

Boozman Hare
 Boren Harman
 Boswell Harper
 Boucher Hastings (FL)
 Boustany Hastings (WA)
 Brady (PA) Heinrich
 Brady (TX) Heller
 Braley (IA) Hensarling
 Bright Herger
 Broun (GA) Herseth Sandlin
 Brown (SC) Higgins
 Buchanan Hill
 Burgess Himes
 Burton (IN) Hinojosa
 Butterfield Hirono
 Buyer Hodes
 Calvert Holt
 Camp Honda
 Campbell Hoyer
 Cantor Hunter
 Capito Inglis
 Capps Inslee
 Cardoza Israel
 Carnahan Issa
 Carney Jackson (IL)
 Carson (IN) Jackson-Lee
 Cassidy (TX)
 Castle Jenkins
 Chaffetz Johnson (GA)
 Chandler Johnson, E. B.
 Childers Jones
 Chu Jordan (OH)
 Clay Kagen
 Cleaver Kanjorski
 Clyburn Kaptur
 Coble Kennedy
 Cohen Kildee
 Conaway Kilpatrick (MI)
 Connolly (VA) Kilroy
 Conyers Kind
 Cooper King (IA)
 Costello Kingston
 Courtney Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Crowley Kissell
 Cuellar Kline (MN)
 Dahlkemper Kosmas
 Davis (CA) Kratovil
 Davis (KY) Kucinich
 Davis (TN) Lamborn
 DeFazio Lance
 DeGette Langevin
 DeLauro Larson (CT)
 Dent Latham
 Diaz-Balart, M. LaTourette
 Dingell Latta
 Doggett Lee (NY)
 Donnelly (IN) Levin
 Doyle Lewis (CA)
 Driehaus Lewis (GA)
 Duncan Linder
 Edwards (MD) LoBiondo
 Edwards (TX) Loeb sack
 Ehlers Lofgren, Zoe
 Ellison Lowey
 Ellsworth Lucas
 Engel Luetkemeyer
 Eshoo Luján
 Etheridge Lummis
 Fallin Lungren, Daniel
 Farr E.
 Fattah Lynch
 Filner Mack
 Flake Maffei
 Fleming Manzullo
 Forbes Marchant
 Fortenberry Markey (CO)
 Foster Markey (MA)
 Foxx Marshall
 Frank (MA) Massa
 Franks (AZ) Matheson
 Frelinghuysen McCarthy (NY)
 Fudge McCaul
 Gallegly McClintock
 Garrett (NJ) McCotter
 Giffords McDermott
 Gingrey (GA) McGovern
 Gohmert McHenry
 Gonzalez McIntyre
 Goodlatte McMahon
 Gordon (TN) McMorris
 Granger Rodgers
 Graves McNerney
 Green, Al Meeks (NY)
 Green, Gene Mica
 Griffith Michaud
 Guthrie Miller (FL)
 Hall (NY) Miller (MI)
 Hall (TX) Miller (NC)
 Halvorson Miller, George

Minnick Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (NY)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murphy, Tim
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Nadler (NY)
 Napolitano
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Nye
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olson
 Olver
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Perriello
 Peters
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe (TX)
 Polis (CO)
 Pomeroy
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Reyes
 Rodriguez
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schauer
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Snyder
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Sutton

Tanner Taylor
 Terry
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)

NOES—1

Berry

NOT VOTING—72

Emerson
 Gerlach
 Grayson
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hinchey
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 King (NY)
 Kirk
 Klein (FL)
 Larsen (WA)
 Lee (CA)
 Lipinski
 Maloney
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCollum
 McKeon
 Meeke (FL)
 Melancon
 Miller, Gary
 Moore (WI)
 Neal (MA)
 Ortiz
 Paul
 Payne
 Putnam
 Richardson
 Roe (TN)
 Rohrabacher
 Roskam
 Shadegg
 Smith (WA)
 Souder
 Space
 Stark
 Teague
 Thompson (CA)
 Towns
 Van Hollen
 Wamp
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waxler
 Wu
 Young (FL)

□ 1911

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
 Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 815 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, today I missed rollcall vote No. 814 on H. Res. 368, congratulating the University of Iowa Hawkeyes wrestling team, and rollcall vote No. 815 on H. Res. 562, congratulating the Syracuse University lacrosse team. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H. Res. 368 as amended, and "aye" on H. Res. 562.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 1929. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

ENERGY-EFFICIENCY RETROFITTING

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

□ 1915

TEENS AGAINST DOMESTIC ABUSE

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 817, supporting the goals and ideals of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Domestic abuse is a terrible and often hidden problem that plagues our Nation and affects millions of families every year. In my congressional district of south Florida, extraordinary groups such as Teens Against Domestic Abuse, or TADA, are working to raise awareness about domestic abuse.

TADA is Florida's first teen antidomestic violence advocacy group. Their commendable efforts, including working with the Women's Fund of Miami-Dade County, will be hosting an event called, "Break the Silence; Break the Cycle" on November 5 in Miami. This event will highlight the spreading frequency of domestic violence throughout the U.S. and how all socioeconomic and ethnic groups are impacted by this crisis.

TADA strives to educate children and teens about the prevalence of domestic abuse in all types of relationships. I encourage everyone in south Florida to show their support on Thursday, November 5.

UNITED AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, as we begin to consider substantial comprehensive immigration proposals, I strongly urge my colleagues to remember what it means to achieve comprehensive reform.

We cannot forget a very important immigrant group in this country, binational GLBT couples. If we are to consider here on this floor a proposal deemed “comprehensive,” we must truly mean everyone. We must mean it when we say that you can be an American no matter the color of your skin, your religion, or who you love.

Congressman HONDA has been courageous enough to tackle the issue of amending the Nation’s immigration laws to allow U.S. citizens and permanent residents to sponsor their same-sex partners for family-based immigration through the United American Families Act.

In this debate, we have talked about keeping families together, but we cannot turn a blind eye to the children who have been taken from a family because they have two moms or two dads and one doesn’t live in this country.

We talk about doing what is right, what is fair, and what is just, but we neglect to imagine the pain and suffering these families are going through because we as a government think it’s our right to tell the people who they can love.

FIVE REASONS THE PRESIDENT’S APPROVAL HAS PLUMMETED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, the President’s approval by the American people has dropped faster than any other President in over 50 years, according to Gallup. Let me offer five reasons why:

One, the President said he would cut the deficit in half; instead, it has tripled.

Two, the White House claimed the \$787 billion stimulus bill would keep unemployment below 8.5 percent; instead, it has jumped to 9.8 percent.

Three, Democratic leaders told us the energy bill would cost families only \$153 a year; instead, the Treasury Department admitted it could cost \$1,700 a year.

Four, the President said the health care bill would be negotiated in open meetings; instead, the decisions are being made behind closed doors.

Five, the President promised that if you like your health care insurance, you can keep it; instead, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office found that, in fact, you can lose it.

Madam Speaker, it is no wonder that a majority of the American people now disagree with the President’s policies, according to a recent CNN poll.

SAUDI ARABIA: MINORITY’S NEW ALLY

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the minority party has a new ally in its effort to obstruct clean energy legislation—the Saudi Arabian Government.

Here in the House I was proud to join my colleagues in passing legislation that would invest in clean energy technology, create new green jobs, and cut global warming pollution. Those same countries on whose foreign oil we are currently dependent are not supportive of legislation that would do these things.

As The New York Times reported on October 14—an article I will enter into the RECORD—Saudi Arabia will go to the international climate negotiations in Copenhagen with the goal of preventing ratification of an effective international treaty to reduce greenhouse gas pollution precisely because such a treaty would reduce American reliance on its oil.

The Senate is considering a bill analogous to what we already passed here in the House to cut global warming pollution and reduce our dependence on foreign oil. I hope Saudi Arabia’s opposition to American energy independence will remind all of us how important it is for the Senate to act, and act now.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 14, 2009]
 “STRIVING FOR NO” IN CLIMATE TALKS
 (By Andrew C. Revkin)

UNFCCC Amid the throngs at climate talks, as shown in Bali here in 2007, officials from individual countries can make a big difference. Saudi Arabia has been pinpointed as an influential player.

In doing my reporting for the story in The New York Times today on Saudi Arabia’s latest maneuvers in climate treaty talks (they are reviving longstanding demands for compensation for lost oil revenue), I found an interesting paper on the oil kingdom’s involvement in climate talks by Joanna Depledge, a research fellow at Cambridge University focusing on climate negotiations.

The paper, “Striving for No: Saudi Arabia in the Climate Change Regime,” was published last November in the journal *Global Environmental Politics*. It is the most comprehensive analysis I’ve seen of the role that Saudi Arabia and other oil-rich states—getting involved in a process primarily to obstruct it. She concludes by noting hints that the oil powers appear to be shifting these days to a more constructive role.

But many observers and participants in the interim climate talks that concluded in Bangkok last week saw scant signs of a cooperative approach. And the e-mail and statements from Saudi officials that Jad Mouawad and I cited in our article appear to display a willingness by Saudi Arabia to impede a deal in Copenhagen if it does not include concrete commitments of aid and investment to offset anticipated drop in oil flows as countries try to cut emissions.

In an e-mail message to me, Dr. Depledge warned that Saudi Arabia and its lead official on climate, Mohammad al-Sabban, should not be underestimated as they pushed for financial commitments. “I am absolutely sure that getting something on this will be a deal-breaker/maker for them,” she wrote. “They are quite blunt about it. It is the strategy they have followed since 1991.”

Dr. Depledge said she was hoping “that getting something on investment” in carbon capture and storage would “provide a win-win way of getting them on board.”

“Al-Sabban is the most skillful and experienced negotiator in the process,” she continued. “Others ignore him at their peril.”

Access to the paper requires a subscription, so I will summarize its main points below. Here’s part of the abstract:

A key starting point for the conduct of global negotiations under the U.N. system is that delegations are actively seeking an agreement that will meaningfully address the problem at hand. Sometimes, however, negotiations must contend with cases of obstructionism, that is, negotiators who are at the table with the aim of preventing an agreement. Given that they face no imperative of striking a deal, governments for whom “no” is the preferred outcome can have a disproportionately high impact on the negotiations, not only by formally blocking agreements, but on a day-to-day basis by slowing down progress or souring the atmosphere. This article examines Saudi Arabia’s involvement in the climate change regime, and argues that the delegation has long played the role of obstructionist.

Dr. Depledge notes that Saudi Arabia and many other oil-exporting states only joined the Kyoto Protocol once it became clear it was going to take effect. “Saudi Arabia acceded in time to ensure that it would become a party—and therefore able to fully influence proceedings,” she wrote.

She described a significant contrast between the stances of Saudi Arabia and another developing country exporting fossil fuels—in this case South Africa and its coal:

Although the South African economy is more diversified than that of Saudi Arabia, it is still highly dependent on the coal sector. South Africa is the world’s second-largest coal exporter, with developed countries accounting for 80 percent of its coal exports. South Africa is much poorer than Saudi Arabia, and coal is more vulnerable to climate policy than oil, given its higher carbon content and the greater availability of alternatives. South Africa, however, has adopted a more balanced view of the risks posed by climate change and mitigation measures, translating into a far more constructive role in the negotiations. Saudi Arabia has simply sought to prevent or slow down progress, either on the general thrust of the negotiations or on specific agenda items.

Dr. Depledge described signs of a shift in the oil kingdom’s stance, including its endorsement of science pointing to big impacts from a building human influence on climate and commitment of money to pursue technologies for capturing carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels and other new energy options.

But her conclusion was still cautionary:

The question is whether, and if so how, these developments will eventually feed through to changes in the Saudi delegation’s approach to the negotiations themselves, especially leading up to the landmark Copenhagen meeting in December 2009. For now (up to the June 2008 sessions), any signs of a softening in the Saudi negotiating position remained well hidden.