

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. 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 411, noes 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

AYES—411

Ackerman	Conyers	Herger
Aderholt	Cooper	Herseth Sandlin
Adler (NJ)	Higgins	Hiro
Alexander	Costello	Hill
Altmire	Courtney	Himes
Andrews	Crenshaw	Hinchey
Arcuri	Critz	Hinojosa
Austria	Crowley	Hirono
Baca	Cuellar	Holden
Bachmann	Cummings	Holt
Bachus	Dahlkemper	Honda
Baird	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Hunter
Barrett (SC)	Davis (KY)	Inglis
Barrow	Davis (TN)	Inslee
Bartlett	DeFazio	Israel
Barton (TX)	DeGette	Issa
Bean	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Becerra	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Berkley	Dent	(TX)
Berman	Deutch	Jenkins
Berry	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (GA)
Biggert	Dicks	Johnson (IL)
Bilbray	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Billirakis	Djou	Jordan (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kagen
Bishop (NY)	Donnelly (IN)	Kanjorski
Bishop (UT)	Doyle	Kaptur
Blackburn	Dreier	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Driehaus	Kildee
Blunt	Duncan	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boccieri	Edwards (MD)	Kilroy
Boehner	Edwards (TX)	Kind
Bonner	Ehlers	King (IA)
Bono Mack	Ellison	Kingston
Boozman	Ellsworth	Kirk
Boren	Emerson	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boswell	Engel	Kissell
Boucher	Eshoo	Klein (FL)
Boustany	Etheridge	Kline (MN)
Boyd	Farr	Kosmas
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kratovil
Brady (TX)	Filner	Kucinich
Bralley (IA)	Flake	Lamborn
Bright	Fleming	Lance
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Langevin
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	Larsen (WA)
Brown, Corrine	Foster	Larson (CT)
Brown-Waite,	Fox	Latham
Ginny	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Lee (CA)
Burton (IN)	Fudge	Lee (NY)
Butterfield	Gallely	Levin
Buyer	Garamendi	Lewis (CA)
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (GA)
Camp	Gerlach	Linder
Campbell	Giffords	Lipinski
Cantor	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Cao	Gohmert	Loeb
Capito	Gonzalez	Lowey
Capps	Goodlatte	Lucas
Cardoza	Gordon (TN)	Luetkemeyer
Carnahan	Granger	Lujan
Carney	Graves (GA)	Lummis
Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	Lungren, Daniel
Carter	Grayson	E.
Cassidy	Green, Al	Lynch
Castle	Green, Gene	Mack
Castor (FL)	Griffith	Maffei
Chaffetz	Grijalva	Maloney
Chandler	Guthrie	Manzullo
Childers	Gutierrez	Marchant
Chu	Hall (NY)	Markey (CO)
Clarke	Hall (TX)	Markey (MA)
Clay	Halvorson	Marshall
Cleaver	Hare	Matheson
Clyburn	Harman	Matsui
Coble	Harper	McCarthy (CA)
Coffman (CO)	Hastings (FL)	McCauley
Cohen	Hastings (WA)	McClintock
Cole	Heinrich	McCollum
Conaway	Heller	McCotter
Connolly (VA)	Hensarling	McDermott

McGovern	Poe (TX)	Sires
McHenry	Polis (CO)	Skelton
McIntyre	Pomeroy	Slaughter
McKeon	Posey	Smith (NE)
McMahon	Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
McMorris	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
Rodgers	Putnam	Snyder
McNerney	Quigley	Space
Meek (FL)	Rahall	Speier
Meeks (NY)	Rangel	Spratt
Melancon	Rehberg	Stark
Mica	Reichert	Stearns
Michaud	Reyes	Stupak
Miller (FL)	Richardson	Sullivan
Miller (MI)	Rodriguez	Sutton
Miller (NC)	Roe (TN)	Tanner
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
Miller, George	Rogers (KY)	Teague
Minnick	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Mitchell	Rohrabacher	Thompson (CA)
Mollohan	Rooney	Thompson (MS)
Moore (WI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Moran (KS)	Roskam	Thornberry
Moran (VA)	Ross	Tiberi
Murphy (CT)	Rothman (NJ)	Tierney
Murphy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Titus
Murphy, Patrick	Royce	Tonko
Murphy, Tim	Ruppersberger	Towns
Myrick	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Nadler (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Napolitano	Salazar	Upton
Neal (MA)	Sanchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Neugebauer	T.	Velázquez
Nunes	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Nye	Sarbanes	Walden
Oberstar	Scalise	Walz
Obey	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Olson	Schauer	Schultz
Oliver	Schiff	Waters
Owens	Schmidt	Watson
Pallone	Schock	Watt
Pascarella	Schrader	Waxman
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Weiner
Paul	Scott (GA)	Welch
Paulsen	Scott (VA)	Westmoreland
Payne	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Pence	Serrano	Wilson (OH)
Perlmutter	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Perriello	Sestak	Wittman
Peters	Shadegg	Wolf
Peterson	Shea-Porter	Woolsey
Petri	Sherman	Wu
Pingree (ME)	Shimkus	Yarmuth
Pitts	Shuler	Young (AK)
Platts	Simpson	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

□ 1422

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1264, MULTIPLE PERIL INSURANCE ACT OF 2009

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on

Rules, I call up House Resolution 1549 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1549

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1264) to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide for the national flood insurance program to make available multiperil coverage for damage resulting from windstorms or floods, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas).

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I am pleased to yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). And all time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1549.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 1549 provides for consideration of H.R. 1264, the Multiple Peril Insurance Act. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Financial Services. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, there is not a person in the Chamber today who can forget the terrible destruction left in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina 5 short years ago. Lives were lost, homes were destroyed, businesses closed. Schools and hospitals were underwater. Our Nation has never been the same.

The damage that Katrina inflicted on New Orleans and across the Gulf States left thousands of people homeless. There were refugees spread across more than a dozen States. I think I speak for all of us when I say the storm left an indelible mark on our collective psyche.

Although the storm and accompanying flood exposed many troubling failings, one of the most alarming was the fact that so many people who believed that they had adequate insurance, in fact, were not covered for Katrina's destruction.

Why? Because insurance companies engaged in a maddening shell game with homeowners about their coverage. Damage that seemed obviously caused by water would be attributed to wind, while wind damage was chalked up to flooding. The stalemate left far too many people with no claim.

The apparent loophole in coverage made it very difficult for many families to rebuild in the months and years after the storm. The same problem has cropped up after other hurricanes or large storms have struck over the years.

In the aftermath of Katrina, Congress worked collaboratively on legislation to address the coverage gap; and 3 years ago, legislation to do just that was approved by the House. However, the plan was unable to win passage in the Senate, so we are here again to try.

Despite the challenges, it is our contention that taxpayers will actually end up saving significant amounts of money if this type of coverage is made available to Americans.

In the aftermath of Katrina, the Federal Government spent more than \$34 billion on rental assistance, on vouchers, trailers, grants to homeowners and Small Business Administration disaster loans to homeowners.

Had there been a public option available to allow property owners to purchase insurance that provided seamless coverage of hurricane losses, some of that cost might have been avoided. With this bill we accomplish that goal.

The bill creates a new program within the National Flood Insurance Program to purchase both flood and wind storm insurance under one multi-peril policy, or to purchase wind storm coverage to supplement their already existing flood insurance.

It is a bipartisan bill and has been endorsed by the National Association of Home Builders, and the National Association of Realtors. The bill is also PAYGO compliant, since the program is required to pay for itself.

The most important thing to remember about this legislation is it simply gives Americans the option of buying coverage of getting some peace of mind.

The issue is far too important for us to wait around for the next round of storms like Katrina or Ike or Gustav to roar ashore and leave far too many families with nothing. This bill is a simple and effective way to permit people to purchase insurance so the next storm does not leave them high and dry.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the chairwoman of the Rules Committee for yielding me this time, my friend, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

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

Madam Speaker, this will be the 34th time I have handled a rule on the House floor, and this will be the 34th

time I have yet to handle one open rule this session of Congress. In fact, over the 130-plus rules this Congress, we have not yet debated an open rule. I guess I could add the word yet, but I would presume that moving forward during this session of Congress I don't think we expect to. What a shame, Madam Speaker.

I don't believe that closing debate or limiting amendments or shutting down Members of Congress who are elected by their colleagues and peers back home to come and represent them, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, makes a lot of sense. As a matter of fact, I think it's wrong. Yet today here we are again with my handling of the 34th time this session a closed rule.

I would once again question this agenda. I would question the agenda of the majority party, the Democratic Party, that we already know is about taxing, spending, and more rules and regulations, and more debt to this great Nation. But I think that it's important to look at how bad process delivers a bad outcome. And today that's exactly what we're looking at again, another flawed process to bring something to this floor that should be treated more respectfully than the topic that it is.

But I am going to use my time also to talk about some Republican ideas. One thing I have the opportunity today, Madam Speaker, is to call for a vote on the previous question to allow for this week's YouCut winner. We've over the weeks heard about YouCut.

YouCut is a Republican idea that's an online idea. It's a voting tool, a tool where people who are back home have an opportunity to pick what they consider to be wasteful government spending, something which this Congress is incapable of doing because the agenda does not allow for making wiser choices or even feedback from our colleagues about how we would cut and make this government more efficient. Over a million Americans have voted this week alone.

This week's YouCut winner is the elimination of subsidies to first-class seats on Amtrak's long-distance routes. This initiative would yield \$1.2 billion in savings over 10 years. And these people who have voted are hard-working Americans who are paying attention to what we're doing here in Washington. They don't want to have their tax dollars subsidize first-class travel on Amtrak.

I have long advocated for reforming Amtrak, especially the long-distance routes. These routes lose money year after year after year. They continue to receive money from the Federal Government, and Amtrak has no incentive to improve their operations as long as Uncle, that's Uncle Sam, is willing to pay.

This Congress I have introduced H.R. 5377, a bill that would require Amtrak to eliminate service on long-distance routes whose total direct costs are more than twice the revenue. That is,

where the costs are more than twice the revenue that comes in, the Federal Government should not be paying for that. The taxpayers should no longer be footing the bill for Amtrak's inefficiencies. And today you're going to have a chance to hear from the Republicans about how we think we ought to streamline this government and provide savings to the taxpayer.

Additionally, we're here today to discuss H.R. 1264, which would expand the National Flood Insurance Program, known as NFIP, to include wind storm insurance coverage. But once again today, based on the agenda that this Democratic majority has, it would create a massive new government program to offer government-paid coverage backed with taxpayer dollars. And while this legislation may be well-intended, I have no doubt that it would have a crushing impact on a very fragile U.S. job market that would add billions to the Federal deficit. That's why we're talking about YouCut today.

We're talking about YouCut today because the bill we're getting ready to pass here in just a few minutes is not even paid for. And our friends in the majority keep talking about, oh, we pay for things. We make the tough decisions. Well, another day in Washington where another tough decision is not being made by the leadership of this House, and the agenda of taxing and spending and more debt and long-term destruction of the free enterprise system is exactly what's on the floor of the House today with this bill.

Transferring these liabilities from the private sector to the NFIP would be fiscally irresponsible. The NFIP currently owes the U.S. Treasury over \$18 billion—yet we're going to give them some more, we're going to empower them some more—the amount that it's been forced to borrow from the American taxpayers to pay claims and expenses in excess of the premiums collected.

Since 2006, the Government Accountability Office has included the NFIP on its list of high-risk government programs in need of comprehensive reform. And here today we're empowering a program that's on the high-risk series and encouraging them to do more business, taking business from the free enterprise system.

Additionally, the Property and Casualty Insurance Association of America, known as PCI, estimates that the legislation will eliminate 41,775 private-sector jobs so that Uncle Sam and the government can add jobs.

Madam Speaker, that is the hallmark of this Democrat majority. It is to empower the government against the free enterprise system. We saw this in May numbers, when the May numbers came out, 431,000 net new jobs. And our friends in the Democrats come down every day and say, Look at us, look at all these jobs we're creating. Yeah, 431,000 jobs in May, but of that figure 400,000 were government jobs. They were census jobs, they were temporary

jobs, and you're trying to fool this country. In Texas, if we were in the Texas legislature, that would be deceptive advertising. It should be deceptive advertising in Washington and be against the law.

With an unemployment rate at 9.5 percent and a loss of over 3 million jobs since January of 2009, now is not the time to be diminishing more. That's 41,775 jobs is the estimate. By increasing the taxpayers' exposure also, this program is \$22.1 billion in premiums that could be taken out of our economy. But it doesn't stop there. More than \$20 billion of investment in mutual, municipal, State, and local bonds will completely dry up. A line of business that the free enterprise system handled that the government did not need to. And government at all levels, State, Federal, and local, will lose billions in tax revenue from the free enterprise system.

During the last Congress, the Senate rejected this proposal by a vote of 74 to 19. Even the administration, shockingly, even the administration voiced opposition to adding wind to the NFIP, citing concerns that it would threaten the long-term viability of the program. Exactly right. It's called bankruptcy. Never forget the taxpayer is there, so it probably won't go bankrupt.

With the current Federal crisis, the financial crisis, and the government crisis, and record unemployment, why would the majority party be pushing for legislation to make unemployment worse? Or would this simply be to help the U.S. Treasury? I don't know. But either way it's government jobs. And I guess we should be careful and not complain too much, because I guess Uncle Sam needs the help.

Madam Speaker, the voices of the American public have been clear. Americans want pro-growth solutions that will encourage job creation and investment and that would keep Americans competitive with the world. Instead, today we find 41,000 more jobs that will dry up in the free enterprise system, jobs back home.

□ 1440

This legislation further diminishes not only these jobs but adds billions of dollars to our national debt. That is the hallmark of this administration and this Congress: more taxing, more spending, more taking of jobs from the free enterprise system to the government, and perhaps worst of all, a debt we may never, ever pay for.

When my friends on the other side of the aisle start to promote positive solutions instead of federalizing more sectors of our free enterprise system, they can count on receiving our support. I can't do it today. Today's another vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

We don't have hurricanes in Rochester, New York—for which we are ex-

tremely grateful. But all of us were affected by Katrina. All of us saw what happened to the city that we all loved. New Orleans belongs to every American. All of us have friends here in the House and some in the Senate who lost everything they had. These were people who had insurance on their homes. They thought they were covered. But because the fact the insurance companies said no, they would come to your house, which may have been completely overwhelmed with water, and say that was wind damage; we don't cover that. With the whipsawing back and forth, so many people lost everything they had.

As I said in my opening statement, the government paid \$34 billion to try to house and maintain people until we could find a permanent solution. If by passing this bill we can avoid that kind of expenditure again, I would call that money well spent. This program is self-sufficient, it is paid for by the premiums.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy in permitting me to speak on the rule.

I will support the rule, but I rise in reluctant opposition to the legislation.

I sympathize with my good friend from Mississippi and admire his passion and commitment to this issue and his tireless effort to try and help his constituents who have been put in a horrible situation in the aftermath of Katrina. But I do think this bill is a classic example of how our empathy interacts with a system that doesn't work to cloud our judgment and leads us to consider action that would actually make things worse over the long haul.

As Mr. TAYLOR has forcefully argued, Katrina exposed many problems with the National Flood Insurance Program. The confusion about wind and flood damage and the difficulty that his constituents had in getting insurance companies to cover their losses after Katrina is unacceptable. That was why I was pleased to support his amendment to the Flood Insurance Reform Act on the floor last week that would prohibit the write-your-own insurance companies from excluding wind damage under their own policy solely because flooding also caused damage to the property. I think that will go far in preventing insurance companies from taking advantage of consumers or the Federal taxpayers.

But extending the flood insurance program to cover wind hazards is like slapping a Band-Aid on a broken bone and then putting the patient on a skateboard while the bones are still mending.

I strongly support the goals of the flood insurance program and know that it has played an important role in insuring many American communities while encouraging mitigation and reducing risks. But with each additional disaster, it becomes clearer and clearer that the program is broken.

Right now, as my good friend from Texas pointed out, it's \$19 billion in debt. Adding for wind coverage, even if it's supposed to be actuarially sound, will only make this worse.

Now, it is very likely to result in significant short-term losses for the flood insurance program. Even though CBO has given the bill a neutral score, that's based on a highly questionable assumption that FEMA will charge actuarial rates that fully cover wind losses despite a 40-year history of failing to do so for flood losses. FEMA doesn't have the ability to calculate what actuarial rates for wind coverage should be, much less enforce them.

As Robert Hunter, who ran the program in the 1970s, has said, Poor management at FEMA—You're doing a heck of a job, Brownie—and lax enforcement of building requirements by local government has meant that the program hasn't worked the way it was supposed to. Some have even argued that it actually even encourages development in hazardous areas.

Let me speak for a moment about the building code requirements under this legislation. The NFIB already subsidizes unwise construction in floodplains, and this would make it worse. While the bill requires the adoption of building codes to mitigate against wind losses, this is not strong enough. It doesn't address development in hazardous areas itself, and by increasing the availability of Federally backed insurance in hazardous areas, this bill will give people a false sense of security and provide incentives for development in those various areas. And there is a serious gap in the actual enforcement of those building codes.

The current problems with the flood insurance programs must be addressed before we can even think of expanding it to cover yet more hazards.

The experts on flood insurance agree. The administration sent up a statement of administration policy against the bill yesterday. The bill is opposed by FEMA, the Association of State Floodplain Managers, the insurance and reinsurance industry, the environmental community, Taxpayers for Common Sense, the National Taxpayers Union, and the Consumer Federation of America. They argue that it would expand a broken program, further encourage development in hazardous areas by giving people a false sense of security, have the Federal Government unfairly compete in the private insurance market, and put the American taxpayer further at risk.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Richmond, Virginia, the minority whip, the favorite son from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I rise in opposition to the previous question.

With over 1.3 million votes cast and counting, the YouCut movement continues to give people across America a

voice to help put a stop to Washington's never-ending shopping spree.

House Republicans have already offered \$120 billion in commonsense spending reductions. Yet week in and week out, the majority has astoundingly voted against the will of the people.

Proposed by Congressman MAC THORNBERRY of Texas, this week's YouCut winner highlights the latest example of egregious government waste.

Despite the fact that only 16 percent of Amtrak passengers choose sleeper class fare, which includes a turndown service and private entertainment, taxpayers are on the hook for more than twice as much for these passengers compared to those who ride in coach.

During these increasingly tough economic times, is it really fair to ask taxpayers to subsidize turndown service and pre-paid movies? The American people have emphatically said "no."

Just days ago, Madam Speaker, four House Democrats bucked their party's leadership to form a working group they say is devoted to cutting wasteful spending. As my House Republican colleagues and I have said since YouCut's launch, tackling our staggering national debt is not a partisan calling. It's an American calling because our country is at a crossroads.

It is only logical then, Madam Speaker, that the new Democratic group would support the elimination of first class Amtrak subsidies and save taxpayers up to \$1.2 billion over the next decade. I urge them, as well as all of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to join us in voting to bring this week's YouCut to the floor for a vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Clarendon, Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that most Americans don't realize is to what extent the Speaker, through the Rules Committee, controls this House and even what we can vote on. She determines what bills will be brought here, even what amendments may be offered. And there are very few ways to get another issue even considered here.

But that's what this next vote is about. It's about trying to get a vote on a proposal that most people who went on the YouCut Web site this week have chosen as something that should at least get a vote.

Now the gentleman from Mississippi has a serious proposal on the floor. But there are other serious proposals which ought to be considered as well.

□ 1450

One of them is to cut the subsidy that goes to Amtrak's sleeper class service.

Madam Speaker, the facts are this. Sixteen percent of the people who ride

Amtrak's long distance routes, 16 percent, choose the sleeper class service. Everybody else rides in coach, but the people who choose the sleeper class service, as the whip mentioned, get a private compartment, usually a private bathroom. They have turndown service where somebody comes and pulls back their sheets at night. They have unlimited meals in the dining car, all a very nice thing, but the problem is the taxpayers subsidize an average \$396 per ticket for every one of those people who choose that sleeper class service. You add it all up and it ends up being actually more than \$1 billion over 10 years that the taxpayers subsidize the people who choose the sleeper class service.

Now, our proposal doesn't eliminate that service. It doesn't change any Amtrak routes. It just says, if you're going to have that service, you ought to pay the cost of it. You ought to pay the cost of what you buy. I don't think that's terribly revolutionary, but it saves more than \$1 billion to the taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, in January I got to speak to a bunch of high school seniors in Randall High School in my district. At that time, their share of the national debt was about \$39,000. Today, their share of the national debt is \$42,739.

I think the next vote hinges on this question: Is it worth \$1 billion of subsidies for sleeper class service to add to the debt that those high school seniors have to pay? That's the question the Members will answer with the next vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) makes a great point, and we can today on the floor of this House of Representatives add to this bill with its own merits by saying let's also, as we're adding billions of dollars, at least simplify government and cut a billion off of what it does. It makes sense to me, and I applaud the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for his great YouCut suggestion.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wheaton, Illinois, PETE ROSKAM.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman.

You know, if you were going to sit around and come up with a movie script of absurdity, you couldn't come up with a script that was this real. In other words, taxpayers out subsidizing first class passenger travel on railcars throughout the United States? If you trotted that out to Hollywood and said, "Oh, we've got one for you," the Hollywood types would throw it away and laugh at you and say there's no way, that's completely unrealistic, except in this Congress.

Congressman THORNBERRY from Texas has figured out by carefully reading an Inspector General report of the Department of Transportation that there is a way to save \$1 billion over 10

years. Now, think about that. You know something very interesting. You don't hear anybody coming to the floor, Madam Speaker, to defend this practice of subsidizing first class rail treatment. The reason is nobody can do it with a straight face. Nobody can say, Oh, no, no, no. We need to subsidize movies on Amtrak. We need to subsidize prepaid meals. We need to subsidize honest-to-goodness the bed turndown service in the sleeper car.

How absurd is that?

So oftentimes in political life we're asked what would you cut. What would you cut? How would you balance this budget? Well, I tell you what. You've got a whole host of Republicans that say let's vote "no" on this previous question and let's take up this effort, this time, this afternoon to cut \$1 billion.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the gentlewoman if she has any further speakers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. At this moment, I do not.

May I inquire of the gentleman if he's ready to close?

Mr. SESSIONS. I wanted to ask the gentlewoman if she had additional speakers. I received a good answer. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentlewoman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. May I inquire if the gentleman is ready to close?

Mr. SESSIONS. I have about 45 or 50 more speakers, and I will consume my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thirty-five or 50?

Mr. SESSIONS. I have a number of speakers. We did not receive enough time in this rule to be able to provide enough time for our speakers. It's a very important topic for us, and I understand that you don't have any speakers, but we've got a bunch. So, yes, ma'am, I do intend to use my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I know we're going to have a big debate on flood insurance and wind insurance and I'm going to be participating in that, but I wanted to talk about, obviously, the YouCut program.

There is nothing that is upsetting to more people across the State of West Virginia that I see every day than the overspending, the debt and deficit that is just overwhelming them and this country. But the YouCut program, since its inception, 1.3 million Americans have weighed in on where they think we can cut government spending. Folks from all across America are tightening their budgets. This summer, they're deciding? Can we go on vacation. Can we go for 2 days. Can we go for a week. Can we fly. Can we drive. Should we go out to dinner? Should we stay in?

All these are economic questions that we ask in our families every single

Now why is this significant? Well, NOAA, the Navy Oceanographic Lab and others went back and looked at the events that were called Hurricane Katrina, and NOAA tells us that for 4 hours before the storm surge arrived in south Mississippi, that house, the house before it, was subjected to hurricane-force winds for 4 hours before the water ever got there. Yet the insurance

companies wanted to turn around and blame everything on the water. Why? Because they could stick the taxpayers with the bill.

The next house is a more typical home, more modest home. This one is about a mile inland, about a mile inland, pretty good ways from the water. Beautiful home. This is what the folks who lived there, when they left, looked at last.

This is what they came home to.

It's not just three houses; it's not 30 houses. It was 30,000 houses that this happened to. So, again, these folks, knowing this was a big part of their lives, had \$249,000 worth of insurance. Their insurance company was slightly more generous than the previous two times and offered them \$10,000.

Now, Mr. SESSIONS points out that, incorrectly, that maybe government shouldn't be doing this. Well, maybe he doesn't talk to his folks in his State capital often enough because if he had he would know that his State is already doing this.

In the aftermath of Katrina, on a State-by-State basis, the insurance industry pulled out, left a vacuum. People had to have some form of wind insurance; and so on a State-by-State basis, the State picked up that obligation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 4 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the gentleman's State of Texas, the Texas wind pool in 2004 had an exposure of \$20.8 billion. That has expanded to \$58.6 billion. That's not private sector that's going to pay that bill; that's the Texas wind pool. They are on the hook for that.

In my home State of Mississippi, it has gone from \$1.6 billion to \$6.3 billion. I can't speak for every State, but I can tell you that pretty well equals the Mississippi State budget. If there was a catastrophic storm in Mississippi that hit all three coastal counties on one day—and, by the way, that's happened three times in my lifetime—it would break the State of Mississippi.

Now, at some point they are going to come up and say, well, they have got reinsurance, okay. Almost all the reinsurance is out of the Bahamas and the Caymans. So let me ask you a simple question: If the Benvenuttis couldn't get a company out of Illinois to pay their claim, if the Haddens couldn't get a company out of Illinois to pay their claim, if the other family couldn't get a company out of Illinois to pay their claim, does anyone really think a company from the Bahamas is going to willingly write these checks? Who is kidding whom?

On a State-by-State basis, Florida has gone from \$2.2 billion to \$436 billion; South Carolina, \$6 billion to \$17 billion; Georgia, the gentleman from Georgia's State, \$565 million to \$2.1 billion, a 265 percent increase, not private sector, State liability.

So why do we want to do this? Because, quite honestly, the purpose of

insurance, to people who pay their premium, to live the way they are supposed to, but they want the certainty that if something bad happens to them, they are going to get paid.

□ 1510

Secondly, why should the Nation do it? Because, quite frankly, it would break any one of these States. The chances of every coastal county in Mississippi getting hit all in the same day has happened three times in my lifetime. In 2004, Florida had four catastrophic storms, hit almost every square inch of the State. But the chances of the same storm hitting every State on the same day is minuscule. And if it does happen, don't worry about paying claims, it's just going to be called Armageddon.

So what we are proposing is a program that, instead of letting the private sector collect the premiums and the Nation pay the bill, would allow people to, as an extension, as an option to their flood insurance, pay for a wind option. That way if they come home to nothing, if they come home to a substantially destroyed house, it doesn't matter if the wind did it, it doesn't matter if the water did it; the fact is they built their house the way they were supposed to, they built it in a place that was safe, they paid their premiums, and they are going to get paid.

The last point of course the insurance industry doesn't want to tell you, so I will. In the same year the National Flood Insurance Program lost \$18 billion they made \$48 billion in profits. Why? Pretty simple. They collected the premiums; you, the taxpayer, paid the bill. You paid the bill for the FEMA trailers because, again, a typical insurance policy says if your house is destroyed, if your house is damaged to where you can't live in it, they will pay to put you up. But when they denied these claims in full, as they did thousands of times, then someone had to do something. President Bush, to his credit, stepped forward and said we're going to make FEMA trailers available. That cost the taxpayers \$4.3 billion; \$7.2 billion for temporary housing; CDBG grants totaling \$15.4 billion. And what was one of the prerequisites to get a CDBG grant? You had to have insurance and you didn't get paid. So who paid that bill? Uncle Sam, you, the taxpayers paid that bill. Lastly, SBA disaster loan, \$7.6 billion. So for a total bill of \$34.5 billion. It wasn't \$18 billion the Nation lost that year, it was over \$50 billion. We are trying to change that. We are trying to come up with a program where the premiums pay for the program.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. So, again, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this to the floor.

I would remind my Republican colleagues that in the 12 years that they ran the House, I don't ever recall a vote on cutting the subsidy for Amtrak. I would have voted with you, but I just don't remember your bringing it up.

So let's talk about this problem this day. I would remind my Republican colleagues that on a regular basis they come to the floor and say, you know what? We shouldn't be doing all these things that don't make sense, all these things that don't contribute to each other. Amtrak is not an insurance problem. This is an insurance program. It is a single-shot bill to do one thing, and that's to let those people who want to buy wind insurance as an option to their flood insurance so that they will know that if they paid their premiums, they built their house the way they were supposed to, if something horrible happens they will get paid.

Mr. SESSIONS. By the way, the gentleman from Mississippi is a very dear friend of mine with whom I engage on a regular basis. I just want the gentleman to know that while I know that under Speaker PELOSI we don't have any process with appropriations to strike or amend any appropriations bills, for 12 years I brought an Amtrak cut bill to this floor. So I will be providing that information, and I look forward to the gentleman joining me as soon as we get a Republican majority that will allow that to take place on the floor of this House, an open process.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Savannah, Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

While I oppose the rule and the bill, I want to say with great emphasis what a fiscal conservative my friend from Mississippi is, and how I know that he is struggling to find a solution to something that I would agree is a problem.

Now, I live in Savannah. I have a house on the waterfront, and I also have a beach house, so I have to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program and in the State wind-storm pool. And Mr. TAYLOR is right, if you've ever dealt with them, it is a pain in the neck. The bureaucracy is horrible, getting the claims paid is a really big problem. The debate as to what is flood and what is wind and what is wind-driven water is very complicated. And the insurance companies will get no sympathy from me on this situation.

The problem is that here we are again under the Pelosi Congress with a closed rule in which none of us can offer an amendment. I mean, think about that. We're all elected, 435 Members representing 600,000 people, and yet we're not allowed to offer an amendment because the Rules Committee has to play favorites. And unless you're on the A list, you can't offer an amendment, even though you

still represent 600,000 people like everyone else here. So we can't improve this.

A couple of suggestions I would have said is, why not give the State insurance commissioners—since, as my friend knows, insurance is a State matter, the McCarran-Ferguson Act, Public Law 15, says that States will regulate insurance. And why not make sure the insurance commissioners have the authority to say to an insurance company, if you want to sell insurance in my State, then you're going to have to take a percentage of the flood or the windstorm exposure? Give him the power to twist their arms. Because I can tell you, having been in the insurance system—I'm a CPCU, that's a Chartered Property Casualty Underwriter—that insurance companies will cede anything, anything that's difficult they will be glad to let the State government or the Federal Government take all the flood claims, take the crime claims, take the DUI drivers. They want the unprofitable stuff off their books because they make money two different ways, one is an underwriting profit, the other one is an investment profit.

Now, ironically, right now we're in a soft market. Insurance premiums on the commercial side are actually going down because insurance companies, for some unknown reason, are making their money elsewhere. So I think what Mr. TAYLOR is saying is right, there are some things that are going on, and an insurance commissioner should be able to get to the bottom of it. But again, since we can't amend this to try to put language like that in there, we need to bring this rule down to send the bill back to committee.

Now, I want to say we almost got through today without a new Federal program—I thought it might happen. This is a new Federal program. We did pass \$34 billion onto the next generation in increased debt—which I know some people were clapping about, I don't exactly follow that. We have a \$1.4 trillion deficit, the largest debt in the history of the Nation, 90 percent of our GDP, and yet we have Members on the Democrat side clapping about \$34 billion in new debt.

Now, put this in context. May of 2008, a Bush stimulus bill—which I voted against—\$168 billion; it did not create jobs. Bear Stearns bailout by the Federal Reserve in March of 2008, \$29 billion. Fannie Mae bailout, \$200 billion in July of 2008. September of 2008, AIG bailout—again by the Federal Reserve—\$85 billion, now up to \$140 billion. And then we had the infamous TARP, \$700 billion. I voted “no” on that. Then here comes the stimulus bill to keep unemployment from going to 8 percent. Unemployment at the time was 7.6 percent, and \$800 billion later we're at 10 percent unemployment. We are right now borrowing 37 cents on every dollar we spend. I hope you will vote the rule down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes re-

maining; the gentlewoman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman from Texas closes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York for not only this time but getting through this thing.

Madam Speaker, as you can see, Republicans, and at least one Democrat, have a lot to talk about. I wish we had more time today. Republicans would have liked a lot more time to make sure that we could talk about not only this bill, but the implications that are on the floor.

Republicans continue to offer, Madam Speaker, commonsense solutions to rein in the current spending spree, a spending spree that's now in its fourth year by this Democrat majority. We, like the American people, would like transparency and accountability and common sense, creation of jobs, not the extension of unemployment benefits that are not paid for.

□ 1520

We believe in people having jobs, and if this majority were serious and if this administration were serious, they would do the things that work rather than the things that don't work. They are doing things that don't work, Madam Speaker, and that is what this Democrat majority will be held accountable for. It's really a sad thing to hear person after person who has lost his job, and people whom I know, and to see the malaise this country is in.

Madam 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. The legislation before us today brings more uncertainty to the long-term solvency of the NFIP. This legislation risks more American jobs and adds more to our State, local, and Federal deficits. It is true, as the gentleman spoke of, that States take this on. It is a State's responsibility, not the Federal Government's, but that is part of what this agenda is all about. For this reason, I encourage a “no” vote on the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I want to remind those persons listening, particularly Members of Congress who are going to come to the floor to vote, that we are not voting on Amtrak cars. We are talking about legislation to try to protect those Americans who are victims of hurricanes and other related natural disasters from losing everything the way the gulf coast victims of Katrina have. The bill will help ensure that the insurance loopholes will be closed and that hardworking Ameri-

cans won't be denied legitimate claims when they desperately need them.

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

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1549 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 5801) to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the subsidization of Amtrak sleeper car service, 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. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5801.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the

opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 179, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—234

Ackerman	Berry	Capps
Adler (NJ)	Bishop (GA)	Cardoza
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Carnahan
Andrews	Blumenauer	Carney
Arcuri	Boren	Carson (IN)
Baca	Boswell	Castor (FL)
Baird	Boucher	Chandler
Baldwin	Boyd	Childers
Barrow	Brady (PA)	Chu
Bean	Braley (IA)	Clarke
Becerra	Bright	Clay
Berkley	Brown, Corrine	Cleaver
Berman	Butterfield	Clyburn

Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Conyers	Kagen	Rahall
Cooper	Kanjorski	Rangel
Costa	Kaptur	Reyes
Costello	Kennedy	Richardson
Courtney	Kildee	Rodriguez
Critz	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ross
Crowley	Kilroy	Rothman (NJ)
Cuellar	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kissell	Ruppersberger
Dahlkemper	Klein (FL)	Rush
Davis (CA)	Kosmas	Ryan (OH)
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Salazar
Davis (TN)	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	T.
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Delahunt	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Levin	Schakowsky
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Schauer
Dicks	Lipinski	Schiff
Dingell	Loeb	Schrader
Doggett	Lowey	Schwartz
Donnelly (IN)	Luján	Scott (GA)
Doyle	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Driehaus	Maffei	Serrano
Edwards (MD)	Maloney	Sestak
Edwards (TX)	Markey (MA)	Shea-Porter
Ellison	Marshall	Sherman
Engel	Matheson	Shuler
Eshoo	Matsui	Sires
Etheridge	McCarthy (NY)	Skeltton
Farr	McCollum	Slaughter
Fattah	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Finer	McGovern	Snyder
Foster	McMahon	Space
Frank (MA)	Meek (FL)	Speier
Fudge	Meeks (NY)	Spratt
Garamendi	Melancon	Stark
Gonzalez	Michaud	Stupak
Gordon (TN)	Miller (NC)	Sutton
Grayson	Miller, George	Tanner
Green, Al	Moore (KS)	Taylor
Green, Gene	Moore (WI)	Teague
Grijalva	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Hall (NY)	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Halvorson	Murphy (NY)	Titus
Hare	Murphy, Patrick	Tonko
Harman	Nadler (NY)	Towns
Hastings (FL)	Napolitano	Tsongas
Heinrich	Neal (MA)	Van Hollen
Hereth Sandlin	Oberstar	Velázquez
Higgins	Obey	Visclosky
Himes	Olver	Walz
Hinchey	Owens	Wasserman
Hinojosa	Pallone	Schultz
Hirono	Pascrell	Waters
Holden	Pastor (AZ)	Watson
Holt	Payne	Watt
Honda	Perlmutter	Waxman
Hoyer	Perriello	Weiner
Inslee	Peters	Welch
Israel	Peterson	Wilson (OH)
Jackson (IL)	Pingree (ME)	Woolsey
Jackson Lee	Polis (CO)	Wu
(TX)	Pomeroy	Yarmuth

NAYS—179

Aderholt	Campbell	Giffords
Akin	Cantor	Gingrey (GA)
Alexander	Cao	Gohmert
Austria	Capito	Goodlatte
Bachmann	Carter	Granger
Bachus	Cassidy	Graves (GA)
Barrett (SC)	Castle	Graves (MO)
Bartlett	Chaffetz	Griffith
Barton (TX)	Coble	Guthrie
Biggart	Coffman (CO)	Hall (TX)
Bilbray	Cole	Harper
Bilirakis	Conaway	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Heller
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Blunt	Dent	Hergert
Boccheri	Djou	Hill
Boehner	Dreier	Hunter
Bonner	Duncan	Inglis
Bono Mack	Ehlers	Issa
Boozman	Ellsworth	Jenkins
Boustany	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Flake	Johnson, Sam
Broun (GA)	Fleming	Jones
Brown (SC)	Forbes	Jordan (OH)
Brown-Waite,	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Ginny	Foxo	Kingston
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Burton (IN)	Gallegly	Kline (MN)
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Kratovil
Camp	Gerlach	Lamborn

Lance	Minnick	Ryan (WI)
Latham	Mitchell	Scalise
LaTourette	Moran (KS)	Schmidt
Latta	Murphy, Tim	Schock
Lee (NY)	Myrick	Sensenbrenner
Lewis (CA)	Neugebauer	Sessions
Linder	Nunes	Shadegg
LoBiondo	Nye	Shimkus
Lucas	Olson	Shuster
Luetkemeyer	Paul	Simpson
Lummis	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
Lungren, Daniel	Petri	Smith (NJ)
E.	Pitts	Smith (TX)
Mack	Platts	Stearns
Manzullo	Poe (TX)	Sullivan
Marchant	Posey	Terry
Markey (CO)	Price (GA)	Thompson (PA)
McCarthy (CA)	Putnam	Thornberry
McCaul	Radanovich	Tiberi
McClintock	Rehberg	Turner
McCotter	Reichert	Upton
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Walden
McIntyre	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Mica	Rooney	Wolf
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Young (FL)
Miller, Gary	Royce	

NOT VOTING—19

Buyer	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Capuano	Hodes	Pence
Culberson	Hoekstra	Tiahrt
Davis (AL)	King (NY)	Tierney
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lofgren, Zoe	Wamp
Diaz-Balart, M.	McNerney	
Fallin	Mollohan	

□ 1550

Messrs. SHIMKUS, MITCHELL, RYAN of Wisconsin, and MICA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SCHRADER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 228, noes 183, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

AYES—228

Ackerman	Butterfield	Crowley
Altmire	Cao	Cuellar
Andrews	Capps	Cummings
Arcuri	Cardoza	Dahlkemper
Baca	Carnahan	Davis (CA)
Baird	Carney	Davis (IL)
Baldwin	Carson (IN)	Davis (TN)
Barrow	Castor (FL)	DeFazio
Bean	Chandler	DeGette
Becerra	Childers	DeLauro
Berkley	Chu	Deutch
Berry	Clarke	Dicks
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Dingell
Bishop (NY)	Cleaver	Doggett
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Doyle
Boren	Cohen	Driehaus
Boswell	Connolly (VA)	Edwards (MD)
Boucher	Conyers	Edwards (TX)
Boyd	Cooper	Ellison
Brady (PA)	Costa	Engel
Braley (IA)	Courtney	Eshoo
Brown, Corrine	Critz	Etheridge

Farr	Loeb	Rothman (NJ)
Fattah	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Filner	Lujan	Ruppersberger
Foster	Lynch	Rush
Frank (MA)	Maffei	Ryan (OH)
Fudge	Maloney	Salazar
Garamendi	Markey (CO)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Gonzalez	Markey (MA)	Sarbanes
Gordon (TN)	Marshall	Schakowsky
Grayson	Matheson	Schauer
Green, Al	Matsui	Schiff
Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader
Grijalva	McCollum	Schwartz
Gutierrez	McDermott	Scott (GA)
Hall (NY)	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Hare	McIntyre	Serrano
Harman	McMahon	Sestak
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Shea-Porter
Heinrich	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Herseth Sandlin	Meeks (NY)	Sires
Higgins	Melancon	Skelton
Hinche	Michaud	Slaughter
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Smith (WA)
Hirono	Miller, George	Snyder
Holden	Mollohan	Space
Holt	Moore (KS)	Speier
Honda	Moore (WI)	Spratt
Hoyer	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Inlee	Murphy (CT)	Sutton
Israel	Murphy, Patrick	Tanner
Jackson (IL)	Nadler (NY)	Taylor
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Teague
(TX)	Neal (MA)	Thompson (CA)
Johnson (GA)	Nye	Thompson (MS)
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Titus
Kagen	Obey	Tonko
Kanjorski	Oliver	Towns
Kaptur	Owens	Tsongas
Kennedy	Pallone	Van Hollen
Kildee	Pascrell	Velázquez
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pastor (AZ)	Visclosky
Kilroy	Payne	Walz
Kind	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peterson	Schultz
Kissell	Pingree (ME)	Waters
Klein (FL)	Polis (CO)	Watson
Kosmas	Pomeroy	Watt
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Waxman
Langevin	Quigley	Weiner
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	Welch
Larson (CT)	Rangel	Wilson (OH)
Lee (CA)	Reyes	Woolsey
Levin	Richardson	Wu
Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez	Yarmuth
Lipinski	Ross	

NOES—183

Aderholt	Cole	Issa
Adler (NJ)	Conaway	Jenkins
Akin	Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)
Alexander	Davis (KY)	Johnson, Sam
Austria	Dent	Jones
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jordan (OH)
Bachus	Djou	King (IA)
Barrett (SC)	Donnelly (IN)	Kingston
Bartlett	Dreier	Kirk
Barton (TX)	Ehlers	Kline (MN)
Biggert	Ellsworth	Kratovil
Bilbray	Emerson	Lamborn
Bilirakis	Flake	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	Latham
Blackburn	Forbes	LaTourette
Blunt	Fortenberry	Latta
Boccieri	Fox	Lee (NY)
Boehner	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Bono Mack	Gallely	LoBiondo
Boozman	Garrett (NJ)	Lucas
Boustany	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX)	Giffords	Lummis
Bright	Gingrey (GA)	Lungren, Daniel E.
Brown (GA)	Gohmert	Mack
Brown (SC)	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Brown-Waite,	Granger	Marchant
Ginny	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Burgess	Griffith	McClintock
Burton (IN)	Guthrie	McCotter
Calvert	Hall (TX)	McHenry
Camp	Halvorson	McKeon
Campbell	Harper	McMorris
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Rodgers
Capito	Heller	Mica
Carter	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Cassidy	Herger	Miller (MI)
Castle	Hill	Miller, Gary
Chaffetz	Himes	Minnick
Coble	Hunter	Mitchell
Coffman (CO)	Inglis	

Moran (KS)	Reichert	Smith (NE)
Murphy (NY)	Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)
Murphy, Tim	Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)
Myrick	Rogers (KY)	Stark
Neugebauer	Rogers (MI)	Stearns
Nunes	Rohrabacher	Sullivan
Olson	Rooney	Terry
Paul	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Paulsen	Roskam	Thornberry
Perriello	Royce	Tiberi
Peters	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Petri	Scalise	Upton
Pitts	Schmidt	Walden
Platts	Schock	Westmoreland
Poe (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Posey	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Price (GA)	Shadegg	Wittman
Putnam	Shimkus	Wolf
Radanovich	Shuler	Young (AK)
Rehberg	Shuster	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Ortiz
Buyer	Duncan	Pence
Capuano	Fallin	Sanchez, Loretta
Costello	Hodes	Simpson
Culberson	Hoekstra	Tiahrt
Delahunt	King (NY)	Tierney
	Loftgren, Zoe	Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1611

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOYLE. Madam Speaker, I wish to inform the House that I was unavoidably detained by a medical situation and, consequently, missed the vote to approve the final version of H.R. 4213, the Unemployment Compensation Act Extension of 2010, earlier this afternoon.

I want to state for the RECORD that I would have voted in favor of the legislation today, as I did on previous occasions when it came before the House for a vote. I've been a consistent supporter of legislation to extend unemployment insurance benefits to Americans who have lost their jobs, and I regret not being here for the vote.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6 p.m. on Monday. The House, on Tuesday, will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list

of suspension bills, as is the practice, will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, we will consider the Transportation and HUD appropriations bill and the Military Construction and VA appropriations bill of 2011. We're also expected to consider items from the Senate, including Senate amendments to H.R. 4899, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2010. There are obviously other possibilities of bills coming from the Senate, and we will consider those as time permits.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that and would ask him if he could respond to some reports about several measures, perhaps, and the possibility of these measures coming to the floor next week, if he could give the House an update.

One would be the oil spill response legislation that's coming out of the Resources Committee, Energy and Commerce Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee; the small business taxpayer fund bill in the Senate; the FAA authorization bill from the Senate; the 9/11 compensation bill; and the Education and Labor OSHA bill relating to mining, if the gentleman could give us an update on those measures.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Rather than going into each one of them individually, I will say to the gentleman that each of those bills is under consideration. With respect to oil spills, there are significant discussions going on among the committees of jurisdiction, and we will, if we have a product to move forward, be prepared to do so.

We believe responding to the oil spill is critical. We've done so, as you know, with two bills this week, passed unanimously through the House, and so that we will be proceeding to look at the oil spill issue to try to ensure, to the extent we can, A, it doesn't happen again, and B, if it does happen, that we are prepared to respond to it and the industry is prepared to respond to it.

With respect to the other pieces of legislation, they are under discussion, some in this House and some in the Senate, as you know.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, and, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if the Members should be prepared for a possible Saturday session next week.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Possibly. I say to my friend that, because next week is our last week and we will be recessing for the August break at that point in time, I would put Members on notice that there will be certain matters that we must complete and that we will complete and, as a result, Members ought to make sure that they have flexibility for next Saturday.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader announced two appropriations bills for