

who wish to contract with the Federal Government. Mandating this annual recertification creates a disincentive for businesses to contract with the government, because filing this unnecessary paperwork takes time, takes money and takes manpower, proving that the actions we take here in Congress actually do have real-world consequences.

The Small Business Administration already has the discretion to determine how frequently small businesses must recertify, and the SBA studied and rejected this annual recertification because it would create, as they call it, an unnecessary burden for small business.

The SBA has already passed a recertification rule that goes into effect in June of this year. This rule will protect small business contracts without the added costs and headaches associated with the Democratic majority's heavy-handed proposal. Congress should have allowed the SBA rule to take effect before mandating this new, unnecessary statutory paperwork.

The failure of the Democratic majority to include my amendment proves that this bill is more about politics than it is about policy. Yesterday, person after person from both parties talked about how great it would be for us to help the great engine of this economy, small business. Yet we find out, when it really comes down to it, they want to put rules and regulations on small businesses, whether they are needed or not.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to insert in the RECORD the Statement of Administrative Policy for the bill which specifically states that the bill would impose additional detailed reporting requirements on agencies and prime contractors that would increase costs without clear benefits.

**STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY, H.R. 1873—SMALL BUSINESS FAIRNESS IN CONTRACTING ACT**

(REPRESENTATIVE BRALEY (D), IA AND 29 CO-SPONSORS)

The Administration supports efforts to increase opportunities for small businesses to compete for Federal government acquisitions. The Administration, however, opposes H.R. 1873, because it would impose broad, burdensome statutory restrictions on Federal agencies' ability to conduct acquisitions and establish unrealistic small business procurement goals. Although the Administration appreciates the efforts of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee to address some of the Administration's concerns, its reported bill contains many of the same objectionable provisions as the introduced bill and the bill as reported by the House Small Business Committee.

Among its objectionable provisions, H.R. 1873 would impose costly and time-consuming requirements on thousands of agency acquisitions through an overly-expansive definition of "contract bundling" that would include construction contracts, new procurements not previously performed by or considered suitable for small businesses, and task and delivery orders under existing contracts even when bundling justifications were already performed under such contract. These requirements would be in addition to

existing rules that already require review of all agency procurements for small business opportunities.

Additionally, the bill would establish unrealistic government-wide and individual agency small business procurement goals that could undermine the small business procurement goal process. Moreover, both the increase in goals and the restrictions on allowing a small business to be counted for only one preferred small business contracting category raise constitutional questions by establishing new race- and gender-based Government preferences without presenting a strong basis in evidence that these preferences meet constitutional standards.

The bill also would overturn a recently issued small business regulation that guards against the abuse of small business preferences while allowing an affected small business a reasonable period of time to take advantage of such preferences during performance of a Federal procurement contract. Finally, the bill would impose additional detailed reporting requirements on agencies and prime contractors that would increase costs without clear benefits.

The Administration would strongly oppose amendments to require the Office of Management and Budget intervention in individual agency acquisition decisions, thereby removing the discretion and flexibility that agencies must have to accomplish their missions by contracting for needed supplies and services. The Administration also would strongly oppose any amendments that require individual agency goals to be no lower than government-wide statutory small business goals, or that apply small business goals to overseas acquisitions.

The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to increase opportunities for small businesses without unnecessarily disrupting agency operations and imposing burdensome requirements on agencies and contractors.

I ask for all my colleagues to oppose this partisan rule, this restrictive rule that will do very little to help small businesses.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to my good friend from Texas and state the committee considered his amendment, proposed amendment, and rejected it for a large reason, because we feel that it is important to make companies certify that they are, in fact, small businesses, that there have been mistakes made in the past, that companies have gotten beyond the threshold and have won contracts that they may not be authorized to do.

Just because the Small Business Administration periodically will go and check that, we don't believe that that is enough of a cause to require that other small businesses be shut out of the process because companies that grow beyond the requirements are allowed special treatment.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would like to thank Mr. CARDOZA, my good friend, and all those who have spoken during this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate my call for the defeat of this restrictive rule. It is an unfair rule, it is unnecessarily restrictive, and it closes down debate. For that reason, I urge the defeat of this rule.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, in my close, I just want to assure the Members of Congress that we are, in fact, running the most open process in this Congress, that, in fact, we have provided seven open rules.

Now those rules may have a pre-printing requirement, as Mr. DIAZ-BALART mentioned, the gentleman from Florida. In fact, though, requiring a pre-printing requirement allows every Member who desires to put forward an idea to come and have their ideas presented to the House. That is much more than what happened in the prior Congress, when they were in charge. We are keeping our commitment to running an open process.

As I mentioned, this legislation is very worthy of this rule and of passage. As I mentioned, small businesses have not received their fair share of Federal Government contracts, despite their importance to our economy. The bill before us today, H.R. 1873, addresses some of the key causes.

By making a few targeted reforms to the procurement process, we can help thousands of small businesses and give a much-needed jolt to our national economy. We must continue to shepherd our small businesses to give them every opportunity to succeed for today and for tomorrow yet to come. This bill will move us in that direction, and a small business will be that much closer to making their dreams of prosperity a reality.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

---

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1684, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008**

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 382 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 382

*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. 1684) to authorize appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. 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 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. 1684 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to 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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 382 provides for consideration of H.R. 1684, the Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill's consideration, except those arising under clauses 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order and provides appropriate waivers for 21 amendments.

I am pleased to stand before you today with a rule to permit the Homeland Security authorization bill to come to the House floor.

First and foremost, I want to thank Chairman THOMPSON for his continued leadership on an issue of utmost importance for the safety and prosperity of this country and for working so closely with Ranking Member KING on this bill.

This bipartisan bill authorizes \$39.8 billion to the Homeland Security to carry out its many functions, from securing our borders to providing our local law enforcement with resources to prepare for and prevent terrorist attacks.

The Department of Homeland Security has a wide range of responsibilities. In recognition of this critical mission, I am pleased that the Homeland Security Committee has authorized \$2.1 billion more than the President requested in his budget. This authorization bill does far more than simply authorize appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security.

□ 1145

This bill gets at the heart of the management problems within the Department. As we all know, the Department was created by combining the work of 22 separate agencies. This process of integration has had many, many challenges, poor communication between agencies, a lack of qualified management, unusually high turnover of senior personnel.

Congress has not made these challenges any easier, however. We could have addressed some of these problems through the legislative process by passing an authorization bill last year, but the prior majority failed to do so, and so the Department's management problems went uncorrected.

Without addressing the underlying management and operational issues, the Department cannot perform its important functions. In such an environment, how can the American people feel safe?

Thankfully, H.R. 1684 addresses these challenges. It mandates a comprehensive review of the Department at the beginning of each new administration in order to ensure that DHS is structured to meet the security needs of the American people. It sets qualifications for senior managers, increases coordi-

nation between agencies, and boosts funds for the Inspector General. And, agency by agency, it puts in place thoughtful personnel policies to attract, train and keep only the most qualified personnel.

These reforms are important, and I'm glad that the committee and the Democratic leadership have moved forward with a well-focused bill to improve the Department's management.

This bill continues the majority's strong record on homeland security. In a few short months, this Congress has passed bills to implement the 9/11 recommendations and to strengthen rail and public transportation security, each with strong bipartisan majorities. Each is a component of a comprehensive approach to protecting our constituents from potential threats.

I applaud the committee and the leadership for their consistent focus on homeland security. I understand that some Members have concerns that this bill does not address every issue, but part of the legislative process is working through these issues through the committees of jurisdiction.

It is important to keep in mind that Chairman THOMPSON and Ranking Member KING put forth a bipartisan bill during markup, and Chairman THOMPSON continues to work with other committees of jurisdiction in order to make sure that every aspect of our Nation's security is supported by Congress.

In particular, I applaud the chairman's record of shepherding 2 major homeland security bills through the House already. I think we should all agree that today's effort, the third homeland security bill in 4 months, makes substantial improvements to long-standing management issues within DHS. The rule and underlying bill shows a commitment of this Congress to working for a safe and secure America.

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), for the time; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The security of the American people, Mr. Speaker, is the primary function of the government of the United States. Since September 11, 2001, we have been working to rebuild our Nation, not only our buildings but also our sense of security. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security to coordinate all domestic security activities on behalf of the American people was an important first step and has served as the foundation of our continuing efforts to protect our citizens.

Today, we consider the third authorization for the Department of Homeland Security. During consideration of this underlying legislation, Members from both sides of the aisle worked together to craft a bipartisan bill. The

bill sought to build a core capacity at the Department and bring about targeted personnel, contracting and policy changes. That bill passed the Homeland Security Committee unanimously.

But even though the bill passed out of the committee with unanimous support, the majority party is attempting to undo the bipartisan bill by coming forth with a manager's amendment that significantly alters the makeup of that bill. The manager's amendment strikes key provisions which address high-priority homeland security issues. Out of a total of 86 substantive bill provisions, 26, or almost a third, are amended by the manager's amendment and 16, 20 percent almost, are entirely struck.

Most of the provisions stricken by the manager's amendment had become part of the bill through Republican amendments in the committee process. For example, the manager's amendment strikes provisions on the Student and Exchange Visitor Program and eligible uses of interoperability grants, among others.

There are two provisions that the manager's amendment deletes that I think should be highlighted, Mr. Speaker. The first would strike post-employment lobbying restrictions. This provision being eliminated from the bill by the manager's amendment would codify the existing ban on senior Department of Homeland Security employees from one part of the Department lobbying other parts of the Department within 1 year of leaving the Department. That reform is stricken from the bill by the manager's amendment.

The second part of the bill being stricken is a sense of the Congress calling for implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendation to establish a single point of oversight of homeland security in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

Now, that is one of the key recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, and precisely it is one that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle ran on in the elections, the promise to enact the 9/11 Commission recommendations.

Yet here they have an opportunity to follow through on their campaign promise, but, instead, they strike the provision from the bill through the manager's amendment. And they don't even allow for the provision to be debated in the form of an amendment on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that the Castor amendment, which helps address concerns with the dual implementation of the Florida Uniform Port Access Credential and the Transportation Workers Identification Card, was made in order. But there was another glaring missed opportunity here by the majority on the Rules Committee.

The Rules Committee had the opportunity to allow an open rule on this bill, but the suggestion that we do so, that we come forth with an open rule,

was voted down by the majority on the Rules Committee. Instead, they decided to report out a restrictive rule, thereby shutting out Members who had worked diligently to prepare their amendments. They also blocked out any Member who may be watching the debate now or in the process of the developing, unfolding debate and has an idea to improve the bill. No, no, they're blocked out as well. They're shut out.

It's unfortunate that the Rules Committee missed another opportunity to open the debate on this important legislation, as they promised during the campaign that they would; and because of that and the reasons that I have brought out, Mr. Speaker, this rule should be defeated.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for her gracious 5 minutes to talk on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. The Committee on Homeland Security is the only committee explicitly charged with overseeing the Department's organization and administration.

We don't take this responsibility lightly. This Congress, we have held dozens of oversight hearings. The topics of each hearing may have been different, but the basic message from the Department was pretty much the same:

Don't blame us for not having our House in order. We have high turnover. We don't have a headquarters. We don't have the authorities we need to be a leader on issues such as bio-preparedness and cybersecurity. We don't have the authorities we need to integrate 22 agencies into one competent unit.

H.R. 1684 takes away all the excuses. Under this bill, the Department is provided the resources, accountability and authority needed to finally become the Federal agency that Congress envisioned and the American people deserve.

Every day, we get another reminder of the urgent nature of the homeland security mission. Just yesterday, we learned that six individuals are in custody on charges of plotting to attack the U.S. Army base at Fort Dix. We don't need to have the luxury of giving DHS time to step up to the challenges of becoming a functional organization.

I introduced, Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan bill with Ranking Member KING. The full committee, by recorded vote of 26-0, voted to order it favorably to the House.

I am pleased that the Rules Committee is allowing so many amendments to be considered today. I look forward to an active debate and the opportunity to present my manager's amendment. The manager's amendment is a product of discussion with other Members of the House and other

House committees who have jurisdictional interest in aspects of this legislation.

I'm very pleased to bring this bill to the floor for consideration by the full House. Today, Members of the House of Representatives will have an opportunity to do something they have not been able to do in 2 years. They will get to cast a vote in favor of authorizing the Department of Homeland Security.

What's more, Mr. Speaker, they will get to vote to restore funding to critical first-responder programs that the President's budget would eliminate or severely cut.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the underlying bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) for yielding. I thank the gentlelady from California (Ms. MATSUI) for her kind remarks. And particularly I want to thank Ranking Member THOMPSON, excuse me, former Ranking Member, current Chairman THOMPSON for the outstanding job I believe he is doing as chairman of the Homeland Security Committee and certainly for the level of bipartisanship which he has demonstrated.

Having said that, I have to reluctantly but strongly urge defeat of the rule today. The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that the bill which did pass through the Homeland Security Committee under Chairman THOMPSON's leadership, passed by a vote of 26-0, was a truly bipartisan effort. There was cooperation from all sides, and we came together to fashion what I believe was a very constructive and significant piece of legislation in an area which obviously is of vital importance to our Nation.

The Department of Homeland Security has been in existence now only several years. It is in its fourth year. We are talking about 22 different Departments and agencies, 180,000 employees. And it is making progress, but much more has to be done. And to address it, we have to do it in a bipartisan way.

Unfortunately, the bill that comes to the floor today has been either stripped or dramatically modified up to 50 percent of the original provisions. And some of these are very significant provisions, probably none more significant than just the sense of Congress, which was so strongly recommended by the 9/11 Commission, saying that the Committee on Homeland Security should be the focal point of legislative activity regarding the Department of Homeland Security, rather than having offices and officials of the Department having to testify before 84 or 86 or 88 various committees and subcommittees of the House.

Also, a number of significant provisions in addition to that that were taken out, for instance, an increase in funding for the Secret Service; prohibiting grants to universities that bar Coast Guard recruiters; and, as Mr. DIAZ-BALART pointed out, a very significant legislation which, by the way, came from Congressman DEFAZIO, which would codify the existing lobbying ban on Department of Homeland Security officials to ensure accountability. And we can go down the list of so many, I believe, significant provisions that were taken out.

Now, the reason for this, I understand where Chairman THOMPSON is coming from. There was resistance from other committees. But I believe we should have withheld that resistance.

For instance, in the prior Congress when we did pass port security legislation, when we did pass legislation restructuring FEMA, when we did pass legislation involving chemical plant security, we met that same resistance from other committees.

□ 1200

But we stood up to it, and we were largely successful. And we did it by working through the leadership to not just back away from these confrontations, but I believe that when we do it so quickly and we do back away, we really weaken the status of the committee. Not that we are looking to build turf, not that it is a power grab, but, again, following the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, if there is one committee which should have primary jurisdiction on homeland security matters, it is the Committee on Homeland Security.

Also, there were amendments proposed that were rejected by the Rules Committee: Congressman DENT's amendment on the Automated Targeting System, which was strongly supported by the 9/11 Commission; Congressman SHAYS' proposed amendment involving cooperation with Interpol, very important, that was also disallowed; Congressman DAVE DAVIS, his amendment to expand the 287(g) program, which would provide funding for local law enforcement in enforcing immigration laws; and Congressman POE's amendment regarding appropriate procedures for Customs and Border Protection agents.

So these are a number of very solid amendments that were disallowed. We come here today with a bill which is really barely half of what it was when it left the committee. So I am strongly urging a "no" vote on the rule.

In no way is this a reflection on my good friend Chairman THOMPSON. And after we go through today and maybe even tomorrow, I pledge to him we will continue to work in a bipartisan way. But I really hope that the leadership of the other side would realize the significance of the Committee on Homeland Security and not just give in to various barons throughout the House who are

trying to just hold on to their own turf and their own power.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the committee. I commend this committee for the hard work in crafting bipartisan legislation because as we continue to face the challenge of identifying new threats and providing new strategies for securing our Nation, it is absolutely essential that the Homeland Security Department operate to its full potential.

The Homeland Security authorization will ensure that taxpayers' dollars are not wasted by mismanagement and will encourage the best and the brightest minds of our time to contribute to our national homeland security strategy.

Harnessing these resources is absolutely key to protecting our Nation's vital infrastructure, infrastructure like the Golden Gate Bridge in my district. And it is vital to quickly respond in providing aid and support in the event of a disaster, unlike the way in which the Department responded to Hurricane Katrina. These new authorizations will make a huge difference. These reforms must be made to keep the people safe. So by restoring accountability to the Department and strengthening the protections for its employees, we can and we will improve our ability to effectively safeguard our Nation.

I encourage all Members to vote for the Homeland Security authorization.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 1684. This bill in its current form would eliminate the critical Federal 287(g) program, which serves as a force multiplier for immigration enforcement across our Nation.

The 287(g) program is a highly effective, voluntary partnership that provides the legal authority and training for States and local enforcement to investigate, detain and arrest illegal aliens on civil and criminal charges and grounds in the course of their regular duties.

Unfortunately, an amendment offered in the Rules Committee to reauthorize this important program was not made in order, jeopardizing the future of this popular program with local and State law enforcement agencies across our Nation and in my district.

Illegal immigration is a serious problem in eastern Oklahoma, and securing a 287(g) designation is a top priority of mine. I am working diligently to see that the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Officials and the Tulsa County Sheriff's Office partner in this program; 287(g) would provide them with the resources they need to deal with the ever-growing criminal alien

population in Tulsa. I am pleased with the progress we have made and recently learned from ICE officials that we are in the final stages of making 287(g) a reality in northeastern Oklahoma.

The 287(g) program is working to stop the catch-and-release practice that allows dangerous criminal illegal aliens to remain free in communities across our Nation. It would be foolish for the House not to reauthorize this critical program.

I urge my colleagues to reject this ill-considered rule.

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

Let me emphasize to all Members that this bill is working its way through the legislative process. It is true that as a fair and responsible chairman, Mr. THOMPSON worked with several other committees of jurisdiction on this measure. As the manager's amendment clarifies, in some cases, the Homeland Security Committee proceeded with its language, and in others, it permitted other committees to lend their expertise to the issue in the coming months. This is the process of governing.

It is also true that the prior majority chose not to engage in this most basic of functions last year. They didn't bring an authorization bill to the floor, and by not engaging in this hard work, the prior majority let known problems go unresolved.

This bill brings overdue reform and accountability to the Department in its earliest Homeland Security authorization bill ever. That is responsible. That is governing.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished leader from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule.

In the manager's amendment adopted by the rule, the majority stripped out a number of commonsense amendments, mostly offered by Republicans, which would enhance homeland security. I think it is a regrettable turn of events which could cost the majority the support of many minority Members.

I guess the good news here is that we know this bill may pass the House, but it is not going anywhere in the Senate, and in this form, it is un-signable by the President.

But the rule also disallowed a critical amendment to help ensure that the Washington area would receive the necessary senior-level attention from the Department of Homeland Security so that Federal, State, and local governments are properly coordinating their homeland security activities.

In 2002, when we established the Department of Homeland Security in a bipartisan manner, it created an Office of National Capital Region Coordination. To demonstrate the importance of this, we put it in the Office of the Secretary.

Unfortunately, the administration decided in their reorganization to put this deep inside of FEMA. My amendment, which was not allowed, was pretty straightforward. It was to restore the office to its original and rightful place in the Office of the Secretary. This amendment would have passed with a large bipartisan majority, but it was not allowed by the other side.

Now, why is this important? The events of 9/11 made it all too important that better coordination of first responders is needed in the D.C. region, with two States and the District of Columbia, 12 local jurisdictions, three branches of the Federal Government, 2,100 nonprofit organizations, thousands of businesses and nonprofit organizations, 4 million Americans. They want to put that responsibility into FEMA. It belongs in the Office of the Secretary. We have been through "tractor man." We have been through disruptions at the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. We have been through the snipers. This needs the highest Federal attention for coordination among all these different organizations in the region. And they wouldn't allow this amendment.

We are going to introduce this as a commonsense stand-alone bill. I hope it will receive the attention of this House. But in disallowing this amendment, now the other side takes ownership of this provision by putting their confidence in FEMA instead of the Office of the Secretary.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I come to this floor reluctantly to oppose this rule. Why? Because it does everything that we ought not to do with respect to the committee process here.

Now, if some people outside this Chamber wonder why the committee process is important or if it is important at all, well, if you look at the 9/11 Commission recommendations, one of the important recommendations they made was to have a single point of responsibility, a single point of oversight in this House for the Homeland Security Department. The very reason we created the Homeland Security Department from about 22 other agencies and Departments was for the purpose of consolidating and giving direction to our response to a new threat to this country. In like manner, here in the House of Representatives, the recommendation by the 9/11 Commission was that we have a primary committee to do that. And that is the Committee on Homeland Security.

We have endeavored to work on a bipartisan basis. When we were in control 2 years ago, we did that. And now when the Democrats are in control, they are doing that. We had vigorous

and open debate. We had a number of amendments adopted on the Republican side so that we pass this bill out of committee unanimously, not a dissenting vote. And we recognized that we were putting aside partisan differences to work for the best interest of this country.

So now we come to the floor, and 50 percent of that bill has been ripped out by the manager's amendment. It just happens to be that 50 percent is virtually all the product of Republican amendments that were adopted in committee on a bipartisan basis. And then they make in order about 22 amendments but not amendments that go to putting back into the bill what we put in there on a bipartisan basis. And virtually, not all, but most of the amendments in order are from Members who are not members of this committee.

So you say, why is this being done? And we understand we are genuflecting to the jurisdictional disputes argued by already existing committees. So what we have done is, rather than following what the 9/11 Commission has said, we have made a worse situation. We not only have the already existing committees that the Homeland Security Department has to report to. They now report to us as well.

Now, is this the efficient way? Is this the way you act when you are dealing with a serious problem? This ought to rise above all partisanship and all kinds of nonsense about jurisdiction of committees. I don't know how we can go home to our constituents and say, oh, yes, we got rid of that stuff that was really good that gave us an advantage in this war on terror because we were concerned about another committee that used to have jurisdiction.

Last year one of the things we heard was just do the right thing and adopt all the 9/11 Commission recommendations. Adopting this rule flies in the face of that. We ought to understand that.

We ought to vote down this rule, bring back the bill as it came out of the committee on a bipartisan basis, and then go forward on a bipartisan basis for the best for the American people.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I that consume.

Let me emphasize to Members the history on this issue. Unlike the prior majority, this majority is committed to passing a Homeland Security authorization into law.

In 2005, 2 years ago, the House passed an authorization after the appropriations bill passed. Last year, 2006, the House did not bother to bring a bill to the floor. That is irresponsible in light of the Department's many problems.

Democrats are committed to governing responsibly, and this is one step along that path.

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

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and the manager's amendment that was made in order under this rule. This manager's amendment will significantly weaken legislation that gained bipartisan support in Committee on Homeland Security and passed 26-0.

As the chairman of the Emergency Preparedness Subcommittee last Congress, we were able to pass into law comprehensive interoperability legislation. This legislation, titled the 21st Century Communications Act, created the Office of Cybersecurity and Communications and elevated the importance of emergency communications within the Department of Homeland Security. In addition, this legislation accelerated the development of national standards for emergency communication equipment.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee has approved an amendment that would remove many key provisions and severely weaken this legislation. This amendment removes language that allows interoperability funds to be used by State and local agencies to develop standard operating procedures, training, and exercises.

□ 1215

It is important for our first responders to have this equipment, but it is also equally important that they have the training to know how to use the equipment. Allowing this amendment on the floor that removes this provision will reduce the first responders' effectiveness due to a lack of training and planning.

We saw what happened during Hurricane Katrina when there was a lack of training, a lack of planning and a lack of communication. It was disastrous. It cost lives.

Next week is National Police Week. At a time when we are supposed to be honoring and supporting our first responders, and especially our law enforcement officers, across this Nation, we are limiting their abilities to protect themselves and to protect this Nation. I know this from firsthand experience. This is a problem that has been in existence for over 35 years, the lack of first responders to communicate. I responded to a call in 1974, not able to get on my radio, having to run across a yard and tackle a kid that had a rifle aimed at three other police officers, because I couldn't get through and talk to the communications center.

Today, eliminating this provision will create that same situation across this Nation. It's unthinkable. It's unconscionable. It should not be happening. This should be a bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify, this bill eliminates the cuts in vital first responders programs, like the 55 percent cuts that the administration asked for in firefighter assistance grants. It preserves the Local Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program that the administration wanted

to close. And on contracting oversight management and personnel policies, it brings overdue reform to a Department in need. This is a good bill, and all Members should support it.

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

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

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am proud to be part of the Homeland Security Committee. It has been a committee that under Chairman KING has functioned in a nonpartisan way and I think under Chairman THOMPSON as well. And so I have deep regret that so many parts of this bill were taken out that were parts that were put in by Republicans. I understand jurisdictional issues, but it seems to me some of these could have been left in.

I am particularly amazed to think that an amendment that I was offering, supported by Interpol, and I would like to submit this letter from Ron Noble, the Secretary General, addressed to me from Interpol. It is one page.

In this letter, he says, "Your initiative would allow DHS and Interpol to work together to identify and apprehend terrorists that use lost, stolen or fraudulent passports to travel internationally in all of Interpol's 186 countries.

"In addition, by facilitating the secondment of DHS officers to Interpol, you are enabling the United States to play a leadership role in shaping Interpol's current and future efforts to enhance travel document security and to deploy its connection technology that allows border officers to make instant passport searches against Interpol's Stolen and Lost Travel Documents database."

There was no reason not to allow this amendment to be offered except for partisan purposes. I happen to be a Republican, and I happen to be targeted by the Democrats, but, other than that, there was no reason not to allow this amendment.

I am strongly against this rule. Unlike my colleagues, I didn't think long about it. I couldn't wait to get here to oppose what is now becoming a very partisan bill. I just can't express strongly enough we are going to endanger Americans by not allowing this debate. There are 14 million documents Interpol has. The United States doesn't have access to hardly any of them because we are not participating. We need to participate.

I would end by just pointing out that Ramzi Yousef had used a stolen passport to enter the U.S. He is a terrorist.

INTERPOL,

Lyon, France, May 7, 2007.

Congressman CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,  
Longworth Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHAYS: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your strong support to Interpol and our missions and goals. Your amendment to H.R. 1684, the

Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, shows both your commitment and profound understanding of the international dimension of modern-day policing.

It is my sincere belief that this amendment, aimed at fostering closer cooperation between Interpol and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), will significantly contribute to international border security. The cooperative agreement the amendment calls for clearly puts both the Department of Homeland Security and Interpol in the best possible position to further enhance their joint efforts against global terrorism.

Your initiative will allow DHS and Interpol to work together to identify and apprehend terrorists that use lost, stolen or fraudulent passports to travel internationally in all of Interpol's 186 member countries.

In addition, by facilitating the secondment of DHS officers to Interpol, you are enabling the United States to play a leadership role in shaping Interpol's current and future efforts to enhance travel document security and to deploy its connection technology that allows border officers to make instant passport searches against Interpol's Stolen and Lost Travel Documents database. Interpol is currently establishing a new office of Border, Port and Maritime Security and, from Interpol's point of view, benefiting from DHS' significant border control and investigative expertise will be a critical factor for its success. Rest assured that I will keep you abreast of our work in this area.

It would be a pleasure for me to receive you at Interpol's General Secretariat in Lyon, France to provide you with an opportunity to receive briefings from our experts and see our operational police tools first hand.

Yours sincerely,

RONALD K. NOBLE,  
*Secretary General.*

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 4½ minutes to a distinguished colleague from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. I thank my friend, Congressman DIAZ-BALART, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

We've all heard the saying that actions speak louder than words; and, once again, the rhetoric from the other side has turned out to be just that, rhetoric. You've heard all the talk about wanting to do everything we can to protect American jobs and keeping our manufacturing base. The majority actually had a chance to put their money where their mouth is by strengthening our national security and our domestic textile manufacturing base.

My amendment was not allowed to come to the floor for debate today. Yes, actions speak louder than words, and the actions from yesterday prove that their talk is cheap because it's not backed up by meaningful action.

Current language in the Department of Homeland Security authorization bill regarding domestic production would require a new domestic requirement for uniforms, protective gear, badges and identification cards. While this provision is a good first step, this approach does not reflect a stronger

proposal contained in the bill that I put together with the textile industry which is called the Berry Amendment Extension Act.

The legislation we put together and the amendment I offered yesterday would ensure that the sensitive uniforms worn by our agents are made in America with American-made components rather than outsourcing to China or Mexico. The problem with the bill in front of us today: The vast majority of the content of these uniforms can be imported from any country in the world, China, Pakistan, Mexico, you name it.

Mr. Speaker, that's not what the Members of this House want. On December 15, 2005, we overwhelmingly supported a measure stating that Border Patrol uniforms should be made in the United States. Has anyone changed their mind? I sure haven't.

These provisions are an extension of the Berry Amendment, which is a well-established domestic Department of Defense purchasing requirement that has been in practice for 70 years. And the amendment would ensure that we are complying with WTO. Make no mistake about it, I don't put legislation together trying to appease the WTO, but if your legislation is blatantly not compliant, which the existing DH bill appears to be, the end result will be lawsuits and countervailing duties. Put that all together, nothing gets done; and American jobs are lost.

You all know I've been a strong advocate for strengthening the Berry Amendment. The Berry Amendment seeks to guarantee the United States has a ready mobilization base of U.S. manufacturers, a critical national security requirement. While the Berry Amendment is 70 years old, Department of Homeland Security is only 5, and this new Department is now home to many functions that are critical to our national security.

I am extremely disappointed that my Democrat counterparts failed and missed a great opportunity to expand the successful requirement to include the Department of Homeland Security. It not only protects American jobs but provides the assurance that Department of Homeland Security officials who work on the front lines of national security are the only people wearing these sensitive uniforms. It is outrageous to think that our Border Patrol or airport security uniforms can be made in factories in China or Mexico where any worker could use these uniforms to impersonate U.S. agents.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment has strong support from the National Council of Textile Organizations, American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition and the American Apparel and Footwear Association. Again, while the base bill has taken a step to add a new requirement for domestic production, I think we could have done and should have done much better.

Let me briefly quote the American Apparel and Footwear Association: The

Hayes amendment “would provide more complete coverage for domestic sources than what is currently intended by H.R. 1684. By requiring that both inputs and manufacture of uniforms originate in the U.S., the Berry Amendment works to support the U.S. supply chain that provides materials for the production of clothing and individual equipment to the military.”

There are many Members, both Democrats and Republicans, who have been very supportive of the Berry Amendment in the past. In fact, I was particularly surprised when a member of the Rules Committee, who has been a co-sponsor of the bill, voted against allowing the amendment to come to the floor today.

Folks, the U.S. textile and apparel industry is vital to the economic security and national security of our Nation. If the majority truly cared about preserving this crucial manufacturing sector, an industry that provides good-paying jobs to American citizens, then they would have supported this amendment in the Rules Committee and allowed it to come to the floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to vote “no” on the previous question so we can allow this amendment to come to the floor for a vote. In my opinion, a vote for this rule as it stands is a vote against the U.S. textile industry, its workforce, and a vote against making our country more secure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

This new majority has once again promised us an open and fair process, but again they have failed to live up to the promises now that they’re out from under the spotlight of their election year. This is extremely disappointing considering the remarkable importance of the legislation before us today, the Homeland Security Authorization Act.

Among some of the provisions that were stripped out of the bill completely, a pilot program for mobile biometric identification of illegal aliens apprehended at sea, denying alien smugglers use of maritime routes and enhanced penalties for alien smuggling, and requiring immigration checks for employees at high-risk critical infrastructures.

What’s so scary about those being in the bill, I would ask? What idea or what one amendment was so scary that inspired this restrictive rule? I urge my colleagues not to be scared, not to hide behind this rule. Vote “no” on this rule so that we can have a complete and fair debate. The American people deserve no less, and they’re watching.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will be asking

for a “no” vote on the previous question so that I can amend this restrictive rule to make in order the amendment offered by Representative HAYES of North Carolina which would strike section 407 of the bill, the section requiring DHS to buy American textiles and apparel, protective gear, badges and ID cards. The amendment would instead require that DHS buy items specified in the amendment only when those items are connected to national security functions within the Department. This amendment also includes language to ensure that these provisions comply with the World Trade Organization rules.

Mr. Speaker, this thoughtful amendment submitted by Mr. HAYES was unfortunately denied yesterday at the Rules Committee. If the previous question is defeated, the Hayes amendment would be made in order and the House would be able to have a full discussion on its merits.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again thank Chairman THOMPSON for his leadership in drafting a well-focused Homeland Security authorization and for working so closely with Ranking Member KING on this bill.

I would note for all Members that Chairman THOMPSON worked with other chairmen and ranking members. The jurisdiction issues were raised by both sides, Republican and Democrat. I would also note that the manager’s amendment which deals with these changes will receive separate debate and a vote. This is an open process.

Unlike the prior majority, we work through these issues. Again, last year when these problems were raised, the prior majority chose not to act. In contrast, we are acting despite these difficulties. We are being responsible.

H.R. 1684 will help improve the policy-making at the Department of Homeland Security, will promote long-term planning and will strengthen management. In particular, it sets qualifications for senior managers, increases coordination between agencies, and boosts funds for the Inspector General. These changes will ensure that the Department of Homeland Security can perform its important function of protecting the American people.

I am pleased that the Democratic leadership has moved swiftly and brought a Homeland Security authorization bill to the floor. This is the first time in 2 years such a bill has come to the floor.

It is also the earliest that a Department of Homeland Security authoriza-

tion bill has come to the floor and the first time it has occurred before appropriators have marked up the Homeland Security appropriations bill. This is truly significant, and I thank the leadership for their commitment to protecting America.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed in today’s rule that barred the House from considering a common-sense amendment that I brought to the committee.

The text of my amendment was substantially from H.R. 1544, the Faster and Smarter Funding for First Responders Act of 2005, which passed the House by an overwhelming, bipartisan majority in the 109th Congress.

One of the 9/11 Commission’s primary recommendations was to ensure that all federal government grants for homeland security be allotted by risk and need. To this day, however, nearly 40 percent of all grants are handed out merely by virtue of their location. The House has time and time again passed legislation to streamline the grant process and reduce the mandatory minimum percentage given to each state.

While the House did pass such language in H.R. 1, the Senate had yet to take up this legislation. Until the President signs into law legislation correcting this oversight, we should not pass up an opportunity to make our nation more secure. But that is what the Democrats are doing today. We must reiterate this critical policy change at each and every opportunity.

The constituents of the fifth district of New Jersey know too well the repercussions of failing to provide for strong homeland security. Many of them lost loved ones on 9/11 and they expect our country to prepare for any such future disaster. As long as grants continue to go to low-priority wasteful projects, our most at-risk citizens will be vulnerable.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 1684. This bill, in its current form would prohibit state and local governments from receiving reimbursement for training expenses associated with participating in the 287(g) program. 287(g) serves as a force multiplier for immigration enforcement across our Nation.

The 287(g) program is a highly effective, voluntary partnership that provides the legal authority and training for state and local law enforcement officers to investigate, detain, and arrest illegal aliens on civil and criminal grounds in the course of their regular duties.

Unfortunately, an amendment offered in the Rules Committee to enhance this important program was not made in order, jeopardizing the ability of state and local law enforcement agencies to join the program.

Illegal immigration is a serious problem in Eastern Oklahoma and securing a 287(g) designation is a top priority of mine. I am working diligently to see ICE officials and the Tulsa County Sheriff’s office partnered in this program. 287(g) would provide them with the resources they need to deal with the ever growing criminal alien population in Tulsa. I am pleased with the progress we have made, and recently learned from ICE officials that we are in the final stages of making 287(g) a reality for Eastern Oklahoma.

The 287(g) program is working to stop the catch and release practice that allows dangerous criminal illegal aliens to remain free in

communities across our Nation. It would be foolish for the House not to allow for reimbursement of 287(g) training related expenses.

I urge my colleagues to reject this ill-considered rule.

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

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

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

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

Strike section 407 and insert the following:

**SEC. 407. BUY-AMERICAN REQUIREMENT IMPOSED ON DEPARTMENT OF HOME LAND SECURITY; EXCEPTIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**SEC. 839. REQUIREMENT THAT CERTAIN ARTICLES PROCURED BY THE DEPARTMENT BE GROWN, REPROCESSED, REUSED OR PRODUCED IN THE UNITED STATES.**

“(a) REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsections (c) and (e), funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department may not be used for the procurement of an article described in subsection (b) if the item is not grown, reprocessed, reused, produced or manufactured in the United States.

“(b) COVERED ARTICLES.—An article referred to in subsection (a) is any of the following, if the article is directly related to the national security interests of the United States:

“(1)(A) Clothing and the materials and components thereof, other than sensors, electronics, or other items added to, and not normally associated with, clothing (and the materials and components thereof).

“(B) Tents, tarpaulins, or covers.

“(C) Cotton and other natural fiber products, woven silk or woven silk blends, spun silk yarn for cartridge cloth, synthetic fabric or coated synthetic fabric (including all textile fibers and yarns that are for use in such fabrics), canvas products, or wool (whether in the form of fiber or yarn or contained in fabrics, materials, or manufactured articles).

“(D) Any item of individual equipment manufactured from or containing such fibers, yarns, fabrics, or materials.

“(2) Protective gear.

“(3) Badges or other insignia indicating the rank, office, or position of personnel.

“(4) Identification cards.

“(c) AVAILABILITY EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the extent that the Secretary determines that satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any such article or item described in subsection (b) grown, reprocessed, reused, produced or manufactured in the United States cannot be procured as and when needed at United States market prices. If such a determination is made with respect to an article, the Secretary shall—

“(1) notify the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate within 7 days after making the determination; and

“(2) include in that notification a certification that procuring and manufacturing the article outside the United States does not pose a risk to the national security of the

United States, as well as a detailed explanation of the steps any facility outside the United States that is manufacturing the article will be required to take to ensure that the materials, patterns, logos, designs, or any other element used in or for the article are not misappropriated.

“(d) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROCUREMENTS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the following:

“(1) Procurements by vessels in foreign waters.

“(2) Emergency procurements.

“(e) EXCEPTION FOR SMALL PURCHASES.—Subsection (a) does not apply to purchases for amounts not greater than the simplified acquisition threshold referred to in section 2304(g) of title 10, United States Code.

“(f) APPLICABILITY TO CONTRACTS AND SUBCONTRACTS FOR PROCUREMENT OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS.—This section is applicable to contracts and subcontracts for the procurement of commercial items notwithstanding section 34 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 430).

“(g) GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE.—In this section, the term ‘United States’ includes the possessions of the United States.

“(h) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED WITHIN 7 DAYS AFTER CONTRACT AWARD IF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS APPLIED.—In the case of any contract for the procurement of an article described in subsection (b), if the Secretary of Homeland Security applies an exception set forth in subsection (c) with respect to that contract, the Secretary shall, not later than 7 days after the award of the contract, post a notification that the exception has been applied on the Internet site maintained by the General Services Administration known as FedBizOps.gov (or any successor site).

“(i) TRAINING DURING FISCAL YEAR 2008.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that each member of the acquisition workforce in the Department who participates personally and substantially in the acquisition of textiles on a regular basis receives training during fiscal year 2008 on the requirements of this section and the regulations implementing this section.

“(2) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN NEW TRAINING PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall ensure that any training program for the acquisition workforce developed or implemented after the date of the enactment of this Act includes comprehensive information on the requirements described in paragraph (1).

“(j) CONSISTENCY WITH INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No provision of this Act shall apply to the extent the Secretary, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that it is in inconsistent with United States obligations under an international agreement.

“(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit a report each year to Congress containing, with respect to the year covered by the report—

“(A) a list of each provision of this section that did not apply during that year pursuant to a determination by the Secretary under paragraph (1); and

“(B) a list of each contract awarded by the Department during that year without regard to a provision in this section because that provision was made inapplicable pursuant to such a determination.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 838 the following new item:

“Sec. 839. Requirement that certain articles procured by the Department be grown, reprocessed, reused or produced in the United States.”

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section take effect 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and apply to any contract entered into on or after that date for the procurement of items to which such amendments apply.

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

**THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 382 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 382, if ordered; on adopting House Resolution 383; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 890.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 199, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—217

Abercrombie	Emanuel	Markey
Ackerman	Eshoo	Marshall
Allen	Etheridge	Matheson
Altmine	Farr	Matsui
Andrews	Filner	McCarthy (NY)
Arcuri	Frank (MA)	McCullom (MN)
Baca	Giffords	McDermott
Baird	Gillibrand	McGovern
Baldwin	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Bean	Gordon	McNerney
Becerra	Green, Al	McNulty
Berkley	Green, Gene	Meehan
Berman	Grijalva	Meek (FL)
Berry	Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Hall (NY)	Michaud
Bishop (NY)	Hare	Miller, George
Blumenauer	Harman	Mitchell
Boren	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Boswell	Herseth Sandlin	Moore (KS)
Boucher	Higgins	Moore (WI)
Boys (KS)	Hill	Moran (VA)
Braley (IA)	Hinchey	Murphy (CT)
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Murphy, Patrick
Capps	Hirono	Murtha
Capuano	Hodes	Nadler
Cardoza	Holden	Napolitano
Carnahan	Holt	Neal (MA)
Carney	Honda	Oberstar
Carson	Hooley	Obey
Castor	Hoyer	Olver
Chandler	Inslee	Ortiz
Clarke	Israel	Pallone
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Pascrall
Cleaver	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Clyburn	(TX)	Payne
Cohen	Jefferson	Perlmuter
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Peterson (MN)
Cooper	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)
Costa	Kagen	Rahall
Costello	Kanjorski	Reyes
Courtney	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Crowley	Kennedy	Ross
Cuellar	Kildee	Rothman
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Royal-Allard
Davis (AL)	Kind	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Klein (FL)	Rush
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Lincoln	Lampson	Salazar
DeFazio	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
DeGette	Lantos	T.
Delahunt	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeLauro	Lee	Sarbanes
Dicks	Levin	Schakowsky
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Doggett	Lipinski	Schwartz
Donnelly	Loebssack	Scott (GA)
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Lynch	Serrano
Ellison	Mahoney (FL)	Sestak
Ellsworth	Maloney (NY)	Shea-Porter

Sherman	Tauscher	Waters
Shuler	Taylor	Watson
Sires	Thompson (CA)	Watt
Skelton	Thompson (MS)	Waxman
Slaughter	Tierney	Weiner
Smith (WA)	Towns	Welch (VT)
Snyder	Udall (CO)	Wexler
Solis	Udall (NM)	Wilson (OH)
Space	Van Hollen	Woolsey
Spratt	Velázquez	Wu
Stark	Viscosky	Wynn
Stupak	Walz (MN)	Yarmuth
Sutton	Wasserman	Schultz
Tanner		

NAYS—199

Aderholt	Fossella	Murphy, Tim
Akin	Foxx	Musgrave
Alexander	Franks (AZ)	Myrick
Bachmann	Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer
Bachus	Gallegly	Nunes
Baker	Garrett (NJ)	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Pearce
Barrow	Gilchrest	Pence
Bartlett (MD)	Gillmor	Peterson (PA)
Barton (TX)	Gingrey	Petri
Biggert	Gohmert	Pickering
Bilbray	Goode	Pitts
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Poe
Blackburn	Graves	Porter
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Bono	Hayes	Radanovich
Boozman	Hobson	Ramstad
Boustany	Hoekstra	Regula
Brady (TX)	Heller	Rehberg
Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Reichert
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Renzi
	Hunter	Reynolds
	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
	Burton (IN)	Rogers (KY)
	McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (MI)
	McCullom (MN)	Rogers (NY)
	McDermott	Rohrabacher
	McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen
	Campbell (CA)	Roskam
	Cannon	Ryan (NC)
	Cantor	Ryan (WI)
	Capito	Sali
	Calvert	Saxton
	Camp (MI)	Schmidt
	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
	Jordan	Sessions
	Keller	Shadegg
	King (IA)	Shays
	King (NY)	Cole (OK)
	Castle	Sullivan
	Kingston	Tancredo
	Chabot	Terry
	Kirk	Thornberry
	Kline (MN)	Tiberti
	Knollenberg	Turner
	Conaway	Mack
	Cramer	Upton
	Crenshaw	Walberg
	Lamborn	Shuster
	Cubin	Simpson
	Culberson	Cardoza
	LaTourette	Smith (NJ)
	Davis (KY)	Smith (TX)
	Davis, David	Smith (VA)
	David, Jo Ann	Stearns
	Linder	Sullivan
	Davis, Tom	LoBiondo
	Deal (GA)	Terry
	Deal (GA)	Thornberry
	Dent	Wamp
	Dent	Weldon (FL)
	Diaz-Balart, L.	Weller
	Diaz-Balart, M.	Wheeler
	Doolittle	Widmer
	Drake	Widmer
	Marchant	Walden (OR)
	Dreier	Walsh (NY)
	McCarthy (CA)	Walsh (NY)
	McCull (TX)	Wamp
	McCotter	Weldon (FL)
	Emerson	Weller
	English (PA)	Wheeler
	Everett	Whitfield
	McHugh	Widmer
	Fallin	Wicker
	McKeon	Wilson (NM)
	Feehey	Wilson (PA)
	Ferguson	Wilson (SC)
	Flake	Wolf
	Miller (MI)	Young (AK)
	Miller (NC)	Young (FL)
	Forbes	Young (FL)
	Miller, Gary	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

□ 1255

Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. CRAMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 310 I was absent due to a meeting with constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 197, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Giffords	Meeks (NY)
Ackerman	Gillibrand	Melancon
Allen	Allen	Gonzalez
Altmine	Altmire	Gordon
Andrews	Andrews	Miller, George
Arcuri	Arcuri	Mitchell
Baca	Baca	Green, Gene
Baird	Baldwin	Mollohan
Baldwin	Barrow	Moran (VA)
Bean	Barry	Murphy (CT)
Becerra	Berman	Murphy, Patrick
Berkley	Berry	Neal (MA)
Berman	Bishop (GA)	Oberstar
Berry	Bishop (NY)	Obey
Bishop (GA)	Bolin	Hinojosa
Bishop (NY)	Bone	Hiroko
Blumenauer	Bones	Olver
Boren	Born	Ortiz
Boswell	Boswell	Pallone
Boucher	Boucher	Pascrall
Boys (KS)	Berry	Royal-Allard
Braley (IA)	Bishop (GA)	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Bishop (NY)	Rush
Capps	Bolin	Sánchez, Linda
Capuano	Bone	T. T.
Cardoza	Bone	Sanchez, Loretta
Carnahan	Bone	Sarbanes
Carney	Bone	Schakowsky
Carson	Bone	Salazar
Castor	Bone	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Bone	Shea-Porter
Clarke	Bone	Sherman
Clay	Bone	Scott (GA)
Cleaver	Bone	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Bone	Serrano
Cohen	Bone	Sestak
Conyers	Bone	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Bone	Sherman
Costa	Bone	Stark
Costello	Bone	Stupak
Courtney	Bone	Tanner
Crowley	Bone	Tauscher
Cuellar	Bone	Taylor
Cummings	Bone	Thompson (CA)
Davis (AL)	Bone	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	Bone	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Bone	
Davis, Lincoln	Bone	
DeFazio	Bone	
DeGette	Bone	
Delahunt	Bone	
DeLauro	Bone	
Dicks	Bone	
Dingell	Bone	
Doggett	Bone	
Donnelly	Bone	
Doyle	Bone	
Edwards	Bone	
Ellison	Bone	
Ellsworth	Bone	

Towns	Wasserman	Welch (VT)
Udall (CO)	Schultz	Wexler
Udall (NM)	Waters	Wilson (OH)
Van Hollen	Watson	Woolsey
Velázquez	Watt	Wu
Visclosky	Waxman	Wynn
Walz (MN)	Weiner	Yarmuth

## NAYS—197

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Myrick
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer
Alexander	Gallogly	Nunes
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Paul
Bachus	Gerlach	Pearce
Baker	Gilchrest	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Peterson (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Petri
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Pickering
Biggert	Goode	Pitts
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Platts
Bilirakis	Granger	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Porter
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Blunt	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Bonner	Hayes	Radanovich
Bono	Heller	Reichert
Boozman	Hensarling	Renzi
Boustany	Herger	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Hobson	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Roskam
Ginny	Hunter	Ryan (WI)
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Issa	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Cannon	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Capito	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Castle	Kirk	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Coble	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Cole (OK)	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	LaHood	Ryan (WI)
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Cubin	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Davis, David	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Tom	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Dent	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart, L.	E.	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Doolittle	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)
Drake	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Ryan (WI)
Ehlers	McCotter	Ryan (WI)
Emerson	McCrary	Ryan (WI)
English (PA)	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Everett	McHugh	Ryan (WI)
Fallin	McKeon	Ryan (WI)
Feeney	Mica	Ryan (WI)
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)
Flake	Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)
Forbes	Miller (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)
Fossella	Murphy, Tim	Ryan (WI)
Fox	Musgrave	Ryan (WI)

## NOT VOTING—13

Boyd (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Larson (CT)	Souder
Brown, Corrine	McMorris	Tiahrt
Engel	Rodgers	Weller
Fattah	Moran (KS)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1304

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. 1873, SMALL BUSINESS FAIRNESS IN CONTRACTING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 383, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote that will be followed by a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 197, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

YEAS—223

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Murtha
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Nadler
Allen	Hall (NY)	Napolitano
Altire	Hare	Neal (MA)
Andrews	Harman	Oberstar
Arcuri	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Baca	Herseth Sandlin	Olver
Baldwin	Higgins	Ortiz
Barrow	Hill	Pallone
Bean	Hinckley	Pascarella
Becerra	Hirono	Pastor
Berkley	Hodes	Payne
Berman	Holden	Perlmuter
Berry	Holt	Pomeroy
Bishop (GA)	Honda	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Hooley	Rahall
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Reyes
Boren	Inslee	Rodriguez
Boswell	Israel	Jackson (IL)
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Jackson-Lee
Boyd (KS)	Jackson-Lee	(TX)
Braley (IA)	Jackson-Lee	Royal-Allard
Butterfield	Jefferson	Ruppersberger
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Ryan (OH)
Cardoza	Kagen	Salazar
Carnahan	Kanjorski	Sánchez, Linda
Carney	Kaptur	T.
Carson	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Caster	Kildee	Sanbaras
Chandler	Kilpatrick	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Lampson	Schwartz
Cohen	Langevin	Sestak
Conyers	Lantos	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Costa	Lee	Shuler
Costello	Levin	Sires
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Cramer	Lipinski	Slaughter
Crowley	Loebbecke	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Snyder
Cummings	Lowey	Solis
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Space
Davis (CA)	Mahoney (FL)	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Davis, Lincoln	Markey	Stupak
Defazio	Marshall	Tierney
DeGette	Matheson	Towns
Delahunt	Matsui	Udall (CO)
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Udall (NM)
Dicks	McCullom (MN)	Taylor
Dingell	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Donnelly	McIntyre	Tierney
Doyle	McNerny	Towns
Edwards	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Ellison	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Ellsworth	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Eshoo	Melancon	Visclosky
Etheridge	Michaud	Walz (MN)
Farr	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Filner	Miller, George	Schultz
Frank (MA)	Mitchell	Waters
Giffords	Mollohan	Watson
Gillibrand	Moore (KS)	Watson
Gonzalez	Moore (WI)	Watt
Gordon	Moran (VA)	Waxman
Green, Al	Murphy (CT)	Weiner
Green, Gene	Murphy, Patrick	Welch (VT)

Wexler  
Wilson (OH)Woolsey  
WuWynn  
Yarmuth

## NAYS—197

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Nunes
Alexander	Gallogly	Paul
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Pearce
Bachus	Gerlach	Pence
Baker	Gilchrest	Pitts
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Petri
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Pickering
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Pitts
Biggert	Goode	Platts
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Poel
Bilirakis	Granger	Porter
Bishop (UT)	Poe	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Porter	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Price (GA)	Putnam
Boehner	Pryce (OH)	Radanovich
Bonner	Putnam	Ramstad
Bono	Radanovich	Regula
Boozman	Ramstad	Rehberg
Boustany	Heller	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hobson	Reynolds
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Roskam
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Rosen (AL)
Ginny	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Rosen (AL)
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Cannon	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Capito	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Castle	Kirk	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Coble	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Cole (OK)	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	LaHood	Ryan (WI)
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Cubin	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Davis, David	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Tom	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Dent	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart, L.	E.	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Doolittle	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)
Drake	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Ryan (WI)
Ehlers	McCotter	Ryan (WI)
Emerson	McCrary	Ryan (WI)
English (PA)	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Everett	McHugh	Ryan (WI)
Fallin	McKeon	Ryan (WI)
Feeney	Mica	Ryan (WI)
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)
Flake	Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)
Forbes	Miller (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)
Fossella	Murphy, Tim	Ryan (WI)
Fox	Musgrave	Ryan (WI)

## NOT VOTING—12

Boyd (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Larson (CT)	Souder
Brown, Corrine	McMorris	Tiahrt
Engel	Rodgers	
Fattah	Moran (KS)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1312

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.

## STUDENT LOAN SUNSHINE ACT

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