

Once again, I would like to offer my sincere gratitude to our Nation's veterans and their families.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to address the persuasive and life-threatening challenges posed by domestic violence.

Mr. Speaker, according to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, as many as one in four women over the course of her lifetime will experience domestic violence. This is a crime that knows no geographical boundaries, a crime which knows no class boundaries, and a crime which does not come to the family from without but comes from within and transcends generations as children are scared and then replicate the behavior that unfortunately they saw in their families.

Mr. Speaker, around the United States and certainly in Connecticut. We've got wonderful organizations like the YWCA of Greenwich, the Center for Women and Families of Eastern Fairfield County, and the Domestic Violence Crisis Centers in Stamford and Norwalk doing wonderful work providing safety and comfort to victims of these crimes.

We should support those organizations, Mr. Speaker. But each and every one of us as fathers, as brothers, as community leaders, as Members of Congress should stand up and say we will put an end to this terribly destructive force.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2838, COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 455 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 455

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. 2838) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2012 through 2015, 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 amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infra-

structure now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print dated October 28, 2011. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of November 4, 2011, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to a measure addressing the applicability of the coastwise trade laws.

□ 0920

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WEBSTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may con-

sume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill.

House Resolution 455 provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 2838, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2011. The rule makes 18 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee in order for robust debate here in the House of Representatives: 10 of those 18 amendments made in order are Democrat-sponsored amendments; 7 are Republican amendments; and one is a bipartisan amendment.

Five information-gathering subcommittee hearings were held prior to this bill being reported out of committee. Further, this legislation passed out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee with bipartisan support by a voice vote.

The Coast Guard is comprised of nearly 100,000 military personnel, reservists, civilian employees, and auxiliary volunteers. It is one of the five branches of the armed services that constitutes our Armed Forces. The Coast Guard or its predecessors has defended this Nation in every war since 1790. Charged primarily with enforcing the laws of the United States in, under, and over the high seas and waters under American jurisdiction, the Coast Guard is asked to serve many functions simultaneously. This is important in my own State of Florida, which has the largest coastline of any of the 48 contiguous States. From drug interdiction to port security to border enforcement, the Coast Guard's reach is wide and its mission critical.

This bipartisan legislation authorizes appropriations through fiscal year 2015 for the Coast Guard to carry out all of its many responsibilities. It also authorizes appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission, including grants for certain short-distance shipping activities. Finally, the bill makes some changes to current law, affecting maritime safety, transportation and the authorities of the Coast Guard.

The rule also allows for the consideration of H.R. 2840, the Commercial Vessel Discharges Reform Act. Ballast water and the subsequent discharge of ballast water are essential to the safe operation and stability of our seafaring vessels. This bill will simply set a single uniform, nationwide standard for ballast water discharge from commercial vessels.

Currently, the Coast Guard and the EPA have developed separate regulations under two different laws to govern ballast water discharge. The EPA's

regulations are particularly burdensome as they allow each State to impose different requirements on top of the Federal regulations. The result: 29 differing and often contradicting standards. A uniform national standard, as set by this legislation, will assure the free flow of ships in and out of United States ports while protecting both the jobs, dependent on their efficient operation, and U.S. waters.

It should be stressed that the standard is meant to protect commerce and the environment. It conforms with the standards set by the International Maritime Organization and the EPA's Science Advisory Board. They have found that the standard set in the bill is the best currently achievable standard. Should a higher standard become achievable due to technological improvements, this legislation allows States to petition for an improved nationwide standard. Further, the bill allows for a review of the performance standard no later than January 1, 2016, and a new review can be ordered upon petition from the States after that.

So, once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has worked to provide us with a very good bipartisan bill, which provides for the ongoing needs of the Coast Guard and the important missions that they carry out on a daily basis.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

The Republican majority has placed the House in a terrible bind this morning. They've taken a worthy bill to authorize the Coast Guard, which enjoys broad bipartisan support, and has tied it together with an unwise, unrelated, misguided bill that will severely limit the ability of States to fight the harmful invasive species that are destroying local ecosystems and disrupting local economies.

In the majority's Pledge to America, leaders of the House promised "we will advance major legislation one issue at a time." This pledge is broken yet again today by this bill we are debating.

Ship-borne ballast discharge has introduced approximately 180 nonindigenous invasive species to the Great Lakes, lakes which comprise 20 percent of the freshwater on this planet. As long as I have been privileged to serve in Congress, Members on both sides of the aisle have vigorously protected these waters. In fact, during the debate on NAFTA, we discovered, along with our Canadian friends, that the Great Lakes water was to be sold in other trade agreements to other parts of the country that had shortages of water.

We all banded together and had that part removed. We do have an obligation to save 20 percent of the planet's freshwater, which is becoming more and more scarce every day.

Nationally, more than 4,500 invasive species have been introduced to the Nation's waters. In total, they cost us billions of dollars on an annual basis. \$5 billion alone has been spent to try to deal with the European zebra mussel, which we've barely made any inroads against. It has been introduced into the Great Lakes and can be found by the thousands throughout the lakes. They attach to the hard surfaces so thickly that they clog municipal water systems and electric generation plants, costing over \$1 billion a year to control.

States know all too well of the dangerous threat of invasive species and are taking commonsense action; but today's bill destroys the effective work by taking away the right of the States to have control. We must allow States to have an equal voice in protecting their ecosystems and economies if we are truly to solve the threat of invasive species in our waters.

Despite the unique challenges facing each State, the majority is demanding that all States follow one set of Federal requirements. This approach is completely different from the one taken by the congressional Republicans when debating regulations that would affect mountaintop mining corporations, which is taking off the top of a mountain and throwing it down into a valley, oftentimes clogging up the water supply.

Earlier this year, the Republican majority passed H.R. 2018, which gave power to the States to decide whether or not they should follow the guidelines set forth by the EPA to regulate pollution from mountaintop mining; but when it comes to ballast water, suddenly we think that the Federal Government and not the States must have the final say.

This inconsistency and, obviously, this war against the EPA is causing great consternation in the country. The only consistent logic in their approach is that, in both instances, they are advocating the interests of the respective industries, not the interests of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to oppose today's rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, pardon my immodesty, but as the only Member of the United States Congress who is also a Coast Guardsman, I can speak with some credibility regarding the Coast Guard. It is my belief that the American taxpayer has more bang for his buck from the United States Coast Guard than

from, probably, any other Federal agency.

It continues to do more with less: be it the search and rescue program, which is endless; be it the drug interdiction that appears to be endless as well; be it the Aids to Navigation program with which the Coast Guard continues to stay on top of the play; be it the ice patrols in the Arctic, the Antarctic, the Great Lakes, and others. The Coast Guard stands always ready.

I am thankful of the comments surrounding this dialogue, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and in favor of the bill authorizing the Coast Guard during this time.

□ 0930

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

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the rule which provides for consideration of H.R. 2838, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2011. The bill will reauthorize the activities of the Coast Guard through fiscal year 2014. It includes critical provisions that will give the Coast Guard, its servicemembers, and dependents greater parity—something that is extremely important—with their counterparts in the Department of Defense.

It includes language which will reform and improve Coast Guard administration and, very importantly, will save taxpayer dollars without impacting the service's critical missions. The bill also amends shipping laws to improve safety and foster job growth throughout the maritime sector.

The bill also establishes a uniform national standard for the discharge of ballast water that is based on the most recent effective technology that is currently available. The standard also must be updated on a regular basis as technology improves. Under current law, the Coast Guard and EPA regulate ballast water, while every State and tribe is allowed to add their own requirements to these regulations. As a result, ships engaged in interstate and international commerce must comply with two Federal standards and 29 different State and tribal standards for water ballast release, many of which are contradictory and technologically unachievable. It's an impossible regulatory nightmare that threatens jobs and the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter of support signed by 28 organizations representing the U.S. flag industry, our ports, farmers, steel manufacturers, the largest maritime unions in the country, and others.

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

SEPTEMBER 22, 2011.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK LOBIONDO,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and
Maritime Transportation, House of Rep-
resentatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB GIBBS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources
and Environment, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NICK RAHALL,
Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, House of Representa-
tives, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICK LARSEN,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Coast Guard
and Maritime Transportation, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. TIM BISHOP,
Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environ-
ment, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MESSRS. CHAIRMEN AND RANKING
MEMBERS: The undersigned organizations
represent U.S. and international vessel own-
ers and operators, industries that rely on
marine vessels to transport essential cargoes
in domestic and international commerce,
and labor unions representing the men and
women whose work keeps this vital segment
of our economy moving. We write to express
our strong support for H.R. 2840, the Com-
mercial Vessel Discharges Reform Act of
2011, which will provide a uniform federal
framework for the regulation of ballast
water and other vessel discharges.

Legislation to establish a consistent, prac-
tical, and science-based national program for
the management of vessel discharges is ur-
gently needed. The current statutory system
is a confusing, duplicative, and inconsistent
patchwork in which two federal agencies (the
Coast Guard and EPA) and more than two
dozen states regulate the same vessel dis-
charges in overlapping and sometimes con-
tradictory ways. The absence of a clear and
effective federal framework for regulating
vessel discharges constrains the movement
of essential maritime commerce, jeopardizes
American jobs, multiplies regulatory bur-
dens on businesses and workers, puts the en-
vironment at risk and forces American tax-
payers to foot the bill for duplicative and
contradictory government programs.

H.R. 2840 will fix this untenable situation
and establish a clear and consistent frame-
work for the regulation of vessel discharges
that protects the economy and the environ-
ment. We respectfully urge its prompt pas-
sage. Thank you again for your leadership on
this important issue.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Allegretti, President & CEO, The
American Waterways Operators; Captain
Lee A. Kincaid, President, American Mari-
time Congress; Brenda Otterson, Legislative
Consultant, American Maritime Officers
Service; Joseph J. Cox, President & CEO,
Chamber of Shipping of America; Barry
Holliday, Executive Director, Dredging Con-
tractors of America; Harold Daggett, Pres-
ident, International Longshoremen's Associa-
tion; R. Andrew Riester, Executive Vice
President, International Propeller Club of
the United States.

Kurt Nagle, President & CEO, American
Association of Port Authorities; Thomas
Bethel, National President, American Mari-
time Officers; Robin Rorick, Director of Ma-
rine and Security Operations, American Pe-
troleum Institute; Christine Duffy, President
& CEO, Cruise Lines International Associa-
tion; Brian T. Petty, Executive Vice Pres-
ident-Government Affairs, International As-
sociation of Drilling Contractors; Captain

Timothy A. Brown, President, International
Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots; Jo-
seph J. Angelo, Managing Director,
INTERTANKO.

James H.I. Weakley, President, Lake Car-
riers' Association; C. James Patti, President,
Maritime Institute for Research and Indus-
trial Development (MIRAID); Joseph C.
Curto, President, New York Shipping Asso-
ciation; John R. Groundwater, Executive Di-
rector, Passenger Vessel Association; Thom-
as Danjczek, President, Steel Manufacturers
Association; Richard H. Hobbie III, President
& CEO, Water Quality Insurance Syndicate.

Christopher L. Koch, President & CEO,
World Shipping Council; Mike Jewell, Presi-
dent, Marine Engineers' Beneficial Associa-
tion; Kendall W. Keith, President, National
Grain and Feed Association; Jim Adams,
President/CEO, Offshore Marine Services As-
sociation; Mike Sacco, President, Seafarers
International Union; James L. Henry, Chair-
man and President, Transportation Insti-
tute; and Catherine Reheis-Boyd, President,
Western States Petroleum Association.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I advise
the gentlelady from New York that I am
prepared to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. As am I; so I will
close.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the pre-
vious question, I will offer an amend-
ment to the rule to make in order an
amendment by Mr. KISSELL of North
Carolina which would prohibit the
Coast Guard from procuring items clas-
sified as textiles and apparel that are
not grown, reprocessed, reused, or pro-
duced in the United States. Republi-
cans blocked this germane amend-
ment last night in the Rules Com-
mittee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous con-
sent to insert the text of the amend-
ment in the RECORD along with extra-
neous material immediately prior to
the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I
urge my colleagues to vote "no" and
defeat the previous question so we can
help the American workers, and I urge
a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, this
rule provides for ample and open de-
bate, allowing our colleagues from
across the aisle the opportunity to
offer their legislative proposals to this
bill.

This bill provides a single uniform,
nationwide standard for how commer-
cial vessels discharge ballast water, a
standard that protects American jobs
by encouraging the efficient flow of
goods in and out of our ports while also
protecting our unique water bodies.
More importantly, the bill provides the
service men and women of the United
States Coast Guard the funding they
need to fulfill their critical missions:
keeping our borders secure, preventing
drugs from infiltrating our commu-
nities, and safeguarding our men and
women.

Service men and women in the Coast
Guard deserve our gratitude and sup-
port. This includes Coast Guard vet-

erans, such as Garrett Bess, a member
of my own staff here in Washington,
D.C. Partisanship has no place in pro-
viding the resources necessary for
those brave men and women in uniform
to do what they do best, keep us safe.
Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join
me in voting in favor of the rule and
passage of the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 455 OFFERED BY MS.
SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the fol-
lowing new sections:

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provi-
sions of this resolution, the amendment
printed in section 7 shall be in order as
though printed after the amendment num-
bered 18 in the report of the Committee on
Rules if offered by Representative Kissell of
North Carolina or his designee. That amend-
ment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equal-
ly divided and controlled by the proponent
and an opponent.

SEC. 7. The amendment referred to in sec-
tion 6 is as follows:

Page 56, after line 3, insert the following
(and conform the table of contents accord-
ingly):

SEC. 612. BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter
15 of title 14, United States Code, is fur-
ther amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 569c. Buy American requirement

“(a) REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in
subsections (c), (d), (e), and (i), the Secretary
may not procure for the Coast Guard an item
described in subsection (b) if the item is not
grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in
the United States.

“(b) COVERED ITEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An item referred to in
subsection (a) is any item described in para-
graph (2), if the item is directly related to
the national security interests of the United
States.

“(2) ITEMS DESCRIBED.—An item described
in this paragraph is any article or item of—

“(A) clothing and the materials and com-
ponents thereof, other than sensors, elec-
tronics, or other items added to, and not nor-
mally associated with, clothing (and the ma-
terials and components thereof);

“(B) tents, tarpaulins, or covers;

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

“(D) any item of individual equipment
manufactured from or containing such fi-
bers, yarns, fabrics, or materials.

“(c) AVAILABILITY EXCEPTION.—Subsection
(a) does not apply to the extent that the Sec-
retary determines that satisfactory quality
and sufficient quantity of any such article or
item described in subsection (b) grown, re-
processed, reused, or produced in the United
States cannot be procured as and when need-
ed.

“(d) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROCURE-
MENTS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Sub-
section (a) does not apply to the following:

“(1) Procurements by vessels in foreign wa-
ters.

“(2) Emergency procurements.

“(e) EXCEPTION FOR SMALL PURCHASES.—
Subsection (a) does not apply to purchases
for amounts not greater than the simplified
acquisition threshold (as defined in section
2302 of title 10, United States Code).

“(f) GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE.—In this section, the term ‘United States’ includes each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and each territory or possession of the United States.

“(g) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED WITHIN 7 DAYS AFTER CONTRACT AWARD IF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS APPLIED.—In the case of any contract for the procurement of an item described in subsection (b), if the Secretary applies an exception set forth in subsection (c) with respect to that contract, the Secretary shall, not later than 7 days after the award of the contract, post a notification that the exception has been applied.

“(h) TRAINING.—

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

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

“(i) CONSISTENCY WITH INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—This section shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis at the beginning of such chapter is further amended by adding at the end of the items relating to such subchapter the following: “569c. Buy American requirement.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 569c of title 14, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to contracts entered into on and after the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

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 Republican 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 Republican 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 Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In 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 Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, 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. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1015

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2838, COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 455) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2838) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2012 through 2015, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

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 passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 177, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 829]

YEAS—234

Adams	Farenthold	Kline
Aderholt	Fincher	Labrador
Akin	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Alexander	Flake	Lance
Amash	Fleischmann	Landry
Amodei	Fleming	Lankford
Bachus	Flores	Latham
Barletta	Forbes	LaTourette
Bartlett	Fortenberry	Latta
Barton (TX)	Fox	LoBiondo
Bass (NH)	Franks (AZ)	Long
Berg	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Biggart	Gallely	Luetkemeyer
Bilbray	Gardner	Lummis
Bilirakis	Garrett	Lungren, Daniel
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	E.
Black	Gibbs	Mack
Blackburn	Gibson	Manzullo
Bonner	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Bono Mack	Gohmert	Marino
Boustany	Goodlatte	Matheson
Brady (TX)	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Brooks	Gowdy	McCaul
Broun (GA)	Granger	McClintock
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McCotter
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Buerkle	Griffith (AR)	McKeon
Burgess	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Calvert	Grimm	McMorris
Camp	Guinta	Rodgers
Campbell	Guthrie	Meehan
Canseco	Hall	Mica
Cantor	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Capito	Harper	Miller (MI)
Carter	Harris	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Hayworth	Myrick
Coble	Heck	Neugebauer
Coffman (CO)	Hensarling	Noem
Cole	Herger	Nugent
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Cravaack	Huelskamp	Nunnelee
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Palazzo
Culberson	Hunter	Paulsen
Davis (KY)	Hurt	Pearce
Denham	Jenkins	Pence
Dent	Johnson (IL)	Petri
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Pitts
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Platts
Dold	Jones	Poe (TX)
Dreier	Jordan	Pompeo
Duffy	Kelly	Posey
Duncan (SC)	King (IA)	Price (GA)
Duncan (TN)	King (NY)	Quayle
Ellmers	Kingston	Reed
Emerson	Kinzinger (IL)	Rehberg