

RANKING MEMBER LINDER: We are writing in strong support of H.R. 4532, the "Social Security Disability Applicants' Access to Professional Representation Act of 2010."

Applying for Social Security disability and Supplemental Security Income disability benefits can be a confusing, complicated, and difficult process. While claimants have the right to be represented, it is a hollow right if there is no realistic way to obtain representation.

The Social Security Protection Act of 2004 (SSPA), Pub. L. No. 108-203, included two provisions intended to help claimants obtain representation: (1) the withholding and direct payment of fees in Supplemental Security Income (SSI) cases; and (2) establishing a demonstration project to allow eligible non-attorney representatives the option of withholding and direct payment of fees in both Title II and SSI cases. Under the SSPA, both of these provisions are scheduled to "sunset" after a five-year period, which would be March 1, 2010. Because both projects have been successful, we are writing to support their permanent continuation. H.R. 4532 accomplishes this goal.

Established in 1979, the National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives (NOSSCR) is an association of nearly 4,000 attorneys and paralegals who represent Social Security and SSI claimants seeking to obtain disability and income security benefits. NOSSCR members are committed to providing high quality representation for claimants, to maintaining a system of full and fair adjudication for every claimant, and to advocating for beneficial change in the disability determination and adjudication process.

WITHHOLDING AND DIRECT PAYMENT OF FEES IN SSI CASES

Section 302 of the SSPA amended section 1631(d)(2) of the Social Security Act to extend the Title II attorney fee withholding and direct payment procedures to claims under Title XVI of the Act. This provision became effective for SSI fees paid on or after February 28, 2005.

Extending the existing fee withholding and direct payment provisions for Title II cases to Title XVI cases has made a measurable difference in the ability of SSI claimants to obtain representation. SSA's statistics for the hearing level show representation of SSI claimants has increased in every year since the SSPA provision was implemented.

Section 302 includes a sunset provision. Under that provision, the amendments made by section 302 will not apply to claims for benefits with respect to which the claimant and the representative enter into the agreement for representation after February 28, 2010.

Because the SSPA change has increased the opportunities for SSI claimants to obtain representation, we support the provision in H.R. 4532, which makes this provision permanent.

NON-ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVES

Section 303 of the SSPA directs the Commissioner to carry out a five-year nationwide demonstration project to determine the potential results of extending the fee withholding and direct payment procedures that apply to attorneys under Titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to non-attorney representatives who meet certain minimum prerequisites specified in section 303 and any additional prerequisites that the Commissioner may prescribe.

Under the prerequisites specified in section 303, individuals applying to participate in the demonstration project must have a bachelor's degree or equivalent education, possess liability insurance or equivalent insurance adequate to protect claimants in the event of malpractice by the representative, pass a

criminal background check ensuring fitness to practice before SSA, pass an examination testing knowledge of the relevant provisions of the Act and the most recent developments in Agency and court decisions, and demonstrate ongoing completion of qualified continuing education courses. In addition, the Commissioner has required that individuals applying to participate in the demonstration project show that they have sufficient prior experience representing claimants before SSA.

The five-year demonstration project on direct payment of fees to eligible non-attorneys began on February 28, 2005, and also is scheduled to "sunset" at the end of five years. The demonstration project established by SSPA section 303 applies to claims for benefits with respect to which the agreement for representation is entered into after February 27, 2005 and before March 1, 2010.

We support the provision in H.R. 4532 that makes this provision permanent. We believe that, to date, the demonstration project has been successfully implemented by the contractor engaged by the Social Security Administration, CPS Human Resource Services. By all reports, the contractor has done a good job administering the demonstration project including periodic administration of the examination and ensuring that the other required criteria are met.

We appreciate your support for improving SSA's service for individuals who are applying for benefits by introducing and co-sponsoring H.R. 4532. We believe that making permanent the SSPA provisions regarding representation will benefit individuals with disabilities who file claims for benefits.

Very truly yours,

NANCY G. SHOR,
Executive Director.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4532. This legislation will "permanently extend fee withholding procedures which allow Social Security and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) recipients to pay fees to lawyers and representatives in successful applications for benefits directly out of a claimant's benefits, such as SSI disability."

"The legislation would set the criteria for an eligible non-attorney representative, including requirements that a representative have a bachelor's degree, pass an examination, have professional liability insurance, and undergo a criminal background check. In addition, the bill would allow the Social Security Commissioner to assess 'reasonable fees' on recipients participating in the program. The program, which was last extended in 2004, is set to expire on March 1, 2009."

Mr. Speaker, it is known that proper representation for Social Security is a must, in order for individuals to obtain their benefits. In some cases, many may not be able to afford attorneys, hence losing the capability to acquire benefits, which are directly related to the well-being of their life. I am very eager for this legislation to pass, so those citizens, who have desperate needs, would be able to have them met.

By extending and continuing this "fee withholding" procedure, which is the practice of the Social Security Administration, this would open the opportunity for citizens to receive the proper representation. It enables them to pay their representative through the awarded Disability Insurance, DI, or SSI benefits. In addition, the program has also increased annual federal revenue by approximately \$55 million, which is an added windfall.

So in conclusion, I support H.R. 4532 and I encourage my colleagues to follow my lead!

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TANNER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4532.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. TANNER. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4061, CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1051 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1051

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. 4061) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, 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 Science and Technology. 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 Science and Technology 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. 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. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Science and Technology or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

□ 1115

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1051.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1051 provides for consideration of H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Science and Technology Committee. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Science and Technology Committee now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for purposes of amendment and shall be considered as read.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule further makes in order only those amendments printed in the report. The amendments made in order 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 be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to demand for division of the question. All points of order against the amendment except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI are waived.

The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the Chair of the Science and Technology Committee or a designee. Finally, the rule provides that the Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the threat of cyberwarfare cannot be overstated. Cyberattacks target everything from classified government information to business and trade secrets to individual financial records. The motivation for these attacks can range from immature harassment to illicit financial gain. The scope can be similarly broad, from an individual computer or Web site to an entire network.

Investing in cybersecurity is the Manhattan Project of our generation. The only difference is that when we were doing the Manhattan Project, we were the only power with the technology. This time around, we are facing far more enemies that have the same level of technology that we do. In fact, nearly every high school hacker has the potential to threaten our unfettered use of the Internet. Just imagine what a rogue state committed to disrupting our cyberinfrastructure could do.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology is responsible for setting cybersecurity standards for non-classified Federal networks. The bill tasks NIST with developing cybersecurity awareness programs to educate individuals, small businesses, State and local governments, and educational institutions on how to implement cyber best practices. It is estimated that 80 to 90 percent of all cyberbreaches could have been avoided with this type of cybersecurity training.

The legislation also directs NIST to conduct research related to improving the security of information and network systems that support so many aspects of our day-to-day life, which many of us take for granted.

The most troubling cyberthreat may be the very real prospect of state-sponsored cyberattacks against sensitive national security information. Cyberexperts believe China is effectively targeting our government networks and that these attacks have resulted in at least one breach of Lockheed Martin's F-35 Joint Strike Fighter development program.

It is estimated that the Federal Government alone needs to recruit between 500 and 1,000 more cybersecurity professionals each year in order to address these threats. The Upstate New York district that I represent is on the front-line of defending our Nation in the cyberwar in which we are engaged. Utica College offers a bachelor of science degree in cybersecurities. Graduates of this program are employed across the country, working to secure the networks of government and private business alike. However, this program currently only graduates about 50 students per year into the cybersecurity field.

Clearly, simply maintaining the status quo will not be enough. Media reports of new attacks by cybercriminals are becoming more frequent and alarming. Just last week, following the State of the Union address, hackers, suspected to be from Brazil, defaced 49 House Member Web sites. Each day,

400,000 new "zombies" are activated. These are computers that are taken over by hackers and can be remotely controlled without the owner knowing it, and 1.5 million new malicious Web sites are identified each month. There are more than 1 billion new endpoints added to the Internet; 50 percent of those will be in China and 35 percent will be in India.

We are locked in a technological arms race with our cybercompetitors. In order to win that race, we must train individuals to look at warfare from an entirely new perspective. This effort goes to the heart of our national security because it requires us to create opportunities in our colleges and universities to train this new type of warfighter to defend our Nation from cyberthreats, a warfighter every bit as important to our security as a traditional armed soldier in the field. The training for this new generation of warfighters that defend us, not from land, sea, or air attacks, but from cyberattacks, is every bit as important as boot camp is for our soldiers. In fact, that is what this bill does, creates a boot camp for our future cyberwarfighters.

H.R. 4061 sets that course by authorizing funding for a Scholarship for Service program through the National Science Foundation that will provide scholarships for students pursuing cybersecurity fields. The scholarships would be provided for up to 1 to 2 years for students pursuing a bachelor's or master's degree and up to 3 years for students pursuing a doctoral degree in the cybersecurity field, provided that the recipient serves as a cybersecurity professional in government agencies for an equal amount of time. This investment in cybereducation is necessary to meet our enemies on the cyberfrontlines and repel their attacks.

Through increased workforce development and continued strengthening of our public-private partnerships, we can and will ensure that the IT systems, on which so much of our way of life depends, are safe from cyberattack. The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act contains the strategic plan necessary to focus our resources to meet these challenges.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding time.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this structured rule that restricts my colleagues from offering amendments to the bill. We certainly are concerned about cybersecurity, but nothing is going to matter if we don't get our fiscal house in order.

The Democrats are basically wasting the American people's time by bringing this bill, which they know has widespread support, to the floor today, as it could, instead, have been on the suspension calendar for this week, leaving us more time to debate legislation that

would address the major problems facing the American people and my constituents in North Carolina, such as the status of our economy and what are we going to do about dealing with the national security issues that are facing us in this country. Instead of using the suspension calendar productively, Democrats have consistently used the majority of our time debating legislation that is not relevant to the challenges that American families are facing on a daily basis.

Democrats have spent the majority of our time debating suspensions such as H. Res. 784, which honors the 2560th anniversary of the birth of Confucius. In doing so, the Democrats have set a higher priority on the 2560th anniversary of the birth of Confucius over solving the problems of the American people. I have nothing against Confucius, Mr. Speaker, but this resolution is not helping American families get back to work or put food on their kitchen tables.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, so far this year the Democrats have spent the majority of our time debating resolutions such as H. Res. 1020, which honors the 95th anniversary of the signing of the Rocky Mountain National Park Act, and H. Res. 981, supporting development in Ukraine. Mr. Speaker, again, I have nothing in particular against these resolutions, but I would be remiss if I did not address the fact that Democrats are making these resolutions higher priorities of these topics than bringing forth commonsense solutions that will help Americans who are suffering across the Nation.

While the bill before us today authorizes several important programs, it also authorizes "such sums as may be necessary for activities to improve cybersecurity." When American families are facing tough economic challenges, Congress should be tightening its own belt and setting funding limits rather than authorizing blank checks on the backs of the American taxpayers. We can do better than this, and we owe it to the American people to do better than this.

This bill also provides for annual increases in authorization levels. At a time of record budget deficits, it is crucial that we hold the line on spending. The Obama administration likes to talk about fiscal restraint, but we have yet to see those words put into action. In fact, talk of fiscal restraint is nothing but talk.

This bill is a classic example of legislation that could be trimmed back by keeping the authorization levels static rather than increasing them each year. But the Democrats refuse to allow such restraint and instead continue to govern as though they are not aware of the fact that our Federal deficit is growing each day. Perhaps they are not aware. So many have been in Washington for so long that they are out of touch with average citizens and the common sense that our citizens represent.

My colleague, Mr. SESSIONS, offered an amendment that would maintain

fiscal year 2011 authorization levels in the bill for 3 years instead of increasing them annually, but the Democrats on the Rules Committee rejected the amendment and did not allow for debate on it on the floor today.

This bill is also being brought forth today under a structured rule, adding to the record number of structured and closed rules the Democrats have arbitrarily used since they have been in the majority. Even though an open rule was requested for this bill, Democrats have chosen to stifle and control the debate today, and so we have another structured rule before us, eliminating both Republicans' and Democrats' ability to offer important amendments affecting their constituents. With this structured rule, the Democrats in charge have blocked at least 13 amendments that were submitted to the Rules Committee last night. If we had an open rule today, I am certain we would be debating many more.

After promising to have the most open and honest Congress in history, why has the Speaker consistently gone back on her word? Why are the Democrats, who are in charge and have a large majority, shutting off debate and silencing their colleagues from both sides of the aisle? Are they afraid of debate? Are they protecting their members from tough votes?

Regardless of their motives, one thing is clear: The Democrats in charge are doing the American people an injustice by refusing to allow their representatives to offer amendments on the floor of the people's House. The American people want to hear debate and are tired of the backroom dealmaking of the Democrats.

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

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

I just want to say that my colleague talks about bipartisanship. And I want to say I can't understand how she can talk about a bipartisan bill, a bill that came out of the Science and Technology Committee with support from both sides of the aisle, and turn it into a partisan political fight. She is right, that is what Americans are tired of. And yet, during her statement she mentioned Democrats at least six times. I lost count after the sixth.

This is not a partisan bill. This is a bipartisan bill that is necessary for the security of our country. That is what people sent us to Washington for. They send us to Washington to make sure that we take steps to ensure that their way of life continues and that they are safe and secure.

This bill strategically places money into education so that we can educate the next generation of cyberwarfighters to protect the Internet and to protect people to be able to use the Internet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in support of H.R. 4061, the Cy-

bersecurity Enhancement Act of 2009. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, and I commend Congressman LIPINSKI for his work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, more and more Americans rely on the Internet every day. Businesses depend on it for commerce. Consumers depend on it to be able to engage in transactions to support small business all across this country. People network in hopes of finding a job or connecting with friends, exploring opportunities to find the financial means necessary to go to college. This means that every day more people rely on secure networks to keep their personal information safe to make sure that people aren't taking advantage of their privacy and exploiting them, exposing businesses to attacks, costing taxpayers thousands and thousands of dollars, growing to millions and millions of dollars, with attacks every day.

□ 1130

We know that this costs the Federal Government money, Mr. Speaker, as more and more countries are looking to engage and find vulnerabilities in these networks just to do harm, to cost the American taxpayers more and more money. We need to make sure that we are truly investing and providing educational opportunities to young people, bringing in those who have some skill sets to teach them how to defend our country and defend business from all these cyber attacks that are costing us millions and millions of dollars every day. Because of our increasing dependence on technology, we must teach these students these important skills.

One provision of this legislation we are debating today will help train the force by establishing the Federal Cyber Scholarship for Service program. During committee markup, I successfully included an amendment to address any regional disparities that may exist to make sure that we are truly looking across the country, in small communities and rural America, to find these experts that can help us protect our country to make sure that small businesses aren't subject to those attacks.

My district in New Mexico is home to 17 different tribes, Mr. Speaker. New Mexico has 22. We need to make sure as they are developing their infrastructure that we provide them the opportunity to make sure they have these skill sets as well. We need to make sure that we are helping keep a vulnerable population engaged, that we are looking to create educational opportunities. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, that we are standing up to those nations, to those people around the world that continue to try to find ways to attack this Nation. They found a way through cybersecurity. They are finding ways to be able to cost commerce money, to prevent business from happening, to stifle small business from growing.

We as a Congress need to make sure we stand with small businesses across

the country and provide educational opportunities and work with them. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

I certainly agree with my colleague from New York that the bill itself is not a partisan bill. I am not talking about the bill. I am talking about the rule. This is a very partisan rule. It didn't need to be a partisan rule. All the majority had to do was allow for amendments on the floor and it wouldn't have been a partisan rule. So I need to remind him that that is where the partisanship comes in. We are here debating the rule.

Mr. Speaker, while debt limit increases have been passed under both Republican and Democratic Presidents and Congresses, the acceleration in the accumulation of the debt that brought us to this point merits examination. In January of 2007, when NANCY PELOSI became Speaker of the House, the statutory debt limit stood at \$8.965 trillion. In less than 3 years, the debt limit has increased by more than 33 percent, representing an additional \$1 trillion of debt per year. By comparison, the statutory debt limit, which stood at \$40 billion in 1940, did not cross the \$1 trillion mark until 1981.

And it has been only 7 weeks since the Democrats voted to increase the debt limit by \$290 billion on December 16, 2009. In that time, House Democrats have passed seven resolutions congratulating sports figures or teams; passed 23 resolutions honoring individuals, entities, or causes; passed five bills naming post offices; authorized \$50 million to construct a new national park in the Virgin Islands, but passed zero bills to reduce spending or lower the deficit. Clearly, they are not serious about this serious issue facing this country.

Since taking office just 1 year ago, the President has increased the public debt by \$1.47 trillion, or 23 percent, from \$6.3 trillion to \$7.78 trillion. Under the administration's budget, the public debt will triple, jumping to \$17.5 trillion by 2019. Before President Obama's budget and stimulus were enacted, the CBO estimated that the public debt in 2019 would be \$9.34 trillion, or \$8 trillion less than it is now projected to be under President Obama.

While the President touts his commitment to fiscal responsibility, he is encouraging Congress to pass a \$1.9 trillion increase in the national debt limit, allowing the government to keep borrowing in order to keep on spending. The Senate has done it last week, and it is probably going to be brought to us tomorrow, where the Democrats will pass this. And I mention the Democrats being in charge and the Democrats doing this because it is important for the American people to know that the Democrats are doing this alone.

While the decline in Federal revenue as a result of the economic slowdown

has contributed to the increase in the debt, the significant increases in Federal spending have also contributed to reaching the debt limit faster than anticipated. Record government spending in the form of both the first stimulus bill and increases in appropriations bills has been a recurring theme of the majority, and it is their responsibility alone because they have done it alone.

The record amounts of debt are a direct responsibility of a spending binge in the Democrat-controlled Congress and White House. In 1 year of controlling Washington, Democrats increased the annual deficit by 308 percent, from \$458 billion to \$1.4 trillion.

A quick review of Democrats' spending increases in 2009 shows why the deficit exploded. In that year alone, House Democrats passed \$787 billion in, quote, "stimulus" spending, in addition to paying \$347 billion in interest on borrowing money we don't have, two omnibus spending bills totaling more than \$855 billion, and increased non-defense spending by 12 percent. Again, totally alone.

Faced with declining revenues, Democrats have pushed forward with the most irresponsible option by increasing spending and deficits rather than by lowering Federal expenditures. According to the House Appropriations Committee Republican staff, when all appropriations spending increases are combined, the Democrat majority has pumped over half a trillion dollars in additional spending into non-defense discretionary programs in three short years. This is over \$512 billion, or 127 percent more money for non-defense discretionary programs than they received in the last year of GOP control of the Congress.

In fact, the fiscal year deficit for just 2009 of \$1.417 trillion is the largest ever, and three times the size of the previous record-setting deficit, last year's figure of \$458 billion. It is no wonder that we hear Democrats such as the House majority whip, who recently proclaimed, "We have got to spend our way out of this recession." Statements like this make clear that the Democrats in charge have absolutely no concept of the value of money or how to meet a budget. It really is stunning that despite the economic turmoil caused by government spending too much, the ruling Democrats can't comprehend the consequences of spending money we don't have.

Although some rigid partisans may choose to ignore the election of Massachusetts Senator-elect SCOTT BROWN and try blaming the current spending largesse on George Bush, it is true that since President Obama's inauguration, the U.S. has had an average monthly deficit of \$122.6 billion. By comparison, from the year 2000 until 2008, the average annual deficit was \$196 billion, and we were fighting a war. So the Democrats' solution for a terrible problem is to make it much worse and just blame it on the other guy.

To that sentiment, Charles Krauthammer responds, "Let's just get this

straight: The antipathy to George Bush is so enduring and powerful that it just elected a Republican Senator in Massachusetts. Why, the man is omnipotent. And the Democrats are delusional: SCOTT BROWN won by running against Obama, not Bush. He won by brilliantly nationalizing the race, running hard against the Obama agenda."

Unfortunately, the trend of increased Federal deficits will not come to an end under the President's new fiscal year 2011 budget. According to the President's own estimates, his budget and spending plan will cause deficits to average \$905 billion for each of the next 10 years. Budget shortfalls incurred by the government fuel the rise in the Nation's debt because the government is forced to borrow money to meet the shortfall. In 2009, the budget deficit was \$1.4 trillion, the first time in history the deficit exceeded \$1 trillion, and the first time the deficit exceeded 10 percent of gross domestic product since World War II.

The consequences of this kind of reckless spending are worth highlighting. Today the cost of the national debt is \$39,870 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. According to the December 2009 Monthly Treasury Report, the Federal Government is projected to spend \$465.444 billion paying interest alone on the national debt in this fiscal year 2010. That amounts to \$1.275 billion per day, or \$1,530.75 for every one of the 304 million people living in the United States today. Just like paying interest on a credit card, these amounts are recurring and do nothing to actually reduce the debt principal.

Ironically, in March of 2006, then-Senator Obama warned his colleagues of the danger of raising the debt limit without addressing the underlying cause, explaining that, quote, "The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the U.S. Government can't pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies. Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. America deserves better." President Obama was against raising the debt limit before he was for it. We agree with then-Senator Obama, but we disagree with President Obama.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This is exactly what the American people are so tired of. My colleague talks about what the race in Massachusetts meant. It meant that people are tired with the partisan bickering. She

just squandered all of the time that we could be here talking about cybersecurity and the importance of passing this bill with talking about politics. Of course she fails to point out the fact that much of the debt was incurred under President Bush, fails to point out the fact that now two wars are on the books.

But that is not what we are here to talk about. We are here to talk about cybersecurity. And I want to read a quote for you. Just yesterday Dennis Blair, the Director of National Intelligence, testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee. And he said, "Malicious cyber activity is occurring on an unprecedented scale with extraordinary sophistication." He went on to say, "Sensitive information is stolen daily from both government and private sector networks, undermining confidence in our information systems, and in the very information these systems were intended to convey." These statements make clear that we cannot afford to maintain the status quo.

In order to meet our enemies on the cyber front lines and repel their attacks, we must create a boot camp for our future cyber warfighters. The investments contained in H.R. 4061 will increase our cyber workforce development and continue to strengthen the public-private partnerships to defend the IT systems on which so much of our daily life relies. That is what the American people have sent us here to Washington to ensure. Cybersecurity enhancement contains the strategic plan necessary to focus our resources to meet the challenges which Director Blair spoke of yesterday.

H.R. 4061 will also strengthen partnerships between the Federal Government and the private sector to guarantee a secure and reliable infrastructure. The benefit of existing public-private partnerships is also on display in Upstate New York, in my very district. The Air Force Research Laboratory Rome Research Site, the Rome Lab as we call it, hosts the main offices of the Air Force Research Lab's Information Directorate.

Located at the former Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome, Rome Lab's scientists and engineers use the latest electronic and computer technology to demonstrate new ways to defend our information networks against attacks. In concert with Rome Lab, the Mohawk Valley is home to a number of companies that are engaged in cutting-edge cyber research, companies that will use the graduates who come out of college with degrees in cybersecurity. Large companies such as PAR Technology, BAE Systems, Booz Allen Hamilton, ITT Industries, Northrop Grumman, and smaller, home grown companies, such as Dolphin Technology, Black River Systems, Assured Information Security, New York State Technology Enterprises Corporation, Syracuse Research Corporation, and Research Associates of Syracuse.

□ 1145

Together, the AFRL and these companies account for thousands of jobs in central New York; men and women doing critical research on our Nation to help fend off cyberattacks. There is no doubt that these companies and the critical public-private partnerships that they have formed with the Air Force Research Laboratory will benefit from this program. But, more importantly, it's the American people that will benefit from this program.

The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act requires the White House Office of Science and Technology policy to convene an industrywide nongovernmental task force of businesses and universities to explore potential public-private collaborations on cybersecurity research and development. This will ensure that these collaborations continue to strengthen our Nation's cyberdefenses. That is what we are here to debate. That is what the American people sent us to Congress for. And that is what we need to pass today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. It's time for our colleagues to accept accountability. They've been in the majority for 3 years but they continue to blame George Bush in the same breath that they accuse me of being partisan. Since the Democrats regained the majority in the House, I have heard a number of Members come down to the floor and quote Supreme Court Justice Brandeis, saying, "Sunlight is said to be the best disinfectant." That quote is quite fitting today, considering that as we speak the majority has been drafting, behind closed doors, no sunshine in sight, health care legislation that will affect every American. What is going on behind these closed doors? We really do not know. We don't even know who is at the table. The American people deserve to know what is going on behind closed doors. We need to bring in the sunlight to a process that is shrouded with secrecy.

That's why I, along with a bipartisan group of 171 other Members, have cosponsored H. Res. 847, a resolution by my friend and colleague Representative BUCHANAN, that expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that any meetings held to determine the final content of sweeping health care legislation be held in public view and not behind closed doors.

In order to help bring sunshine to a process that the majority continues to hide from public view, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and allow the House to consider the Buchanan transparency resolution. This vote will give Members of the majority the chance to live up to their promise, as Speaker PELOSI said, "to lead the most honest, most open, and most ethical Congress in history." I know that Members are concerned that this motion may jeopardize consideration of the bill under consideration today, but I want to make clear: The

motion I'm making provides for separate consideration of the transparency resolution within 3 days so we can vote on the bill before us today, and then, once we are done, consider H. Res. 847.

Mr. Speaker, 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the first rule that they teach you in trial advocacy class, and that is when you're trying a case and you don't have the facts on your side, talk about everything but the facts. And I feel that's what my colleague from North Carolina is doing today. Rather than say that we can work together in a bipartisan way on a bill that is good for all Americans, she would rather talk about everything else that there is. Well, we're not here to talk about everything else today. We are here to talk about cybersecurity and the importance of passing this bill for the American people.

As I said earlier, investing in cybersecurity is the Manhattan Project of our generation. Cyberthreats and attacks are real, and they threaten our financial and defense networks every day. Nearly every aspect of everyday life in our global society is dependent on the security of our cyber networks. We rely on these systems to carry virtually all our business transactions, control our electric grid, emergency communication systems, and traffic lights.

The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act reauthorizes and expands the programs aimed at strengthening the Nation's cybersecurity, including a new scholarship program to train the thousands of cybersecurity professionals that are needed to defend our Nation. In requiring a cybersecurity workforce assessment, this bill will also give us a clearer picture of our current cybercapabilities and identify what new skills and educational advances are needed in both the Federal Government and the private sector to combat future attacks.

H.R. 4061 requires NIST to undertake research and development programs to improve identity management systems, which include health information technology systems, in order to improve interoperability, authentication methods, privacy protection, and usability of these systems. These systems hold great potential for streamlining the delivery of services and care to individuals, but they must be secure in order to function properly and efficiently. This legislation will ensure that they are.

From the perspective of my district in upstate New York, it plays a critical

role in our Nation's cybersecurity, and this research and development work is often discussed publicly. Yet, the work done by contractors, subcontractors, and universities, in conjunction with Federal agencies, employs thousands across New York in cutting-edge R&D. But, more importantly, they are essential to defending America from cyberterrorist attacks and espionage. It is essential these public-private partnerships continue to flourish and they have the necessary manpower in place to protect our Nation from these threats.

The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act will make that happen not just for New York, but across the Nation. This is not a program for which we can afford to ask, How can we do this, but a program for which we must ask, How can we afford not to do this?

H.R. 4061 is supported by numerous organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Business Software Alliance, Software and Information Industry Association, National Cable and Telecommunications Association, U.S. Telecom, TechAmerica, and Computing Research Association. This legislation enjoyed bipartisan support in committee, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

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

The material previously referred to by Ms. FOXX is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1051 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

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

SEC. 3. On the third legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV and without intervention of any point of order, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 847) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any conference committee or other meetings held to determine the content of national health care legislation be conducted in public under the watchful eye of the people of the United States. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 847.

(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.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 1051, if ordered; and suspending the rules with regard to H. Res. 1043, H. Res. 901, and H. Res. 1044.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 175, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—238

Ackerman	Green, Al	Napolitano
Adler (NJ)	Green, Gene	Neal (MA)
Altmire	Grijalva	Nye
Andrews	Hall (NY)	Oberstar
Arcuri	Halvorson	Obey
Baca	Hare	Olver
Baird	Harman	Ortiz
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Barrow	Heinrich	Pallone
Bean	Herseht Sandlin	Pascrell
Becerra	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Berkley	Himes	Payne
Berman	Hinchey	Perlmutter
Berry	Hinojosa	Perriello
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Peters
Bishop (NY)	Hodes	Peterson
Blumenauer	Holden	Pingree (ME)
Bocchieri	Holt	Polis (CO)
Boren	Honda	Pomeroy
Boswell	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Boucher	Inslee	Quigley
Boyd	Israel	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Braley (IA)	Jackson Lee	Reyes
Bright	(TX)	Richardson
Brown, Corrine	Johnson (GA)	Rodriguez
Butterfield	Kagen	Ross
Capps	Kanjorski	Rothman (NJ)
Capuano	Kaptur	Royal-Allard
Cardoza	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Carney	Kilpatrick (MI)	Salazar
Carson (IN)	Kilroy	Sanchez, Loretta
Castor (FL)	Kind	Sarbanes
Chandler	Kissell	Schakowsky
Chu	Klein (FL)	Schauer
Clarke	Kosmas	Schiff
Clay	Kratovil	Schrader
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schwartz
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott (GA)
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Sestak
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Levin	Sherman
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Shuler
Costello	Lipinski	Sires
Courtney	Loeb sack	Skelton
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lowey	Snyder
Cummings	Lujan	Space
Dahlkemper	Lynch	Speier
Davis (CA)	Maffei	Spratt
Davis (TN)	Maloney	Stark
DeFazio	Markey (CO)	Stupak
DeGette	Markey (MA)	Sutton
Delahunt	Marshall	Tanner
DeLauro	Matheson	Teague
Dicks	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McCollum	Tierney
Donnelly (IN)	McDermott	Titus
Doyle	McGovern	Tonko
Driehaus	McIntyre	Towns
Edwards (MD)	McMahon	Tsongas
Edwards (TX)	McNerney	Van Hollen
Ellison	Meek (FL)	Velázquez
Ellsworth	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Engel	Melancon	Walz
Eshoo	Michaud	Wasserman
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Farr	Miller, George	Waters
Fattah	Mitchell	Watson
Filner	Mollohan	Watt
Foster	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moore (WI)	Weiner
Fudge	Moran (VA)	Welch
Garamendi	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (OH)
Gonzalez	Murphy (NY)	Woolsey
Gordon (TN)	Murphy, Patrick	Wu
Grayson	Nadler (NY)	Yarmuth

NAYS—175

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

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

NOT VOTING—20

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Rush
Barrett (SC)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Culberson	Kirk	T.
Davis (AL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Massa	Smith (WA)
Deal (GA)	Murtha	Souder
Garrett (NJ)	Radanovich	Young (FL)

□ 1218

Messrs. TERRY, SMITH of Texas, WHITFIELD, and SMITH of Nebraska changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 176, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

AYES—237

Abercrombie	Andrews	Baldwin
Ackerman	Arcuri	Barrow
Adler (NJ)	Baca	Bean
Altmire	Baird	Becerra

Aderholt	Brown-Waite,	Davis (KY)
Akin	Ginny	Dent
Alexander	Buchanan	Diaz-Balart, L.
Austria	Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bachus	Burton (IN)	Donnelly (IN)
Bartlett	Buyer	Dreier
Bartlett	Calvert	Duncan
Barton (TX)	Camp	Ehlers
Biggert	Campbell	Emerson
Bilbray	Cantor	Fallin
Bilirakis	Cao	Flake
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Fleming
Blackburn	Carter	Forbes
Blunt	Cassidy	Fortenberry
Boehner	Castle	Fox
Bonner	Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)
Bono Mack	Childers	Frelinghuysen
Boozman	Coble	Gallely
Boustany	Coffman (CO)	Garrett (NJ)
Brady (TX)	Cole	Gerlach
Broun (GA)	Conaway	Giffords
Brown (SC)	Crenshaw	Gingrey (GA)

NOES—176

Brown-Waite,	Davis (KY)	Dent
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, L.	Diaz-Balart, M.
Buchanan	Donnelly (IN)	Dreier
Burgess	Duncan	Ehlers
Burton (IN)	Emerson	Fallin
Buyer	Flake	Fleming
Calvert	Forbes	Fortenberry
Camp	Fox	Fox
Campbell	Franks (AZ)	Frelinghuysen
Cantor	Gallely	Garrett (NJ)
Cao	Gerlach	Gerlach
Capito	Giffords	Gingrey (GA)
Carter	Gingrey (GA)	
Cassidy		
Castle		
Chaffetz		
Childers		
Coble		
Coffman (CO)		
Cole		
Conaway		
Crenshaw		

NOT VOTING—20

Bachmann	Hoekstra	Reyes
Barrett (SC)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Culberson	Kirk	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (AL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	T.
Davis (IL)	Massa	Smith (WA)
Deal (GA)	Murtha	Souder
Gutierrez	Radanovich	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1227

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.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.