

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2200, TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 474 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 474

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. 2200) to authorize the Transportation Security Administration's programs relating to the provision of transportation security, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on 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 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 reconsider with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5

legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 474.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume. House Resolution 474 provides for consideration of H.R. 2200, the Transportation Security Administration Authorization Act of 2009. This legislation is a much-needed fix to an agency tasked with maintaining security in some of our most important facilities. The urgency is clear, especially since many programs under TSA have not been altered or revised since their original authorization in the Aviation and Transportation Security Act passed immediately after the attacks on September 11, 2001.

Since that time, we have seen threats against our transportation systems change dramatically. We've seen attacks against rail and mass transit systems in London, Madrid and Mumbai. As a result, this legislation broadens the focus of TSA to address more than just aviation security, which, for years, received an overwhelming majority of funding and manpower.

So this bill triples the funding for surface transportation systems. I'm pleased to say this increased attention to surface transportation is done in consultation with consumer groups to ensure security provided at subway stations and other facilities does not turn the daily commute into a daily mess.

In addition, we create a much-needed position of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Surface Transportation to give a voice to that component of TSA.

Another significant advance in this bill is its risk assessment allocation method. According to the FAA, there are 561 certified airports in the United States, including commercial and general aviation. Moreover, there is an untold number of bus terminals, subway stations, and rail facilities in the United States. The security of the American people demands TSA's limited resources be directed toward the modes and facilities which face the greatest risk.

This bill directs the TSA administrator to adopt a policy whereby funding is allocated based upon risk, not merely based on population or some other criteria.

Regarding aviation security, the bill provides for a strengthened perimeter security program at our Nation's airports. It also provides a pilot program for biometric identification access systems at seven airports for airport employees. And in many cases, security experts have found canines can provide unparalleled detection of narcotics and explosive materials. So this bill provides for 250 canine detection teams, and an amendment by Representative DOC HASTINGS of Washington will provide for even more.

There are plenty of other positive steps this legislation makes. But what I believe is most important about this bill is the way it has made its way through the House. The bill has been developed over several months with a great amount of input from majority and minority Members, labor and business and independent analysis. The bill passed out of the Homeland Security Committee without any dissenting votes, and as it comes to the floor, 14 substantive amendments will be debated. Of those 14, eight are Republican amendments and six, obviously, are from the Democratic side.

I had the privilege to serve on Homeland Security, Mr. Speaker, and it is with pride that I say I found that committee to be among the most bipartisan committees in the House of Representatives. The efforts by Chairman THOMPSON and Ranking Member KING to work for the protection of the United States work well within the committee and allow for bipartisan effort from both sides.

The rule will provide for ample debate on this important bill and allow Members to vote on many proposals to improve it. This bill is a great example of bipartisan cooperation to address a problem our Nation wishes us to address. The security of our Nation's passengers require sensible solutions, and this bill provides them just that.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for the time. And I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to remember and ask the House to recall that today is June 4. Twenty years ago a massacre occurred in Beijing. Thousands of students and other pro-democracy activists were murdered. Subsequently, they were rounded up, those who had not been murdered, who had been in the square, and thrown in dungeons and tortured. And so it's been 20 years, but we cannot forget.

The regime is still in power there. They haven't had much reason to regret their murders and their systematic oppression of the people. But over you, in something that distinguishes this Congress, we read the words "In God We Trust." And I do. I trust that justice will be done, and that those who committed the murders at Tiananmen Square in June of 1989 will be brought to justice. We can never forget, Mr. Speaker.

With regard to the rule being brought forth today, bringing forth important legislation to the floor today, in order to protect our transportation systems after the cowardly attacks of September 11, 2001, Congress passed and President Bush signed into law on November 19, 2001, the Aviation and Transportation Security Act. That legislation created the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, improving

aviation security and restoring public confidence in air travel.

The underlying legislation that's being brought forth today for consideration by the Congress, by this rule, authorizes \$7.6 billion in appropriations for the TSA during the fiscal year 2010, and provides a 6 percent across-the-board increase for fiscal year 2011.

□ 1045

In their report to Congress, the 9/11 Commission criticized the existing process for allocation of Federal homeland security grants. The report recommended that, "Homeland security assistance should be based strictly on an assessment of risks and vulnerabilities," and that the distribution of the grants "should not remain a program for general revenue sharing." I have long worked to make certain that homeland security assistance follows the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission and that funds are distributed through risk-based assessments. As such, I am pleased that this legislation requires TSA to update Congress on its implementation of a risk-based system for allocating security resources.

The underlying legislation would establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee to assist and make recommendations to the Secretary with issues pertaining to aviation security. It also establishes an Air Cargo Working Group to provide recommendations for the implementation of the cargo screening initiatives proposed by the TSA to meet the 100 percent air cargo screening mandates set forth in the "Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act."

I am pleased there is a provision that provides for the reimbursement of airports that took the initiative and used their own funding to install explosive detection systems after the September 11 terrorist attacks. Those airports installed the systems after receiving assurances from the Federal Government that they would be reimbursed for these expensive yet very important protection systems. Unfortunately, after all these years, we're still waiting for the Federal Government to provide the promised reimbursement. I congratulate our colleague, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for having this important provision included in the legislation.

While I plan to support the underlying legislation, Mr. Speaker, I must express concerns that the legislation was really rushed to the floor by the majority. On such an important issue as the safety of our transportation systems, one would think the majority would want the input of the very agency affected by the legislation. And yet it decided it was more important to move forward than to wait until the administration, the new administration, had selected a TSA administrator who could provide Congress the necessary input and new ideas on how Congress can improve the agency. So the majority, it can be said, used excessive haste to rush the bill to the floor.

On Thursday, May 14, the majority announced that the House would consider the Transportation Security Administration reauthorization bill the week of May 18. However, at the time of the announcement, the legislative language of the bill was nowhere to be found.

The majority kept the text, as you know upon which amendments are based or can be based, hidden under lock and key until late on Monday, May 18. And just as they released the text, they set a hard and fast deadline of 5 p.m. on Wednesday, May 20, for Members to submit their amendments. What this did was give Members, in effect, one business day to read the legislation that reauthorizes the TSA and draft and submit amendments. The majority justified their short amendment deadline by saying that the Rules Committee was going to meet the next day, Thursday, to report a rule for amendments, with the idea that the bill would be on the floor on Friday, May 22.

But the House decided to leave for the Memorial Day district work period on Thursday evening, without considering the TSA bill, and rather than allowing Members more time to review the bill, the majority pushed ahead, eliminating the opportunity for Members to further review the legislation and propose amendments to improve it.

I bring this up, Mr. Speaker, because it is not an anomaly on the majority's part, but it's business as usual. Since the majority took power in Congress in January 2007, Members have been given an average of one business day or less to submit amendments than we did when we were in the majority.

And that's important because it's important for people here representing their constituents to have time to read legislation before having to introduce amendments to try to improve the legislation.

I am pleased that the majority agreed to allow an amendment that I introduced in the Rules Committee for consideration. However, there were other amendments from Members on both sides of the aisle that were blocked.

For example, the majority blocked an amendment by Representative SOUDER that would require the TSA to place all of the detainees held at the Guantanamo Bay detention facility on the no-fly list, an amendment that I'm sure would have overwhelming support on the floor.

So I would simply urge the majority to allow an open process, as it promised in its campaign, and not just on noncontroversial legislation such as this one. This is legislation, in terms of the merits of the legislation, it was brought forth in a bipartisan manner within the committee. The chairman, Mr. THOMPSON, is known to work in a very respectful and bipartisan manner with all of the members of his committee, and I think all of us are grateful for that and commend him for it.

So I would urge, though, that not only on noncontroversial legislation but also on upcoming, for example, health care and climate change legislation, that openness be allowed in the House. It's important. It's, I think, required by the spirit of the democratic process. So both of these upcoming pieces of legislation, energy, health care, they will obviously have far-reaching consequences for our constituents and for the economy, and so I would hope that on such important issues the majority does not block the opportunity for Members of the House to bring forth their amendments seeking to improve the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Florida. I think they would have more weight on maybe another bill than this one, where clearly there has been bipartisan effort from the very beginning. The bill has been in the works for a long time, and it passed out of the committee without objection.

So with that, I would yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON of Mississippi.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule for the Transportation Security Administration Authorization Act, H.R. 2200. I would also like to thank my colleague, Mr. PERLMUTTER from Colorado, who until this session was a member of that committee and is eminently qualified to talk about homeland security issues.

As I stated, this rule reflects a bipartisan rule process in which more than half of the proposed amendments were made in order. And more than half of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, that we are considering today are sponsored by my Republican colleagues.

H.R. 2200 is the first authorization bill for all of the Transportation Security Administration since TSA was established in 2001. It authorizes over \$15.6 billion in appropriations to the Transportation Security Administration for fiscal year 2010 and 2011.

The product of months of bipartisan negotiations, H.R. 2200 was drafted with significant contributions from both Democratic and Republican members of the committee, industry stakeholders, labor representatives, the Government Accountability Office, and the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General's office.

With the change in administration, TSA is at a crossroads. It has to decide how to allocate its resources going forward and who it wants to be.

For the first 8 years, TSA acted like the Aviation Security Administration more than a Transportation Security Administration. This bill takes important steps to bring greater resources and support for the much-neglected surface transportation security mission.

On the aviation side, this bill greatly improves aviation security, and not

only commercial aviation but also general aviation. Specifically, the bill establishes an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, an Air Cargo Working Group, and a General Aviation Security Working Group to ensure robust and meaningful stakeholder input.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in the area of general aviation, the bill authorizes \$10 million for a new grant program to enhance perimeter security, airfield security, and terminal security at general aviation facilities. And I fully support and believe this provision will be strengthened even more with the passage of an amendment that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is expected to offer. It will require the issuance of these grants to be competitive and risk-based. The allocation of scarce Federal funds, specifically those from TSA, should be based on risk. Section 102 of the bill actually requires TSA to report to Congress on the extent to which it is allocating transportation security resources on the basis of risk.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, also is forward-looking and makes great strides, most notably with respect to biometrics. During the recess, I had the opportunity to observe how other countries are using biometric technology to increase security. I strongly believe that greater deployment of biometric equipment can help to address some of our most vexing security challenges. This is why I am pleased to include a provision authorizing the development of a biometric system for law enforcement officers who fly armed.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, also includes provisions on the Registered Traveler and Transportation Worker Identification Credential programs, TSA's two main biometric programs.

Another amendment that the rule makes in order is sponsored by my good friend from North Carolina, Mr. BUTTERFIELD. The amendment would enhance the underlying bill by adding facial and iris recognition to TSA's biometric toolbox.

On the surface transportation side, this bill enhances surface transportation security by authorizing a tripling of funding over fiscal year 2009. These new resources would help support a newly created Surface Transportation Security Inspection Office. This office would be responsible for training and managing inspectors that work in the field and assist surface transportation operators with security inspections.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes 300 more surface transportation security inspectors over the next 2 years and Visible Intermodal Prevention and Response Teams, called VIPER teams, to do security operations in mass transit and other surface systems.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the gentleman 2 more minutes.

□ 1100

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Thank you, Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2200 also authorizes the creation of a Transit Security Advisory Committee, or TSAC, a Passenger Carrier Security Working Group, and a Freight Rail Security Working Group to provide robust stakeholder input to TSA on security policies that impact this sector. Given TSA's limited experience in this sector, I would expect it to be relying heavily on these groups.

Another major provision that I was particularly pleased to include would streamline the security licensing for truckers. Ms. JACKSON-LEE, lead sponsor of this bill, and I have been working with our committee colleague, Mr. LUNGREN, for years on this issue, and finally we have a vehicle to move key provisions in the SAFE Trucker Act. These provisions address redundant background security checks which we have learned are draining of financial resources on transportation workers.

I'm committed to marking up H.R. 1881, the Transportation Security Workforce Enhancement Act of 2009, later this summer, which will provide collective bargaining rights for the TSA workforce. To me, the unfinished business of the 9/11 Act was the granting of these rights to the men and women who are the backbone of TSA. I'm hopeful that these changes in the White House and at the front office at DHS will ensure that we are successful this time around.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to a distinguished colleague who works ceaselessly for the security of the American people. Unfortunately, a very important amendment that he came to the Rules Committee on to be made in order, was denied on a party line vote by the majority, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman and my friend from Florida for yielding time. I speak in opposition to the rule. I want to thank Chairman THOMPSON, Subcommittee Chair SHEILA JACKSON-LEE for their bipartisan effort. In fact, this is a bipartisan bill and one that there's really no fundamental reason to vote against.

In fact, some of the amendments we're voting on today, such as people being able to retrieve their cell phones, are very nice. The one on people with hip replacements is very important to me. I have three of the four biggest orthopedic companies in the United States—in fact, in the world—in my district. And Chairman OBERSTAR and others who go through the machinery with hip replacements have concern on how we do that.

But, you know, it doesn't matter very much if you can find your cell phone or get through security easier if you die. And one of the problems here is I had offered an amendment before

the Rules Committee that would have had added an important layer of security for the U.S. commercial aviation to the TSA Authorization Act. Unfortunately, on a party line vote my amendment was not made in order.

My amendment was very simple. In fact, I was shocked. I thought the debate in committee was going to be whether we were going to ask for just a voice vote or a recorded vote to make sure everybody was recorded. Instead, it was challenged. So I brought it to the committee.

It's very simple. It requires TSA to place any detainees held at Guantanamo Bay on the No Fly List. Now I think they ought to stay at Guantanamo, but it looks like I have lost that debate.

They may be coming in the United States. We have released some around the world. Many of them have already committed terrorist acts since then or reaffiliated.

But whether you agree with it or not, it seems so simple and fundamental that, if they're released in America, they ought to go on a No Fly List. For crying out loud, we have all kinds of people on the No Fly List. Why would we not automatically place somebody who is released in the United States on the No Fly List?

It is essential that we guarantee the security of the American people. The TSA Authorization bill is one of the first opportunities we have to take meaningful steps to ensure that any Gitmo detainee released in the United States is a threat to the American public and doesn't get on an airplane.

My amendment closes a potential terrorist loophole. Actually, it's not a loophole. It's a fly hole. It is so huge that it puts all of us at risk.

I offered this amendment during committee markup. Unfortunately, it was gutted by a second degree amendment. It wasn't compromised, it wasn't changed. Basically, it went right back to the current policy we have. It was totally gutted.

The Gitmo prisoners released in the United States may or may not be added to the No Fly List under this bill. It's an interesting thing. There's an option that they could be added to the No Fly List, but there's no guarantee under this bill. It was not a compromise amendment. It was a gutting amendment.

So the committee never had a choice of whether to vote. They voted unanimously on the majority side to not allow my amendment to be voted on and gutted it, saying it would be up in the air.

The transfer or release of any of these detainees is a matter of homeland security. We need to have a serious debate about whether it's appropriate to bring them on U.S. soil, where they will be kept, what will happen if they're released in the United States. But even the President's own administration has noted that any Gitmo detainees released in the United

States would need additional security and monitoring.

In May, Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano stated before the Committee on Homeland Security that DHS would take efforts “to ensure that Americans are confident in their safety” and recognized that the Department had a role “to provide information on what protections are needed in the homeland should Gitmo detainees be released.”

That same day, FBI Director Robert Mueller testified before Congress that bringing Gitmo detainees into the U.S., even to maximum security prisons, poses significant security risks, including radicalization of other inmates.

All I’m asking is they be placed on a No Fly List. Why wouldn’t we? Maybe my amendment should have said at least they get denied an aisle seat. I mean, I don’t understand this at all.

Despite earlier confirmation by Defense Secretary Gates that the Chinese Uyghurs would be released in the U.S. as soon as the final details are complete, the Solicitor General filed a brief with the Supreme Court on Friday arguing that these individuals should not be brought into the United States since they are associated with a terrorist group. They were associated with the East Turkistan Islamic Movement and they were funded and trained by al Qaeda in Afghanistan, yet they were going to release these 11 in northern Virginia so they could get on the airplanes going out of Reagan Airport. What is wrong with this? We need a guarantee that that’s not going to happen.

Despite the concerns of the public and the uncertainty within his own administration, the President is forging ahead with a plan to bring some of these detainees to the United States. Even if they are transferred from Gitmo to a U.S. prison, they could fall under constitutional protections allowing for their release. And this is a very real possibility with existing precedent. Then it will be even harder to put them on a No Fly List.

Based on a Supreme Court ruling, DHS is forced to release illegal aliens, including many dangerous ones, after 180 days.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. How can we be assured that Gitmo detainees will be treated differently? The simplest way to do this is to say you will automatically be placed on a No Fly List. No debate. You’re automatically on there if you are a detainee.

The detainees held at Gitmo are not low-risk, innocent people. They are they worst of the worst. Most of the Gitmo detainees are violent radicals, hardened on the battlefield and willing to die or kill for their cause.

According to DOD, 74 of the 530 transferred from Gitmo are confirmed or suspected to have returned to the bat-

tlefield since we have released them. Some have carried out attacks. This includes Abdallah Saleh al-Ajimi. Ajimi was arrested along the Pakistan-Afghan border in December 2001, fighting alongside al Qaeda. He was transferred from Gitmo to Kuwait in November 2005. In 2008, he joined several others in a suicide bombing in Iraq, killing more than a dozen people.

This is somebody who was released from Gitmo, one of the early releasees. The ones we have now, we would deem not safe enough to release. This is somebody who we released.

According to the Department of Defense, “He was apparently living a productive life in Kuwait. It was unknown what motivated him to conduct a suicide attack.”

In this second poster, this is Said Ali al-Shihri. Shihri was captured in Pakistan in December 2001. He was transferred from Gitmo to Saudi Arabia in November 2007. He fled to Yemen, declaring himself the deputy director of al Qaeda in Yemen, and is a prime suspect in the December 2008 bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Yemen.

This is one we released. This is not one of the 530 who we’re still holding because they were too dangerous to release.

The security concerns and lack of a clear plan from this administration demonstrate an absolutely clear need for proactive restrictions on detainee freedom to travel within the U.S. should they be transferred here. Congress must play an active role in ensuring that any detainees released in U.S. communities do not pose a threat.

A Gallup Poll released this week found that by a ratio of 3:1, respondents oppose moving detainees to the U.S. prisons. I don’t think we need a poll to find out whether they want them next to them on an airplane. In Indiana, we have an expression: You can count them on one hand and have enough fingers left to bowl.

Other than people in Congress, I can’t imagine anybody who wants these people who are released on planes next to them. They make a mockery of “Fly the Friendly Skies.” One slogan is “Fly with Friends.” Another slogan is “Lower Fares, Fewer Restrictions.”

I mean, think of the airline slogans with this. My favorite is Delta says, “Delta Gets You There.” They’re going to need to add, “Maybe.”

If we don’t have this protection, we are vulnerable. This is a matter of national security. As important as this bill is, as important as these amendments are, our number one responsibility is guaranteed safety.

I do not understand. I simply do not understand why my friends on the majority side don’t even want to have a vote to say, not keep them in prison, not keep them in Guantanamo. This is about a vote should they automatically be placed on the No Fly List.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time on each side remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 18½ minutes

remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you. I’d say to my friend from Indiana, I appreciate his concerns, and virtually everything that he is concerned about is in the bill. And I think it’s important that I read from section 405, found on page 87, where it says, “The Assistant Secretary, in coordination with the Terrorist Screening Center, shall include on the No Fly List any individual who was a detainee housed at the Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, on or after January 1, 2009, after a final disposition has been issued by the President.

“For purposes of this clause, the term ‘detainee’ means an individual in the custody or under the physical control of the United States as a result of armed conflict.”

So virtually everything he talked about is in this bill already, and that’s why the bill came out of Homeland Security without opposition.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the manager of the bill, and I also thank him for his knowledge as a very able member formerly of the Homeland Security Committee and Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for his continued interest.

I also would like to rise to support the rule and, of course, the underlying bill and to acknowledge the chairman of the full committee, Mr. THOMPSON, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. KING, and my ranking member, Mr. DENT. This is truly a bipartisan effort.

The act is a product of months of negotiation, give-and-take, including Republican stakeholders, labor organizations, and industry groups, the Government Accountability Office, and the Department of Homeland Security’s Inspector General’s office.

It provides a new look and a new face to surface transportation security enhancements and particularly addresses the concerns of 9/11 from the point of view of having a comprehensive security program for the United States of America.

I am glad that it increases by three times the FY 2009 funding for surface transportation security. It authorizes an additional 200 surface transportation security inspectors for FY 2010, and an additional 100 inspectors for FY 2011.

It establishes the Surface Transportation Security Inspection Office within TSA to train and manage inspectors to conduct and assist for security activities in surface transportation systems. And I’m glad that it creates a Transit Security Advisory Committee to facilitate stakeholder input to TSA on surface transportation policy.

Every morning, millions of Americans rise and go to work on surface

transportation facilities, and yet we have not paid the attention necessary to ensure that when we talk about a comprehensive security for this Nation, we truly mean comprehensive.

I am glad for the fact that we now have our eye on surface transportation. The men and women who use commuter rail, the men and women who use subways and undergrounds and elevated rail systems like in our older cities can at least experience the idea that we are concerned.

I traveled to Mumbai, India, to see the ravaging, if you will, of the terrorist acts that occurred around Thanksgiving of 2008. This is a bill overdue.

I'm delighted, of course, that we have moved on some issues dealing with airport security and screening enhancements. I'm delighted that we have directed TSA to develop a strategic, risk-based plan to enhance security of airport perimeter access controls. I am always so glad that we're paying attention to general aviation, and my subcommittee will hold a hearing on that as we move forward to extend the security of general aviation.

But also in this bill, in particular, we deal with security of the perimeter of airports. We provide flight training, self-defense training for our cabin officers, if you will, our flight attendants. It's long overdue. It's an issue that I have worked on for a number of years, and it is in this bill, where our flight attendants are being trained. And we have a wonderful compromise and working relationship with our airlines and the flight attendants.

Also, we have found that we have been slowed in technology. There are a multitude of devices that have been created to secure America. But the science and technology department or area of the Department of Homeland Security has been slow in producing, if you will, the approval for these technologies.

In this bill we now have a process, a roadmap, if you will, for our inventiveness so that these particular products, many of them coming from small and minority and women-owned businesses, can follow a process, get approved, and provide for the security of America.

We have enhanced the use of canine detection resources. And I, in fact, support the Hastings amendment that is in place to provide the added utilization of canine detection teams, the Hastings-Rogers-Jackson-Lee amendment.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield another 30 seconds.

□ 1115

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. We are also very supportive of the Hastings from Florida amendment that, within 6 months of enactment, requires TSA to submit a report to Congress on complaints and claims received by TSA for loss of property in baggage screening areas.

We have to be respectful of the idea of security but also of the rights of our particular citizens. We look forward, as we move forward with this bill, to make sure that it covers a variety of areas. Those areas, again, address the question of a Federal flight deck officer program, requiring additional training, and it directs TSA to develop a security training program for all air cargo.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have addressed this question of both international and domestic air cargo by suggesting that we will work with the administration to make sure that we have within a 2-year period 100 percent screening for all of our baggage no matter where it comes from.

I ask my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield again 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), who is extremely concerned about this issue, and rightfully so.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with so many important issues in this bill, but there are none as important as the issue of whether the actual people getting on board with you are terrorists, which is the fundamental thing we should be concerned about.

My amendment said: the Assistant Secretary, in coordination with the Terrorist Screening Center, shall include on the No Fly List any individual who was a detainee housed at the Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, on or after January 1, 2009. For purposes of this clause, the term "detainee" means an individual in the custody or under the physical control of the United States as a result of armed conflict.

That is all in the bill. So what happened in committee? I sat on committee. It was not unanimous. I abstained. I supported the bill, but I could not support a bill with this kind of terrorist fly-through in it.

The words that were added were "after a final disposition has been issued by the President."

These people are all lawyered up. They are fighting every process to hold them. Many of them, probably, will win, partly because we don't want to go into open court, having to release the information of how we got the information of why they're there, because—guess what? People are getting beheaded. They're exposing our entire lines of tracking information, so some will get out on that basis. Some will get out on the basis that their countries won't take them back.

It also says here: "the final disposition." Well, if they're released in the United States, lawyered up and on trial, I don't want people here who are involved in blowing us up and who have been fighting and killing our soldiers. These people who are still there are the ones we haven't already released. I earlier gave examples of people who were

released, those who have gone back in, meaning, already, 20 or 30 percent of them have been re-involved.

Now, a final disposition can take anywhere from 2 years to a decade to forever. Then there is a final disposition by the President. Well, what if they're just plain released?

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

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

Mr. SOUDER. Do you think you're really going to be able to hold them if they've been released? The courts may very well rule we can't even hold them in the United States.

This amendment and anybody who goes to the legislative intent will hear the debate. The debate was not about whether or not they were all going to be placed on the No Fly List. The debate was about whether I was prejudging the people who were in Gitmo. Legislative intent will show that this amendment was meant to keep some people from being added to the No Fly List.

Any legislative intent will show that, in committee, the intent here was to say: SOUDER was trying to prejudge the people in Gitmo in that they shouldn't be on a No Fly List and that some of those people should be on a No Fly List. It's indisputable. It's in the RECORD.

So, unless we change the bill, this is a gutting amendment that does not put people on the No Fly List. It is current law which says that the President has the opportunity to put them on a No Fly List.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I will yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The gentleman is, first of all, correct in the severity of the question, but I do want the gentleman to know that it's speculation to suggest that they might be released.

The language says they will be on a No Fly List with the final disposition of the President. More importantly, those individuals will not be holding visas, and they will not be holding passports. We have enhanced our security internationally. It is without probability of any kind that they will be coming into the United States, and those who are under lawyering, as you say, will be under lawyering, handcuffed and moved around the country. We will have this ability with your language, which I congratulate the gentleman on, as the final disposition of the FBI, of the CIA and of the military intelligence. Give us the list, and they will be on a No Fly List.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentlewoman. If there is any logic in the world, not a single person here is not going to be on the No Fly List, but we have no assurances. We can't predict what the courts are going to do. We can't predict that.

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

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

Mr. SOUDER. We can't predict what any President or any Attorney General is going to do at any given moment. Even if this goes 8 to 10 years and even if the current President serves two terms, we can't predict it. The fact is that my amendment predicted it.

It says, if you are released in the United States, you are automatically on a No Fly List. There was at least enough risk.

Poor Congressman JOHN LEWIS keeps getting on these lists, and we keep trying to get him off. You can see what a mess sometimes our lists are. It ought to be, if you're in Guantanamo—this is simple. We have their names. We have their fingerprints. We know who they are. We know that they are potential risks. Why would you resist? Just put them on a No Fly List. Why take the gamble here?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Would you yield for just a moment, Mr. SOUDER?

Mr. SOUDER. I would yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. We are in agreement that these individuals are outrageous for the very reasons that you are saying. They will not be released willy-nilly into the United States. They will not be dispatched out by any court. They are going to be under military tribunals. The system is being worked out. As you well know, no one voted against this in the committee because we know that we have a process that will allow them to be on a No Fly List.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, we do not know anything. The only way we know it is to put it into law. We are speculating and are hopeful. Logic would suggest that my amendment is not needed. But in watching what has happened in America today, guess what? The American people look at Congress; they look at the executive branch, and they don't often see common sense at times.

Furthermore, particularly as we head into an era where courts are going to go, perhaps, more on feelings rather than on law, this is a risky time period. We need to make it clear-cut—absolutely—if you're in Guantanamo.

Now, we've already released a bunch, and a whole bunch of them are coming back and are hitting us. At the very least, if we're not going to keep them in prison, if we're not going to keep them in Guantanamo, at the very least, this Congress needs to guarantee you will absolutely, certainly, 100 percent—not hopefully, not maybe, not probably—100 percent not get on an airplane out of Reagan Airport, sitting next to us, with the ability to blow up this Capitol building and the White House.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, again, to my friend from Indiana, I

don't think the language in the bill could be any clearer about these detainees and their being part of the No Fly List.

I am going to now yield 2 minutes to my friend from New York (Ms. CLARKE), who is a member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I would like to just highlight today section 201 of H.R. 2200, the Transportation Security Administration Authorization Act of 2009, which requires the TSA to establish a system to verify that all cargo transported on passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or by a foreign air carrier inbound to the United States be screened for explosives within 2 years of its enactment.

Notwithstanding the contrary rhetoric we have heard from the opponents of H.R. 2200, the committee is taking the responsible, necessary steps to implement the cargo screening requirement originally authorized in the 9/11 Act by requiring that all cargo transported between the United States airports on passenger planes be screened by August of 2010, by maintaining the commitment to screen inbound cargo, by responding in a timely manner to the needs of the TSA rather than taking a wait-and-see approach until 2010, and by dedicating the committee to receiving monthly briefings on the program so that the necessary oversight is exercised to ensure that TSA will meet the 2010 deadline and the deadline for inbound cargo created by this provision.

The previous administration's delay and confusion have disadvantaged TSA and have necessitated this action.

I am committed to achieving 100 percent screening of all cargo transported on passenger planes. This is arguably the largest screening vulnerability given that all passengers, their carry-ons and checked baggage currently get screened.

I would like to thank Chairman THOMPSON and Ranking Member KING for their vigilance and leadership, and I would like to thank subcommittee Chairwoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE and the ranking member for their diligence and leadership on this authorization.

As a member of the New York delegation, as one who serves on this committee and as one who holds very vivid memories of the most devastating airliner-based attack on U.S. soil, I kindly ask my colleagues to support the rule of H.R. 2200 as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to yield 2 minutes to another member of

the committee, to my friend from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Mr. PERLMUTTER.

I want to thank Chairman THOMPSON for his leadership. I am reminded, friends, that there is a difference between leadership and management. A manager wants to do things right, and a leader wants to do the right thing.

Chairman THOMPSON has not only wanted to get this right procedurally; he has wanted to make sure that we do the right thing. He has proceeded on the premise that there is safety in the counsel of the multitudes. Everybody who wanted to be heard was heard on this bill. Labor was heard. Industry was heard. Republicans were heard. Democrats were heard. Everybody who wanted to be heard was heard. I know of no one who wanted to be heard at the subcommittee level more than the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, who was not heard. There was nobody on the committee who had an issue that was not embraced and heard. I was there. What I'm about to say is not something that I know from second-hand, or secondarily. I don't know it tertiarily and I don't know it quaternarily. I know this from being there in person.

This issue about the prisoners at Guantanamo Bay was aired adequately, sufficiently, totally, completely, and absolutely. The man who spoke, who is my friend and who is a man I respect greatly, had his issue heard, and he did not vote against it. He did not vote against it. He was the only abstention. My brothers and sisters on the Republican side supported this as well. I say "brothers and sisters" because I believe there is just one race—the human race—and we're all related. We're probably cousins if we're not brothers and sisters. But my point is this:

This was totally, completely and absolutely thoroughly aired. Everybody had a say. I am going to support the rule because I support the notion that there is safety in the counsel of the multitudes and that the multitudes were heard.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to another member of the committee, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak in support of this rule and in support of the underlying bill, which has been the product of lengthy, bipartisan negotiations. It contains contributions from stakeholders throughout the private sector and government.

Before I continue, I want to take a moment to recognize the hard work and dedication of the TSA leadership and of their employees who work day in and day out to help keep our country safe. Thank you.

This bill is important because it allows us to take a look at TSA and to

address any problems that have arisen over the past 8 years. One of the concerns this bill addresses is the matter of whole-body imaging, or WBI.

□ 1130

This technology allows airport screeners to clearly see items passengers may be concealing beneath their clothing anywhere on their body. However, many folks on both sides of the aisle have expressed serious reservations about the privacy implications of creating detailed images of people's bodies underneath their clothing. Therefore, one of the many amendments offered and accepted during the markup of this bill was my amendment that requires TSA to submit a report on privacy to Congress upon completion of the WBI pilot program. This will give both TSA and Congress the opportunity to reflect on this program before we jump into full implementation.

This bill has been thoroughly considered and approved in both the subcommittee and full committee levels. So I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this rule and the bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my friend from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I introduced my first bill to enhance screening of aviation in 1987. I saw the extraordinary deficiencies of the system back then, fought for two decades with the airline industry, and it took a horrible tragedy to transform the system. Even 2 years before that bill, Mr. LIPINSKI and I looked at the workforce—minimum wage, high turnover, some of them were illegal aliens—and said we ought to Federalize the screening workforce. We need a better system. Again, the airlines fought. Again, it took a tragedy.

Well, now, out of that we have developed the potential for a better system. This bill will move it along tremendously, both in aviation and surface security that we need to protect our Nation. This bill represents tremendous progress, tripling the funding for surface transportation and the oversight program that will require that airlines give meaningful training to flight crews—something that some of the airlines still aren't doing. They say it costs too much.

We will have new standards for foreign repair stations. We have a huge loophole. Most of our planes—or many of them—are getting maintenance overseas where there is no security. Just imagine what a terrorist operative could do to sabotage one of our planes over there. It helps with the last line of defense. Our Federal Flight Deck Officer program. And it makes other tremendous improvements.

I am a bit bemused by the gentleman from Indiana alleging that this bill somehow might allow some terrorist to somehow—who is known—not be on the No Fly List. We've got a whole bunch of really bad people in prison, not just

down in Guantanamo but in our super-maximum security prisons here; some who attacked the Twin Towers before 9/11. The guy called the Unibomber. Guess what? They're not on the No Fly List because they aren't going anywhere. And if they did escape, they certainly wouldn't be flying under their own name. So we don't routinely put people who are in super maximum security prisons on a No Fly List.

But what the bill says if and when any one of those people who was detained at Guantanamo is in any way capable of getting out and getting on an airplane: If they're sent to a foreign nation for disposition and we don't know what that disposition would be, their name must go on the No Fly List. So his arguments about somehow we're undermining security or threatening the public are particularly puzzling to me. As one who has advocated long and hard for enhanced security, I'm a bit insulted by that.

Now, we need better technology for the Federal workforce to use at the point where they screen passengers. And one of those things is a walk-through device where you'll be able to see any concealed contraband on the person. That is a tremendous step forward. They've been using it in Heathrow for years now. It's an option at Heathrow.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the gentleman 1 more minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. You can either be very intrusively frisked at Heathrow—and I have had the experience; it's not great, and it's much more intrusive than here—or you can walk through that screening device. More than 85 percent of the people choose to walk through the screening device. And as we've proposed it here, it has extraordinary privacy protections. The person monitoring the dumbed-down image of the person's body will be remote from the actual screening area, won't be able to see that person. It's dumbed down. It's not very revealing. And this is a step forward that will enhance our security.

There are ways now to smuggle devices onboard, and we've got to deal with them. And this is one of them.

We also have to deal better with liquids and explosives, a major threat. We need to get more equipment deployed—and this committee has pushed hard and there was money in the stimulus bill—and there will be more authorization here to get better equipment to our screeners so they can detect threats before they get on our planes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend if he has any other speakers.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. We do not.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to thank everybody who has participated in this debate. I think it's been very fruitful, and I think it's been important.

I mentioned before that when I first spoke on this legislation that process

is important because it affects fairness, obviously, but it also affects legislation. We are dealing today—we are bringing to the floor legislation that I am sure will pass by an overwhelming majority on a bipartisan basis. It's important legislation. It's been drafted through the committee process in a bipartisan fashion, and that's commendable.

I mentioned that on legislation like this—and quite frankly, also, on legislation that's coming to the floor soon that's more controversial—openness, as much as possible, is advisable. We saw an amendment described by Mr. SOUDER that is important because it basically, as it was explained by Mr. SOUDER, his interventions would take out of the hands of the President the ultimate determination of whether somebody currently held at the detention center in Guantanamo could be placed or not on the No Fly List, and it would say that automatically those people would be on the No Fly List. And that's important. It's an example of why process is important because being denied—Mr. SOUDER is being denied the opportunity to present the amendment. I think that's unfortunate.

Anyway, as I say, the underlying legislation is one that I'm certain will pass with great bipartisan support. And again, I reiterate my gratitude to all colleagues who have debated on the rule, and, obviously, I look forward to the debate on the underlying legislation.

Having said that, I yield back my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida and I appreciated today's debate as well.

I would ask that House Resolution 474 be passed this morning, that the rule be passed.

This is a bill, H.R. 2200, involving transportation security. It's been a bill that has been long in the making and long overdue, and it is time to move forward with this piece of legislation.

The bill itself was developed over several months with a great amount of input from majority and minority Members, labor and business, and independent analysis. We heard from Representative GREEN about all of the input that went in from various perspectives and the fact that everyone was heard.

The bill passed out of the Homeland Security Committee without any dissenting votes. We've heard Mr. SOUDER complain that his amendment was modified to include the President of the United States. I mean, obvious reflection of separation of powers has to be part of the bill. Otherwise, it's exactly what he wanted. And it does not allow detainees of Guantanamo to come into the United States. They will become part of the No Fly List if they were ever detained at the Naval Station Guantanamo Bay. So the language is clear with respect to his concerns.

The bill, as it comes to the floor, will have 14 substantive amendments debated: eight by Republicans; six by Democrats. This rule will provide for ample debate on this important bill and allow Members to vote on many proposals to improve it. The bill is a great example of bipartisan cooperation. It addresses the need for risk-based determinations, surface transportation and biometrics.

I would urge, Mr. Speaker, a “yes” vote on the rule and on the underlying bill. I urge a “yes” vote on the previous question.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. 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, this 15-minute vote on adopting the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on a motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1817; and a motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 196, of ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

YEAS—243

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Abercrombie | Cohen | Grayson |
| Ackerman | Connolly (VA) | Green, Al |
| Adler (NJ) | Conyers | Green, Gene |
| Altmire | Costa | Griffith |
| Andrews | Costello | Grijalva |
| Arcuri | Courtney | Gutierrez |
| Baca | Crowley | Hall (NY) |
| Baird | Cuellar | Halvorson |
| Baldwin | Cummings | Hare |
| Barrow | Dahlkemper | Harman |
| Bean | Davis (AL) | Hastings (FL) |
| Becerra | Davis (CA) | Heinrich |
| Berkley | Davis (IL) | Herseth Sandlin |
| Berman | Davis (TN) | Higgins |
| Berry | DeFazio | Himes |
| Bishop (GA) | DeGette | Hinchey |
| Bishop (NY) | Delahunt | Hirono |
| Blumenauer | DeLauro | Hodes |
| Bocieri | Dicks | Holden |
| Boren | Dingell | Holt |
| Boswell | Doggett | Honda |
| Boucher | Donnelly (IN) | Hoyer |
| Boyd | Doyle | Inslee |
| Brady (PA) | Driehaus | Israel |
| Bright | Edwards (MD) | Jackson (IL) |
| Brown, Corrine | Edwards (TX) | Jackson-Lee |
| Butterfield | Ellison | (TX) |
| Capps | Ellsworth | Johnson (GA) |
| Capuano | Engel | Johnson, E. B. |
| Cardoza | Eshoo | Kagen |
| Carnahan | Etheridge | Kanjorski |
| Carney | Farr | Kaptur |
| Carson (IN) | Fattah | Kildee |
| Castor (FL) | Filner | Kilpatrick (MI) |
| Chandler | Foster | Kilroy |
| Childers | Frank (MA) | Kind |
| Clarke | Fudge | Kirkpatrick (AZ) |
| Clay | Giffords | Kissell |
| Cleaver | Gonzalez | Klein (FL) |
| Clyburn | Gordon (TN) | Kosmas |

| | | |
|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Kratovil | Murphy, Patrick | Scott (VA) |
| Kucinich | Murtha | Serrano |
| Langevin | Nadler (NY) | Shea-Porter |
| Larsen (WA) | Napolitano | Sherman |
| Larson (CT) | Neal (MA) | Shuler |
| Lee (CA) | Nye | Sires |
| Levin | Oberstar | Skelton |
| Lewis (GA) | Obey | Slaughter |
| Lipinski | Oliver | Smith (WA) |
| Loebback | Ortiz | Space |
| Lofgren, Zoe | Pallone | Speier |
| Lowe | Pascarella | Spratt |
| Lujan | Pastor (AZ) | Stupak |
| Lynch | Payne | Sutton |
| Maffei | Perlmutter | Tanner |
| Maloney | Perriello | Tauscher |
| Markey (CO) | Peters | Taylor |
| Markey (MA) | Peterson | Teague |
| Marshall | Pingree (ME) | Thompson (CA) |
| Massa | Polis (CO) | Thompson (MS) |
| Matheson | Pomeroy | Tierney |
| Matsui | Price (NC) | Titus |
| McCarthy (NY) | Quigley | Tonko |
| McCollum | Rahall | Towns |
| McDermott | Rangel | Tsongas |
| McGovern | Reyes | Van Hollen |
| McIntyre | Richardson | Velázquez |
| McMahon | Rodriguez | Visclosky |
| McNerney | Ross | Walz |
| Meek (FL) | Rothman (NJ) | Wasserman |
| Meeks (NY) | Roybal-Allard | Schultz |
| Melancon | Rush | Waters |
| Michaud | Ryan (OH) | Watson |
| Miller (NC) | Salazar | Watt |
| Miller, George | Sanchez, Loretta | Waxman |
| Mitchell | Sarbanes | Weiner |
| Mollohan | Schakowsky | Welch |
| Moore (KS) | Schauer | Wexler |
| Moore (WI) | Schiff | Woolsey |
| Moran (VA) | Schrader | Wu |
| Murphy (CT) | Schwartz | Yarmuth |
| Murphy (NY) | Scott (GA) | |

NAYS—179

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Fleming | McClintock |
| Akin | Forbes | McCotter |
| Alexander | Portenberry | McHenry |
| Austria | Fox | McHugh |
| Bachmann | Franks (AZ) | McKeon |
| Bachus | Frelinghuysen | McMorris |
| Barrett (SC) | Gallegly | Rodgers |
| Bartlett | Garrett (NJ) | Mica |
| Biggert | Gerlach | Miller (FL) |
| Bilbray | Gingrey (GA) | Miller (MI) |
| Bilirakis | Gohmert | Miller, Gary |
| Bishop (UT) | Goodlatte | Minnick |
| Blackburn | Granger | Moran (KS) |
| Blunt | Graves | Murphy, Tim |
| Boehner | Guthrie | Myrick |
| Bonner | Hall (TX) | Neugebauer |
| Bono Mack | Harper | Nunes |
| Boozman | Hastings (WA) | Olson |
| Boustany | Heller | Paul |
| Brady (TX) | Hensarling | Paulsen |
| Brown (GA) | Herger | Pence |
| Brown (SC) | Hill | Petri |
| Brown-Waite, | Hoekstra | Pitts |
| Ginny | Hunter | Platts |
| Buchanan | Inglis | Poe (TX) |
| Burgess | Issa | Posey |
| Burton (IN) | Jenkins | Price (GA) |
| Buyer | Johnson (IL) | Putnam |
| Calvert | Johnson, Sam | Radanovich |
| Camp | Jones | Rehberg |
| Campbell | Jordan (OH) | Reichert |
| Cantor | King (IA) | Roe (TN) |
| Cao | King (NY) | Rogers (AL) |
| Capito | Kingston | Rogers (KY) |
| Carter | Kirk | Rogers (MI) |
| Cassidy | Kline (MN) | Rohrabacher |
| Castle | Lamborn | Rooney |
| Chaffetz | Lance | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Coble | Latham | Roskam |
| Coffman (CO) | LaTourette | Royce |
| Cole | Latta | Ryan (WI) |
| Conaway | Lee (NY) | Scalise |
| Crenshaw | Lewis (CA) | Schmidt |
| Culberson | Linder | Schock |
| Davis (KY) | LoBiondo | Sensenbrenner |
| Deal (KY) | Lucas | Sessions |
| Dent | Luetkemeyer | Shadegg |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Lummis | Shimkus |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | Lungren, Daniel | Shuster |
| Dreier | E. | Simpson |
| Duncan | Mack | Smith (NE) |
| Ehlers | Manzullo | Smith (NJ) |
| Emerson | Marchant | Smith (TX) |
| Fallin | McCarthy (CA) | Snyder |
| Flake | McCaul | Souder |

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| Stearns | Turner | Wilson (SC) |
| Terry | Upton | Wittman |
| Thompson (PA) | Walden | Wolf |
| Thornberry | Wamp | Young (AK) |
| Tiahrt | Westmoreland | Young (FL) |
| Tiberi | Whitfield | |

NOT VOTING—11

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Barton (TX) | Kennedy | Sestak |
| Braley (IA) | Ruppersberger | Stark |
| Cooper | Sánchez, Linda | Sullivan |
| Hinojosa | T. | Wilson (OH) |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1207

Messrs. COFFMAN of Colorado, KINGSTON, and PLATTS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 301, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

JOHN S. WILDER POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1817, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1817.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

YEAS—420

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Boehner | Carney |
| Ackerman | Bonner | Carson (IN) |
| Aderholt | Bono Mack | Carter |
| Akin | Boozman | Cassidy |
| Alexander | Boren | Castle |
| Altmire | Boswell | Castor (FL) |
| Andrews | Boucher | Chaffetz |
| Arcuri | Boustany | Chandler |
| Austria | Boyd | Childers |
| Baca | Brady (PA) | Clarke |
| Bachmann | Brady (TX) | Clay |
| Bachus | Braley (IA) | Cleaver |
| Baird | Bright | Clyburn |
| Baldwin | Brown (GA) | Coble |
| Barrett (SC) | Brown (SC) | Coffman (CO) |
| Barrow | Brown, Corrine | Cohen |
| Bartlett | Brown-Waite, | Cole |
| Barton (TX) | Ginny | Conaway |
| Bean | Buchanan | Connolly (VA) |
| Becerra | Burgess | Conyers |
| Berkley | Burton (IN) | Costa |
| Berman | Butterfield | Costello |
| Berry | Buyer | Courtney |
| Biggert | Calvert | Crenshaw |
| Bilbray | Camp | Crowley |
| Bilirakis | Campbell | Cuellar |
| Bishop (GA) | Cantor | Culberson |
| Bishop (NY) | Cao | Cummings |
| Bishop (UT) | Capito | Dahlkemper |
| Blackburn | Capps | Davis (AL) |
| Blumenauer | Capuano | Davis (CA) |
| Blunt | Cardoza | Davis (IL) |
| Bocieri | Carnahan | Davis (KY) |