers into this country to provide the same advanced information to CBP as do the airlines, made sense. Unfortunately, the majority members in the Rules Committee did not agree.

My second amendment would have authorized the deployment of the Automated Targeting System For Passengers, or ATS–P as we refer to it. ATS–P is an intranet-based enforcement and decision support tool that is the cornerstone of all of CBP's targeting efforts at the border.

ATS–P coordinates passenger information and forms an intelligence assessment of a traveler. ATS–P then makes a simple ''yes'' or ''no'' determination on whether that international traveler should be flagged for additional screening. Once this information is received by CBP officials, these officials retain the discretion to act, or not to act, on that information. In short, ATS–P is nothing more than a tool that can help CBP determine who might be a person worthy of a follow-up interview.

Again, since we are already using this technology to screen international incoming flights, why not apply it to border crossings of trains and buses, other forms of transportation through which terrorists might try to enter the country? Why not? That was the gist of my amendment. Once more, however, the majority on the Rules Committee shot us down.

Together, APIS and the ATS–P make up the building blocks of exactly the kind of border security program recommended by the 9/11 Commission, and yet this rule prohibits our consideration of these two programs as part of our mass transit and rail security structure. The majority can talk the talk when it comes to adopting the 9/11 Commission recommendations, but by failing to implement these two amendments, it has shown that it cannot walk the walk.

Accordingly, while I know that this legislation, H.R. 1401, will do many good things, and I do support the underlying bill, I ask that you vote against this rule because it fails to address the homeland security concerns detailed in my amendments.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 1401, the Rail and Public Transportation Security Act of 2007.

This rule is overly restrictive because it prohibits several good amendments like my colleague just enumerated as well as an amendment that I had tried to get in the bill. I think it is shocking because members are the most knowledgeable about this bill, having worked on it for weeks now, our members of the committee.

One of the amendments that the rule excludes was the rule that basically said if we have an assessment out there

of perhaps a lack of security or an area that we need additional resources in, this information is going to become public. Think about what the terrorists would do. The amendment would have filled this security gap by exempting all sensitive information from Freedom of Information Act requests. It directed the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue regulations that would prohibit unauthorized disclosure of sensitive information such as security plans, vulnerability assessments, and risk-based criteria.

Mr. Speaker, the International Association of Fire Chiefs recently wrote a letter supporting my amendment, and I will include that letter in the RECORD.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE CHIEFS,
Fairfax, VA, March 12, 2007.

Hon. GINNY BROWN-WAITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BROWN-WAITE: On behalf of the nearly 13,000 chief fire and emergency officers of the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC), I would like to voice our support for your amendment to the ''Rail and Public Transportation Security Act of 2007'' that would protect sensitive information about our nation's rail and public transportation sector.

We share your concerns about protecting sensitive information from accidental public disclosure. Both the vulnerability plans and the security assessments described in this legislation contain sensitive information, such as threats to our nation's transportation system, security weaknesses, and redundant and back-up systems. It is important that this information be shared with the appropriate fire and emergency services, and law enforcement organizations to ensure that they are prepared for the accidental or deliberate release of hazardous materials. However, this information should not be made public, because of the serious problems that could occur if information about weaknesses in the security of our nation's transportation system fell into the wrong hands.

Thank you again for offering this amendment. If you have any questions about the IAPC's role in the safe transportation of hazardous materials, please feel free to call Ken LaSala, the Director of Government Relations.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. HARMES,
President.

I would also like to quote two sentences from the letter by those who would be the first responders, the Association of Fire Chiefs, and the fire chiefs in your local district: ''It is important that this information be shared with appropriate fire and emergency services and law enforcement organizations to ensure that they are prepared for the accidental or deliberate release of hazardous materials. However, this information should not be made public because of the serious problems that could occur if information about weaknesses in the security of our Nation's transportation system fell into the wrong hands.''

Mr. Speaker, they said it far better than I could, and they would clearly be the first responders. By excluding these important amendments, we are shortchanging the people of America with a bill that is filled with loopholes.

I ask Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question and on the rule so we can go back and make some of these very appropriate amendments in order.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the Chair of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 1401, the Rail and Public Transportation Security Act of 2007. I am also grateful to the Rules Committee and my colleague from Florida for offering this rule.

The bill passed out of the Committee on Homeland Security was a comprehensive bill. I know a number of my colleagues offered amendments, and I appreciate their interest.

I am also pleased the rule makes in order the manager's amendment I will be offering. This amendment was the result of extensive negotiations with my colleagues on the Oversight and Government Reform as well as Transportation Committees. Chairman WAXMAN assisted in perfecting the whistleblower protections in the bill. Chairman OBERSTAR worked with me on clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the Departments of Transportation and Homeland Security in this bill.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a good rule. It provides for sufficient debate on this important legislation. It also rules in order several amendments that deserve discussion and consideration by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my privilege to yield 4 minutes to a distinguished new Member who is already making an impact in this House with his forceful leadership and his knowledge and wisdom, Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule but in support of H.R. 1401, the Rail and Public Transportation Security Act, which will improve the security of our Nation's rail, subway, and bus systems.

I am very disappointed that this rule does not allow any Republicans on the Homeland Security Committee to offer amendments, of which there were several. Two of my committee colleagues, Congressman DANIEL E. LUNGREN and Congresswoman GINNY BROWN-WAITE, have critically important amendments that would significantly improve this bill.

However, I am pleased to support this bill, which my Homeland Security Committee approved unanimously. I support this bill because it will provide much-needed protections and security improvements for the millions of Americans that travel on our Nation's buses, our subway system, and our train system.

The Rail and Public Transportation Security Act will require Federal officials and transportation providers to assess our vulnerability to terrorist attacks against these public transportation systems and determine ways to improve their security.

I am especially pleased that the bill we are considering today includes two proposals that I made during committee consideration of this measure that I believe will strengthen our security against terrorist attacks on rail and mass transportation systems.

First, the committee adopted an amendment I offered that requires DHS to conduct physical testing of railcars to determine the most likely successful means of attack against them. This is important because no real-world vulnerability testing has been done on the safety of tank cars carrying dangerous toxic-by-inhalation hazardous materials. My amendment remedies that by requiring such tests so that we can properly assess their current vulnerabilities and protect them to the most practical extent possible.

My proposal also requires real-world plume modeling analysis for such attacks to help fill the current gaps in our understanding of these vulnerabilities so that we can better protect our constituents and first responders from attacks on tank cars carrying dangerous materials and mitigate their consequences.

Second, this bill incorporates the text of an amendment that I filed during the committee's consideration of H.R. 1401 that requires the security coordinator positions required under section 103 of the bill to be filled by U.S. citizens, a requirement which I think makes sense for several reasons. U.S. citizenship is required for individuals seeking security clearances for access to classified information and materials. I very strongly believe that individuals who will be responsible for coordinating and implementing security plans for our Nation's rail and public transportation systems should be able to access, when appropriate, information to help them do their jobs as effectively as possible.

I think it just makes sense to put American citizens in charge of the security for our country. As we saw during the Dubai Ports debacle, many of our constituents demanded that Americans be in charge of America's security, a position with which I hope we can all agree.

I want to thank full committee Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, Ranking Member PETER KING, Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection Subcommittee Chairwoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, and subcommittee Ranking Member DAN LUNGREN for their hard work and open-mindedness in crafting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we have rightly focused much of our time, attention, and resources on securing our Nation's aviation system in the years since 9/11. I believe it is time that we focus on securing our country's public transportation systems, which so many of our constituents use each day.

□ 1315

This bill is a significant step in that direction. I urge our colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), the chairwoman of the Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to address you this afternoon. I thank my good friend Mr. HASTINGS from Florida, and let me thank the Rules Committee for the thoughtful and constructive rule that has been put forward and acknowledge my colleague on the subcommittee, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for his comments about the underlying bill.

Just to inform my colleagues, this is a bill long overdue, and procedurally I believe that we moved this bill in regular order. We held two hearings. First of all, a hearing that allowed us to hear from the vastness of government agencies, who, I guess out of their testimony, one could argue that they made a very clear case that we needed a regulatory framework within which to secure the Nation's railroads and transit systems.

Obviously, through the tragedies of London and Madrid, we knew that the clock was ticking; and this committee, under the chairmanship of Chairman THOMPSON, knows that we must advance the ball, building on the work that this committee has done as a bipartisan committee over the years with a number of chairpersons, that we must move the ball forward to ensure the security of the Nation's homeland.

That means this particular subcommittee will address questions dealing with not only the questions of rail, but of aviation, of bus, of trucking, and as well critical infrastructure that heretofore may not have been assessed as closely as we should have.

So we held one hearing. At a second hearing we were able to hear from a number of industry persons to tell us, again, of some of the mountains that they had to climb in order to ensure security of the homeland.

That being so, this is a comprehensive bill. I am delighted it includes language regarding research and training, whistleblower language that comports with the Waxman legislation, so we are consistent in the legislative structure. I support, as well, the manager's amendment by Mr. THOMPSON, which focuses on some aspects that I think help the bill.

There will be some issues that I hope that we can move further along, and that is a relationship of consultation between the Homeland Security Department and the Department of Transportation.

As relates to security, I think it is key that the Department of Homeland Security and the Homeland Security Committee lead in consultation with a number of our jurisdictional allies.

I want to thank the chairman of the transportation committee and the chairperson of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Congresswoman CORRINE BROWN. We worked very collegially together, and I think this is a strong product.

Might I also just indicate that I hope my colleagues will pay close attention to language that would eliminate Amtrak from security grants. One of the largest modes of passenger transportation, which has had its ups and downs, sometimes the passenger rate is up, sometimes it is down, but it does not mean that it is not a vulnerable target.

It is interesting that if you run your transit system 24 hours a day, for example, there has to be a period where there is low passenger census. Does that mean that it is any less a target to threats than it would be during peak times? So I hope my colleagues will consider the vulnerability that the Sessions amendment gives to this whole bill and the idea of securing extensively the rail system.

Might I suggest that amendments that would undermine the Transportation Security Administration breeding program increase also pose concern, because, as we know, we have not yet had a system in rail travel that addresses the question of security of baggage. So this breeding program, dealing with domestic animals, is an important aspect of dealing with the question of security.

I would also suggest that you don't want to leave out the provision that we have in the over-the-road bus program, and that should not be eliminated.

This is a good rule. I ask my colleagues to support it, and I hope they will support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the history of this bill. This bill was badly needed because, as you know, the issue of transportation security has been over looked. This bill authorizes more than 5 billion dollars over the next four years for rail, public transportation, and over-the-road bus security. Having seen the horrific events in Madrid and London, something must be done to improve transportation security. We know that this bill moves in that direction because we've had a long and distinguished legislative record resulting in this bipartisan bill.

As the Chairwoman for the Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection we have held two hearings on the topic of transportation security. On February 6, the Subcommittee received testimony from the government on transportation security. On February 13, the Subcommittee heard testimony from industry and labor about the issue as well. Both of these hearings were attended by the Subcommittee's Ranking Member, Mr. LUNGREN from California, and other Committee Members from both parties.

In these hearings, the Subcommittee heard from over nine different witnesses. The witnesses included, Assistant Secretary Hawley, with the Transportation Security Administration, two witnesses from the Department of Transportation, one from the Federal Railroad Administration, and the other from the Federal Transit Administration, and the Government Accountability Office's rail security expert. We also heard from the Amtrak's Inspector General, the Association of American Railroads, and the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Finally, we also heard from the Transport Workers Union and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. As such, I think we have heard from all the stakeholders impacted by this bill.

Besides hearings, the Subcommittee held a mark-up on March 1, 2007, in which there were ten amendments offered and discussed. These amendments dealt with issues, including whistleblower rights, reducing protections for protecting sensitive information, and others. I believe the mark-up yielded a strong bill, which was made even stronger by the Full Committee's mark-up and its consideration of more than twenty amendments.

Mr. Speaker, because the Homeland Security bill was passed unanimously out of Committee and it represents a compromise between the Transportation & Infrastructure and Oversight and Government Reform Committees, and is a great step forward to protecting our transportation systems, I urge my colleagues to support the Rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague from California, Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good day in some respects, and that is that we have this bill on the floor, H.R. 1401, the Rail and Public Transportation Security Act of 2007. It follows up on work that we began in the last Congress on a bipartisan basis.

I would say the committee acted on a bipartisan basis all the way through. It is a shame, however, that bipartisanship stops at the edge of the Rules Committee. When we made an attempt to ask for reasonable amendments in this regard from members of the committee of jurisdiction, the Homeland Security Committee, we were rejected.

I might just talk about the one amendment that I had asked to be considered dealing with whistleblower protection. The bill has in it now a provision which is extraordinary in its breadth and which is unique in its application of criminal law. People wonder why we would be concerned about this when we all agree we ought to allow whistleblowers, when acting properly, to expose wrongdoing.

The problem is we are in an area dealing with security, and this would allow an employee to make an individualized determination, without further review or even perhaps without all the relevant information, to disclose classified information. We ought to be concerned about that. My amendment would have dealt with that.

For some reason now in the manager's amendment we are going to exempt these criminal penalties for many Federal employees, but we are going to

impose them on State and local employees, criminal penalties and punitive damage awards. So we are going to have a situation in terms of sensitive information that might be revealed by an employee and therefore action taken against that employee, and the government unable to respond to that, because under this whistleblower protection law, there will not be the ability for the government to talk about protecting basically state secrets.

What we are talking about here are areas of sensitive information. This goes along with the gentlewoman from Florida's amendment to try and protect sensitive information. Both of those amendments were rejected.

I would hope that Members would vote down this rule so we might have a chance to do our job and at the same time protect sensitive information.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), one such distinguished Member who had two germane amendments before the Rules Committee that were shut out. He is the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I do rise in opposition to this rule.

I have been here for 15 years, and this is probably one of the most egregious efforts to deny committees of jurisdiction input into this very important legislation.

We just heard from Mr. LUNGREN, a very distinguished Member and ranking member on the Homeland Security Committee. He stated again the partisan nature of the Rules decision. The Chair on the Republican side, the ranking member of that committee, Mr. KING, indicated that there were zero amendments. Unprecedented. On the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, there were zero amendments accepted.

So I must strongly encourage that we vote against this rule. Again, in my experience, I have never heard of such an egregious abuse of minority rights or participation in the process.

Most importantly, I think that one of the amendments that we offered from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, while the manager's amendment does have some improvements in taking these important security grants from DHS, which has had difficulty in managing all their responsibilities, and we have the money going through DHS and the grants administered by the Department of Transportation, which is an improvement, it has been my experience that it is not how much money you spend, it is how you spend it. We had an amendment that offered a vast improvement, which was to conduct a needs and risk assessment on security risks relating to transit and rail, which has never been conducted.

So we are going to take $6 billion of hard-earned taxpayer money and put it through this system that I just described and not really address that money to the real threats and risks that we face. I don't think that is wise.

This weekend I spent some time in Pennsylvania. I went through a couple of towns and I saw a lot of people. I saw some tough towns in some of the rural areas traveling up there. But I saw a lot of people going to work and working hard, sending their money to Washington. They are counting on us to be good stewards of that money and to spend that money.

Our number one responsibility is the safety and security of those people, and here we are abandoning that responsibility. So they work very hard out there to send that money here and now see it not properly applied.

That is wrong, and I will oppose this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule, H. Res. 270, for the consideration of H.R. 1401, the Rail and Public Transportation Security Act of 2007.

I strongly support effective security measures for America's railroads, transit systems, and intercity buses.

But the funding authorization levels in the bill that will be brought up today are based on a phony estimate of the surface transportation security needs.

The $6 billion authorized in H.R. 1401 is based on a 2003 member survey conducted by the American Public Transportation Association.

There was no discipline to the APTA survey—anyone could ask for anything they thought they might need at any time.

Yesterday, I offered two amendments to the Rules Committee, both of which were rejected on a straight party-line vote.

The first amendment was simply a requirement that DHS and DOT determine what the security needs of the Nation's transit systems and railroads are before authorizing $6 billion in grants.

This amendment was supported by the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Yet the Rules Committee refused to allow the amendment to be considered.

I also proposed an amendment to expand the current whistleblower protection law for both the safety and security of railroad employees under the Railway Labor Act.

This effective whistleblower protection law in title 49 of the U.S. Code has been in place since 1970. This law covers the reporting of all hazardous conditions, whether related to safety or security.

Under the Railway Labor Act whistleblower protection, railroad employees are fully protected against termination, harassment or discrimination.

There is absolutely no good reason to replace this functional and effective law with new whistleblower protection requirements under the Department of Labor. Don't fix it if it isn't broken.

But this amendment, despite support from both the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, was also rejected by the Rules Committee on a party-line vote.

I strongly oppose this Rule.

The bill development was not bipartisan, and it is obvious that the development of the Rule was completely partisan.

The Democrat-led Congress's unwillingness to work with Republicans on this bill flies in the face of Speaker PELOSI's commitment to work in an open and bipartisan manner.

It's a shame that this Congress has put politics ahead of effective security for the traveling public.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to make in order two amendments Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania offered last night at the Rules Committee. Mr. DENT, a member of the Homeland Security Committee, testified on behalf of his amendments, but the Democratic majority of the Rules Committee all voted against making these important amendments in order.

These amendments would establish a screening program for individuals who are arriving at or departing from the U.S. through covered transportation, namely, by passenger rail and bus. His amendments would also require carriers who provide transportation to people entering the U.S. to provide passenger information to Customs and Border Protection.

Mr. DENT's amendments would implement one of the key 9/11 Commission recommendations, which stated: ''Information systems able to detect potential terrorist indicators should be used at primary border inspection lines, in immigration services offices, and in intelligence and enforcement units.''

During the recent campaign, the Democrats pledged to enact all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. By not allowing Mr. DENT's amendments, they are ignoring a loophole for the terrorists to exploit and are reneging on a promise they made to the American people to protect them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the amendment and extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great intensity to my friend from Florida regarding the resources that the American public provides to the United States Government for its distribution. He seems to decry the fact that this year we are going to spend $7 billion on rail security. My ultimate question would be, What did you spend on rail security last year, the year before, the year before and the year before that?

Somewhere along the line, I believe that the American people want us to

make sure that our rail system and our bus system are as secure as we can make them. This is a start in that direction.

I also heard my friend from Orlando say that the rule itself is the most egregious that he has seen in 15 years. Well, I have been here every one of those 15 years that he has been here, and if he wants to see egregious, then travel with me back to the 4 years in the minority that I was on the Rules Committee, and I will show you egregiousness.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, the 9/11 Commission gave the Transportation Security Administration a C-minus for its efforts to develop a security strategy for all modes of transportation. GAO, as I previously mentioned, has said that the U.S. has failed to provide the appropriate leadership in enhancing all forms of covered transportation.

Something needs to change. This bill provides the necessary leadership and funding to move us forward.

For too long, Congress has neglected its responsibility to do whatever is necessary to protect the well-being of the American people. This is a fair rule. It gives four amendments to the minority and four amendments to the majority; hardly as egregious as the many times no amendments were granted to the minority when Democrats were in the minority.

I urge my colleagues to support both the substantive legislation and this rule.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Rail and Public Transportation Security Act (H.R. 1401). Our country needs this bill. Our communities need this bill.

This legislation is very timely for my district. On March 15th, a train trestle burned down just outside central Sacramento. The fire sent a dark plume of smoke into the sky.

The residents of our region received quite a scare. Children were kept inside because authorities could not determine if the smoke from the trestle fire was toxic.

Fortunately, no one was hurt. The incident is not being investigated as a terrorist attack.

However, this fire showcased the impact that our rail vulnerabilities can have on communities.

In Sacramento, our train tracks form a ring around our most populated areas. If the trestle had caught fire just a few miles down the track, houses would have burned. If the train had exploded, or if it had leaked hazardous material, my constituents could have died.

I cannot let that happen. That is why this legislation is so important. It makes critical advancements in rail security policy.

I am grateful that Representative MARKEY has addressed the transport of hazardous materials through heavily populated areas.

As the situation in Sacramento demonstrated, we must begin to reroute hazardous shipments to avoid populated areas.

When possible, we must integrate new technologies to secure these shipments. I look forward to working with Mr. MARKEY to implement this proposal.

It is also important to note that more people than ever are using public transit. Over 10 billion trips were taken on public transportation last year. There has been a 30 percent increase in public transit use in the last decade.

This increased ridership is great news. However, it is important that we invest in security funding to match growing demand. This legislation will do just that.

Finally, I want to commend Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON of the Homeland Security Committee for his leadership on this issue.

As a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I have seen how smoothly Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairman THOMPSON have collaborated.

They have done a great job dealing with the jurisdictional issues raised by transit security.

Their work demonstrates the level of commitment that is needed to secure our communities. Such collaboration is a refreshing change.

It should serve as an example for us all as we tackle other pressing issues facing the 110th Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the Rule, so that we can enact this important legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 270

OFFERED BY REP. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendments printed in sections 4 and 5 shall be in order as though printed as the last two amendments in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Dent of Pennsylvania or his designee. Such amendments shall each be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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

At the end of title I of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1xx. PASSENGER AND CREW MANIFESTS FOR VEHICLES ARRIVING IN OR DEPARTING FROM THE UNITED STATES.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Congress supports the following recommendations from the Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States:

(1) ''The small terrorist travel intelligence collection and analysis program currently in place has produced disproportionately useful results. It should be expanded. Since officials at the borders encounter travelers and their documents first and investigate travel facilitators, they must work closely with intelligence officials.''.

(2) ''Information systems able to authenticate travel documents and detect potential terrorist indicators should be used at consulates, at primary border inspection lines, in immigration services offices, and in intelligence and enforcement units.''.

(3) ''We advocate a system for screening, not categorical profiling. A screening system looks for particular, identifiable suspects or indicators of risk. It does not involve guesswork about who might be dangerous. It requires frontline border officials who have the tools and resources to establish that people are who they say they are, intercept identifiable suspects, and disrupt terrorist operations.''.

(4) ''[T]he National Targeting Center, assisted by the new Terrorist Screening Center, provides information support to inspectors at ports of entry so that they can make more informed decisions about potential terrorists and harmful cargo attempting to enter the United States.''.

(b) AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE ADVANCED DELIVERY OF INFORMATION.—Part II of title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 434 the following new section:

''SEC. 435. PASSENGER AND CREW MANIFESTS FOR VEHICLES ARRIVING IN OR DEPARTING FROM THE UNITED STATES.

''(a) PASSENGER AND CREW MANIFESTS REQUIRED.—The Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection of the Department of Homeland Security may require each vehicle (including a rail car or bus) of a provider of covered transportation, as defined in the Rail and Public Transportation Security Act of 2007 arriving in the United States from, or departing the United States to, a foreign port or place to transmit to United States Customs and Border Protection a passenger manifest and crew manifest containing the information set forth in subsection (c) for each such arrival in or departure from the United States.

''(b) TRANSMISSION.—A passenger manifest and crew manifest required pursuant to subsection (a) shall be transmitted to United States Customs and Border Protection in advance of arrival in or departure from the United States in such manner, time, and form as the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection may prescribe by regulations.

''(c) INFORMATION.—The information to be provided with respect to each person listed on a passenger manifest or crew manifest required pursuant to subsection (a) may include—

''(1) the person's complete name, date of birth, citizenship, gender, passport number and country of issuance, and alien registration number, if applicable; and

''(2) such other information as the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection determines is necessary to enforce the customs, immigration, and other related laws of the United States, to ensure the transportation security of the United States, and to protect the national security of the United States.

''(d) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any person who fails to provide accurate and full information in a passenger manifest or crew manifest required pursuant to subsections (a) and (c) or regulations issued thereunder, or fails to provide the manifest in the manner prescribed pursuant to subsection (b) or regulations issued thereunder, shall be liable for a civil penalty in the amount of $5,000 with respect to each person listed on the manifest for whom such accurate or full information is not provided in accordance with such requirements.

''(e) PASSENGER NAME RECORD INFORMATION.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection may require each commercial carrier arriving in the United States from, or departing the United States to, a foreign port or place to make available to United States Customs and Border Protection, upon the agency's request, passenger name record information for each such arrival in or departure from the United States in such manner, time, and form as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulations.

''(2) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any person who fails to provide passenger name record information required pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be liable for a civil penalty in the amount of $5,000 with respect to each person for whom such information is not provided in accordance with such requirements.

''(f) SHARING OF MANIFEST AND PASSENGER NAME RECORD INFORMATION WITH OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.—The Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection may provide information contained in passenger and crew manifests and passenger name record information received pursuant to this section to other government authorities in order to protect the national security of the United States or as otherwise authorized by law.

''(g) CONSIDERATION OF ECONOMIC IMPACT.—Prior to issuing any interim or final regulation under this section, the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection shall consult with stakeholders from the transportation industry and assess the economic impact that the regulation would have on private industry.

''(h) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section abrogates, diminishes, or weakens the provisions of any Federal or State law that prevents or protects against the unauthorized collection or release of personal records.''.

SEC. 5. The second amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows:

At the end of the title I, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 132. AUTOMATED TARGETING SYSTEM FOR PERSONS ENTERING OR DEPARTING THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS OF THE 9/11 COMMISSION.—Congress finds that the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (commonly referred to as the 9/11 Commission) concluded that—

(1) ''The small terrorist travel intelligence collection and analysis program currently in place has produced disproportionately useful results. It should be expanded. Since officials at the border encounter travelers and their documents first and investigate travel facilitators, they must work closely with intelligence officials.'';

(2) ''Information systems able to authenticate travel documents and detect potential terrorist indicators should be used at consulates, at primary border inspection lines, in immigration service offices, and intelligence and enforcement units.'';

(3) ''The President should direct the Department of Homeland Security to lead the effort to design a comprehensive screening system, addressing common problems and setting common standards with systemwide goals in mind.'';

(4) ''A screening system looks for particular, identifiable suspects or indicators of risk. It does not involve guesswork about who might be dangerous. It requires frontline border officials who have the tools and resources to establish that people are who they say they are, intercept identifiable suspects, and disrupt terrorist operations.''; and

(5) ''Inspectors adjudicating entries of the 9/11 hijackers lacked adequate information and knowledge of the rules. A modern border and immigration system should combine a biometric entry-exit system with accessible files on visitors and immigrants, along with intelligence on indicators of terrorist travel.''.

(b) AUTOMATED TARGETING SYSTEM FOR PERSONS ENTERING OR DEPARTING THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, may establish an automated system for the purpose of the enforcement of United States law, including laws relating to anti-terrorism and border security, to assist in the screening of persons seeking to enter or depart the United States (in this section referred to as the ''system'') through the use of covered transportation.

(c) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—The Secretary, acting through the Commissioner, shall ensure than an administrative process is established, or application of an existing administrative process is extended, pursuant to which any individual may apply to correct any information retained by the system established under subsection (b). Nothing in this section shall be construed as creating a private right of action and no court shall have jurisdiction based on any of the provisions of this section to hear any case or claim arising from the application of the system or the corrective administrative process established or applied under this section.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as abrogating, diminishing, or weakening the provisions of any Federal or State law that prevents or protects against the unauthorized collection or release of personal records.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make a point of order a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 270 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 270, if ordered; adoption of H. Res. 269, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 266.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 199, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Cleaver	Filner
Ackerman	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Allen	Cohen	Giffords
Altmire	Conyers	Gillibrand
Arcuri	Cooper	Gonzalez
Baca	Costa	Gordon
Baird	Costello	Green, Al
Baldwin	Courtney	Green, Gene
Bean	Cramer	Grijalva
Becerra	Crowley	Gutierrez
Berkley	Cuellar	Hall (NY)
Berman	Cummings	Hare
Berry	Davis (AL)	Harman
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Davis (IL)	Herseth
Blumenauer	Davis, Lincoln	Higgins
Boren	DeFazio	Hill
Boswell	DeGette	Hinchey
Boucher	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Boyd (FL)	DeLauro	Hirono
Boyda (KS)	Dicks	Hodes
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Holden
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Holt
Brown, Corrine	Donnelly	Honda
Butterfield	Doyle	Hooley
Capps	Edwards	Hoyer
Capuano	Ellison	Inslee
Cardoza	Ellsworth	Israel
Carnahan	Emanuel	Jackson (IL)
Carney	Engel	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Castor	Eshoo	Jefferson
Chandler	Etheridge	Johnson (GA)
Clarke	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Clay	Fattah	

Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—199

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Andrews
Barton (TX)
Carson
Davis, Jo Ann
Ehlers
Kanjorski
Kingston
Lampson
Meehan
Millender-McDonald
Spratt
Udall (NM)

□ 1359

Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, RYAN of Wisconsin, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and SULLIVAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 199, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—199

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield

Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews
Carson
Davis, Jo Ann
Garrett (NJ)
Kanjorski
Kingston
Lampson
Meehan
Millender-McDonald
Spratt
Udall (NM)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1408

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 835, HAWAIIAN HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the de novo vote on adoption of House Resolution 269.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—234

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

NAYS—188

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews
Carson
Cooper
Davis, Jo Ann
Kanjorski
Kingston
Lampson
Meehan
Millender-McDonald
Udall (NM)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1416

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.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL WORK MONTH AND WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 266, 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 gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 266.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 2, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett