refuse to address the issues that are of real concern to American people. It is time we take America in a new direction.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, President Bush issued the first veto of his Presidency yesterday, and it was the right thing to do.

By sustaining that veto last night, after more than a year of rhetoric, much of it misleading, we have come down on the side of protecting human life. And we have saved the American taxpayer from being forced to fund unethical and unsuccessful research involving the destruction of human embryos.

Though a chapter in this debate has now been closed, this issue is not going away. As we move forward, I hope we will keep in mind what we have learned. The choice doesn't have to be between doing stem cell research and not doing stem cell research. There are ethical, life-affirming methods of doing this research that are producing successful treatments today using adult stem cells.

Let's move forward with stem cell research, Mr. Speaker, but let's do it in an ethical way.

□ 1030

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5684, UNITED STATES-OMAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 925 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 925

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5684) to implement the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement. The bill shall be considered as read. The bill shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Pursuant to section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 5684 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker in consonance with section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 925 is a closed rule providing for 2 hours of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It also provides that pursuant to section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion.

Lastly, the resolution provides that during consideration of the bill, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker in consonance with section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 925 provides for the consideration of H.R. 5684, a bill to implement the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement, in accordance with trade measures negotiated under the Trade Promotion Authority. Under these procedures, once the administration formally submits the final legislative language to Congress, it may not be amended.

Former United States Trade Rep Rob Portman signed the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement on January 19, 2006. Under the agreement, all consumer and industrial goods traded between the U.S. and Oman will immediately be duty free, and 87 percent of the U.S. agriculture tariff lines will gain immediate duty-free access with the remaining tariffs phased out over a 10-year period. It provides wide access and sets a strong precedent for opening up opportunities for services for U.S. firms, contains robust protections for U.S. intellectual property rights holders, and includes strong labor and environmental provisions.

Oman enacted broad labor reforms in 2003, Mr. Speaker, and has followed up with specific commitments to ensure that its laws provide strong protections for workers consistent with international standards. Oman enacted many of these reforms earlier this month and has pledged to enact the remaining reforms by this November. This agreement makes it clear that it is inappropriate for Oman to weaken or reduce domestic labor protections or environmental laws to encourage trade or investment and that this obligation is enforceable through specific dispute settlement procedures.

Mr. Speaker, the United States makes up only 4 percent of the world's population. Therefore, we must recognize that we have an opportunity to create and expand the marketplace for U.S. goods and services by reaching fair trade agreements with our international trading partners. This agreement will contribute to economic growth and trade between the U.S. and Oman; generate export opportunities for U.S. companies, farmers, and ranchers; help create jobs in both countries; and help American consumers save money while offering them greater choices.

My home State of Washington, for example, is one of the most trade-dependent States in the Nation, and our economy depends on fair trade. From agriculture to high tech to manufacturing industries, Washington State and our Nation are in a position to benefit by having more trading partners.

One area where trade with Oman shows great promise for America is in the area of commercial aircraft. Oman Air recently purchased Boeing 737 airplanes valued at $200 million at catalog prices. We want to continue to encourage these kinds of sales to Oman and in the broader Middle East, which, of course, creates new jobs here at home.

In addition to the new commercial opportunities it provides, this agreement will support many of the recent government, legal, and economic reforms in Oman, which are important to bringing stability to the Middle East region. In 2003 President Bush proposed completion of a Middle East Free Trade Area by 2013 as part of a plan to fight terrorism by supporting Middle East economic growth and democracy through trade.

The United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act would be the fifth bilateral trade agreement reached between the United States and a Middle Eastern country. It is yet another step in the right direction toward integrating fair trade policies and economic reforms to support a more stable and prosperous Middle East. This agreement will send a strong signal to countries in that region about the benefits of closer economic and political ties to the United States.

The Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported H.R. 5684 last May. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 925 and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today we debate another free trade agreement. We all know well-crafted trade policy is capable of spreading benefits to a broad portion of the population while promoting innovation and solidifying partnerships between and among nations.

As a leader in the global economy, the United States has the ability and

the responsibility to use trade agreements to effect positive change here at home and abroad. Unfortunately, the Oman Free Trade Agreement, which we are considering, continues the recent trend toward divisive partnership on trade.

Because of the majority's approach on trade policy, you have a lot of Democrats, who I believe are inclined to vote for free trade agreements, voting against this pact. I am disappointed the administration and the Republican leadership have missed another opportunity to return to a bipartisan consensus on trade. The majority once again cut Democrats out of the negotiations and produced another free trade agreement that fails to protect the basic rights of workers.

Like the Central American Free Trade Agreement, CAFTA, which I voted against a year ago, the labor provisions of the Oman Free Trade Agreement only require Oman to enforce its own labor laws. At this time Oman's laws do not come close to meeting International Labor Organization standards. This is a threshold that Ways and Means Democrats have set for labor provisions in trade agreements, and it is quite reasonable. The United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement does not meet it.

Of utmost concern, Oman's laws do not guarantee the freedom of association and the right to bargain collectively. It does not even prohibit human trafficking and forced labor.

In Oman today unions do not exist. There are only labor management committees where management holds over 70 percent of the leadership positions. In no way is this even close to representation the workers here have achieved after decades of struggle.

Ways and Means Committee Democrats tried to work with the Government of Oman to revise its labor laws, and they were very clear about what steps needed to be taken: Specifically, make sure Oman's laws conform to basic labor standards and begin to implement existing laws in a manner that complies with the principles established by the International Labor Organization. These are not radical requests. Yet the majority and Oman have not acceded to them.

Just yesterday Representative CARDIN offered a reasonable amendment that would have delayed implementation of this agreement until Oman came into compliance with these standards. That amendment was rejected. The Omani Government attempted to pacify our labor concerns with an 11th-hour royal decree. Unfortunately, it fully addressed only one of the 10 deficiencies outlined by Ways and Means Democrats. So this is not a valid argument.

The situation I just described is quite a contrast to the United States-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement negotiations. Bahrain made commitments to modify its laws to adhere to International Labor Organization standards and took steps to make sure those standards were being adhered to on the ground immediately. Oman has taken no such actions. As a result, the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement fails workers in Oman and here in the United States.

This sends a message to the world that the United States does not respect the hardworking men and women that fuel the global economy. That is extraordinarily unwise, particularly considering the challenges we are facing all around the globe today.

I had hoped that the bipartisan opposition to CAFTA might make it clear to the Bush administration that a broad cross-section of this House would not accept trade agreements which fail to ensure fundamental rights for workers. That is apparently not the case because this agreement is another step backwards for workers. Further, it demonstrates this administration's refusal to use trade to better the lives of the broad portion of working families, not a select few.

And yesterday at the Rules Committee, Representative CARDIN highlighted a potentially serious concern about port security. The provision imposes a burdensome process should the United States Government choose to protect its citizens from potentially dangerous foreign control over United States port operations. Representative CARDIN offered a second amendment yesterday in the Rules Committee that would have addressed this concern. However, like his other commonsense amendment on labor provisions, it was rejected. This scenario is another reason Members should reject this agreement as currently written.

I know these amendments would interrupt the fast-track process. However, I believe the issues raised by Mr. CARDIN's amendments warrant rejecting this agreement as currently written. By doing so, we can put together a framework that addresses these very serious concerns on port security and workers' rights.

Congress needs to push the administration to step back and rethink its trade policy. The United States cannot afford to abandon its role as a leader in the global economy nor can we abandon our duty to working families both here and abroad.

We need to embrace the benefits of trade while still respecting the fundamental rights of workers. I sincerely hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will work together to achieve such a balance in considering future trade policy.

When we debated CAFTA, I said, ''If we do not get CAFTA right, we risk undercutting support for all future trade agreements.'' Well, we did not get CAFTA right, and now we are doing it again on Oman. The majority is just digging us all into a deeper hole, making it that much more difficult to establish the trust required for balanced trade negotiations.

I hope the scrutiny that this relatively small free trade agreement is receiving leads the majority to reconsider its approach. I hope it makes them ask: Is it worth rushing this agreement to passage with inadequate assurances on labor protections when we might be able to achieve them in a number of weeks? Is it really worth cutting the minority out of the negotiations?

In my opinion, the answers to these questions are obvious. Partisanship tears this House apart every week we are in session. Look at the tone of the debate on the floor this week. It is time for a new direction; and trade, because it is such a critical issue, would be an ideal place to start.

I continue to have hope that we can regain the spirit of cooperation on trade that has served this House so well in the past. It is a goal that is within reach. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to commit to achieving it.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will respond to a couple of points that my friend from California made. Regarding the labor language in this trade agreement, it is essentially the same language that was in the Bahrain trade agreement that, of course, is in the same part geographically in the world as Oman.

□ 1045

I would just remind my colleagues that that language and that trade agreement were acceptable to my friend from California. She voted in favor of the Bahrain trade agreement, as did the gentleman from Maryland, whom she referenced.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to respond to the concerns that this agreement poses national security issues and concerns that a third-party tribunal would have ultimate say over our security issues.

The U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement, like previous trade agreements, treats Omani landside service providers and investors no less favorably than our own landside service suppliers. These landside activities include unloading vessels, marine cargo handling, and ship cleaning.

When an entity participates in these landside aspects of port activities, it does not control, manage or operate a U.S. port. That always remains the responsibility of the port authority.

Nothing in this agreement, Mr. Speaker, before us today prohibits the U.S. from reviewing foreign investment transactions in order to ensure our national security. More importantly, it expressly permits the U.S. to block a potential port acquisition by claiming national security interests.

As you see, Mr. Speaker, all of our trade agreements, including this one, contain an article called ''essential security,'' which is self-judging, meaning that it is up to an individual country

to determine whether a particular matter is necessary for the protection of its essential security interests. All the commitments that we undertake in trade agreements are subject to this provision.

Under this article, nothing in an agreement can prevent us from applying measures that we consider necessary for the protection of our essential security interests. Therefore, the ultimate decision on what is necessary to protect our essential services rests with the United States, not a third-party tribunal.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, history and precedent also indicate that no third-party dispute panel or tribunal has ever heard any arguments, much less issued a decision, related to the scope and application of any national security exception contained in a national trade or investment agreement.

So those issues, while they may be nice to talk about, really have no bearing on the trade agreements that we have had in the past.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed today that we are about to consider a free trade agreement with Oman that I would have hoped we would have worked out so we could have had strong bipartisan support. Unfortunately, the agreement comes up short on international labor standards, and I believe we could have achieved those international labor standards to make sure that Oman complies with ILO standards. But, unfortunately, there was an unwillingness on the part of the negotiators to complete the agreement in a way that could have gotten more support.

The second issue that I take, particularly with this rule, because I am going to support the gentlewoman's position of opposing the previous question, is to deal with a very sensitive issue of port security. So let me try to explain the port security issue, because I think there have been some misstatements on the floor of the House.

This agreement permits Oman to operate landside aspects of port activities, including operation and maintenance of docks, loading and unloading of vessels directly to and from land, marine cargo handling, operation and maintenance of piers, ship cleaning, stevedoring, transfer of cargo between vessels and trucks, trains, pipelines and wharves and waterfront terminal operations.

That is exactly what Dubai Ports World tried to do in ports in this country, including my own Port of Baltimore. We spoke up and the American people spoke up against allowing a foreign company to operate port facilities here in the United States, and we blocked that transaction. It was the right thing to do for the security of America and the security of our ports.

Under this agreement, if Dubai Ports World had an operation within Oman, they would be permitted to apply to do those same operations here in the United States and they would be permitted to do that under the free trade agreement.

I have heard my colleagues suggest that we can just invoke the essential security exception to an agreement, and you are correct, we can invoke the essential security exception and block the transaction. But then we are subject to dispute settlement procedures. We never give up our sovereignty in trade agreements, but we changed our tax laws because of international pressure when we thought we didn't have to, because otherwise we would have been subjected to tariffs against U.S. products. The same thing is true here. If the dispute panel rules against us, then we are subjecting ourselves to sanctions.

Our USTR says this is absolute, they can't do that. But let me remind you, we have lost 83 percent of our cases in dispute settlement procedures where sanctions have been imposed against our country. So we haven't been that successful in these international tribunals.

Let me also point out that by including this language in this bill, there will be continued pressure on this administration to allow foreign government companies to operate ports here in the United States. We have an administration that is friendly towards that.

We have the responsibility in Congress to protect our ports and protect our Nation. It is our responsibility. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can protect the ports here in America and make it clear, by simply taking out that one provision that would allow the operation of port facilities potentially by companies owned by countries that are not friendly to the United States.

This is an important issue, and I urge all my colleagues to pay attention to this. This is our vote and our opportunity, and I urge the defeat of the previous question.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time.

I rise in strong support of the U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement. Following the U.S.-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement last year, Mr. Speaker, the U.S.-Oman FTA sends a clear message that we are committed to improving our relationship with the Middle East while improving our international trade interests.

The agreement goes beyond addressing trade issues. As part of the FTA, Oman commits to intensifying its political reform efforts to enhance participation of all of its citizens in the process. Oman has also implemented economic changes that will make entry into its domestic and international markets more accessible to private citizens.

Additionally, the FTA has stipulations that Oman complete labor reforms by October 31 of this year. However, of its own volition, Oman began enacting these reforms beginning in 2003, and earlier this month many of the remaining reforms were implemented by a royal decree. Some of the recent changes include dispute settlement procedures for labor representatives, the ability to call for strikes, and strengthening of legal protections for women and foreign workers. Oman has ratified the International Labor Organization conventions against child and forced labor.

Not only has Oman undertaken domestic reforms, but it has also made strides to change its international policy by pulling out of the Arab League boycott of Israel and repealing all aspects of the boycott. This shows a clear commitment to Oman's desire to function in accordance with international trade norms of equality and full market access.

The 9/11 Commission report states that economic reforms will be the key to changing the cultural landscape in the Middle East. As such, this FTA is about much more than trade; it is a tool for advancing U.S. strategic interests. Oman is a key ally in the global war on terror and has provided critical assistance to our Armed Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In short, this U.S.-Oman FTA will help to improve our market access and increase national security; and, therefore, I would like to reiterate my strong support for this mutually beneficial agreement.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question. This would allow us to consider the Cardin amendment to close the loophole in the agreement that would allow a foreign company based in Oman to operate U.S. port facilities.

Earlier on I was opposed to the Oman Free Trade Agreement because it undermines fundamental workers' rights. This free trade agreement is another blow to working families, exporting more of our jobs overseas. But I was shocked to learn that it could underpin the basic safety and security of those who I was sent here to represent.

I come from a community that is directly tied to this Nation's largest port, the Port of Long Beach. The safety and security of this port and all other American ports are essential to our country.

The Oman FTA directly threatens our ability to control our Nation's ports. The creators of this deal completely ignored Congress' overwhelming response to the Dubai Ports

World deal because, just like that deal, the Oman FTA has a very far-reaching provision hidden completely from the public eye.

Buried deep in the annex of this agreement, our country's right to determine who operates our ports of entry is given away. Who gets the new right to control vital American infrastructure? Any group of people or government that incorporates to do business in Oman.

The same people who supported the Dubai Ports World deal are now telling us that this is, again, nothing to worry about. They were wrong then, and they are wrong now. We should not export the safety and security of Americans. I urge again my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support today of the Oman Free Trade Agreement. It is an important outreach and step that this country ought to be making and I think we will make.

I would like to comment just briefly on a couple of the previous speakers. They appear to be relying on stock certificates to protect our ports. The truth of the matter is, I agree with them wholeheartedly that protecting our ports is in the vital interests of this country. No one would argue about that.

But simply the fact who owns a particular company is scant comfort when it comes to control of the ports, as well as the security surrounding all of the ports. All the conduct that goes on, the goods and services are moved through there. The scheduling and the actual control of our security by the Coast Guard, to me is a much better way to secure our ports than simply worrying about the stock certificates of the companies that provide the services of scheduling, loading and unloading.

The United States free trade agreement with Oman represents more than just simple economics and trade. Support for this agreement represents building a relationship and strengthening with a peaceful ally in the Middle East that has a proven track record.

Let me run through a couple of things that I think are important when we talk about who is Oman and why should we enter into some sort of bilateral free trade agreement with Oman.

Oman has been a proven leader in the Persian Gulf in establishing trade and other ties with Israel. Since 1970, Oman has pursued a moderate foreign policy and expanded its diplomatic relationships dramatically.

Oman has also worked to develop close ties with its neighbors in the Middle East. Oman joined the six-member Gulf Cooperation Council when it was established and traditionally supports Middle East peace initiatives.

In 1979, Oman supported the Camp David Accords and was one of only three Arab League states which did not break relationships with Egypt after the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty in 1979.

In April of 1994, Oman hosted the plenary meeting of the Water Working Group of the peace process and was the first gulf state to do so.

On December 26, 1994, Oman became the first gulf state to host an Israeli Prime Minister, again trying to build on a relationship of peace with another important ally of ours in the Middle East.

Oman has eliminated all aspects of the Arab boycott of Israel. In 2005 and 2006, senior Omani officials issued letters affirming that Oman has no boycott in place against Israel. Oman was one of the first regional states to offer recognition to the U.S.-appointed Iraqi Governing Council in 2003 and backed the Iraqi elections that took place in January 2005.

This agreement with Oman illustrates the importance of trade liberalization and security cooperation, both of which further our national interests from an economic and security standpoint. We must not turn our backs on the peace-promoting leader in this region. Oman is dependable, and it is critical that we continue to build on this relationship.

□ 1100

Please join me in supporting the previous question on the rule and in support of the Oman Free Trade Agreement that will be brought to the floor later today.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this agreement. Unfettered free trade is one of the major reasons why in our country today the middle class is shrinking; why for 5 straight years family median income has declined, while in the last 5 years 5 million more Americans have slipped into poverty; why millions of Americans are working longer hours for lower wages.

Yes, I acknowledge at a time when the CEOs of large corporations earn 400 times what their workers are making, at a time when large corporations are throwing American workers out on the street and moving to low-wage countries, yes, free trade has worked very, very well for the large multinationals.

But maybe, just maybe, once in a long while, the Republican leadership might want to consider the middle class of this country, working families, lower-income people and not just the wealthiest people.

Mr. Speaker, the American middle class should no longer be forced to compete against workers in China, Vietnam, and other countries where desperate people, through no fault of their own, are forced in some cases to work for wages as low as 30 cents an hour. That is not a level playing field.

Throwing American workers out on the street, moving to countries where people are paid pennies an hour, is bad public policy. It has failed. One of the definitions of insanity is to do the same thing over and over again. That is what this Congress does. It fails every single time.

Mr. Speaker, before we vote for unfettered free trade with Oman, we should consider this. In Oman, the minimum wage ranges from absolutely zero to $1.30 an hour. The average wage in Oman is about $13,200, below the poverty line for a single mother with one child living in this country.

Is that fair competition for American workers? In addition, Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot from this administration and my Republican colleagues about the need to support freedom. Well, are the people in Oman free to elect their leader? What was the result in the last election? We didn't hear much about that, because they don't have elections.

Oman is a hereditary monarchy. Is there freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press in Oman? No, there is not. Mr. Speaker, in the last 5 years alone, we have lost nearly 3 million decent paying manufacturing jobs, 17 percent of our total. In 1993, before NAFTA, our trade deficit was over $70 billion. Last year, after unfettered free trade, it was over $715 billion. This year it is expected to top $800 billion.

The time is now to rethink our policy with regard to unfettered free trade.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a union member and as a Member of this body, and as someone who wants to expand U.S. trade relations, nonetheless I feel obligated to oppose this rule and the Oman Free Trade Agreement we will consider today.

The Bush administration and congressional Republicans are again trying to force passage of a trade agreement that willfully undermines labor rights in Oman and economic and homeland security for hardworking Americans in this country.

Democrats have called for such standards in every agreement negotiated by this administration, and each time we have been let down by the President and his allies here in Congress. In sending the Oman trade agreement to the Hill, the Bush administration has also astonishingly opted to send Congress an agreement in which he refused to include a prohibition on forced or slave labor.

Is this how we spread democracy in the Middle East? Is this how the U.S. best improves the lives in the Middle East and advances our own security interests? Another bizarre decision the President made is to put in jeopardy

the security of our ports and other critical landside homeland security functions. This Oman agreement explicitly paves the way for companies like Dubai Ports World to gain control of our ports.

Those who disagree with this argument refuse to acknowledge that the fact that in the best-case scenario, with the President utilizing every national security waiver at his disposal, the final decision on such a matter will be left out of U.S. hands and left to an international tribunal.

I would think the Republican leadership could at least agree that we should not outsource our core homeland security functions and decisions. In a country like Oman, where meager rights for workers fall well below the International Labor Organization's standards, where the Sultan can change any law by decree, and where there are no independent unions, Congress should be especially vigilant.

Mr. Speaker, we must ensure that any trade agreement with Oman, or any country, contains hard and fast labor standards. The Oman FTA does not. This is a loser on homeland security, for job security and for the best interests of Omanis. It should be defeated.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from the Rules Committee for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Ms. MATSUI's leadership. Mr. Speaker, this legislation needs to pass. This trade agreement is very much in the interests of the United States. Oman is our ally. It is an example of exactly what we need to help bring about throughout the Arab world.

Now, I do not know if everyone in this body knows where Oman is located. It sits at the Strait of Hormuz and at the entrance to the Persian Gulf. It is in a critically strategic location. Across that strait lies Iran. More than 20 percent of the world's oil supply passes through that strait.

Oman has remained our ally, notwithstanding all of the pressure that it has received over generations. It has been our ally since 1833 when we passed the Treaty of Amity and Commerce. It was the first Arab country to send an Ambassador to the United States. Today it is the first and only Arab country to have a female Ambassador to the United States.

It is one of the most open, liberal societies in the Arab and Muslim world. They signed a 10-year military access agreement in 1981 with the United States, and they have renewed it twice. They continue to be one of the most important logistical and operational support areas for the present war in Iraq, and were so in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what more they can do. They are an active supporter of the United States against terrorism, and as this letter from AIPAC says, they have been willing to take on the Arab world and break the Arab boycott against Israel, the primary, secondary and tertiary boycott. And here we are, we debated all night last night about the resolution in the Middle East.

We know the number of lives that are being lost, the conflagration that is taking place, and we will not reach out to an Arab nation that is our most important ally, that is exactly what we are hoping to achieve in terms of economic and social liberalization.

They have agreed to comply with all of the International Labor Organization's standards. They will have collective bargaining, unionization. They are going to open up their industries to outside review and competition. And what do they want to buy? They want to buy transport equipment and manufactured products, products that generate jobs in the United States.

And what are they going to sell to us? It is primarily oil that does not generate jobs in the Arab world. That is part of the problem. But the Sultan of Oman understands that the vast majority, more than 60 percent of his population, are under the age of 18. He gets it. He understands. He needs to move into the modern world. But he needs American support to do that.

This trade treaty needs to pass.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, who is probably one of the individuals in this body that works on trade issues more than anybody else.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I will correct him by saying that I take a back seat to the Speaker pro tem, Mr. KOLBE, who unfortunately is going to be leaving at the end of this Congress. I have been very pleased to work with him on a wide range of issues dealing with trade globally, and appreciate his stellar service.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I want to associate myself, my remarks, with my Democratic colleague, Mr. MORAN, underscoring the fact that this is a very important bipartisan issue. We as Republicans within the Republican leadership, are reaching out to Democrats who share our vision of pursuing our very, very important goal of free trade overall and this very important agreement with Oman.

Now, my colleague from Vermont was speaking earlier about the fact that unfettered free trade has, in fact, jeopardized the livelihood of Americans, it has helped the very rich and hurt the middle class. Nothing could be further from the truth.

One has to look at the overall policies of the United States of America and look at the economic policies pursued by this administration and this Congress. We have to realize the fact that we have minority home ownership at an all-time high. We have unemployment at a 4.6 percent rate.

The first quarter of this year, we saw gross domestic product growth at 5.6 percent. We have seen inflation, based on the projections outlined by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Bernanke, yesterday, tempering.

We are seeing predictions for strong economic growth. And, Mr. Speaker, it is due in large part to our pursuit of breaking down barriers to expand the opportunity for greater trade and for job creation right here in the United States of America.

Now, this agreement that we are going to be facing today, which I am very pleased will enjoy bipartisan support, as I said, is an agreement that I believe really transcends the simple economic questions that we face today, the economic questions of important job creation in the United States.

But the vote that we face today is a very important geopolitical question. Now, my friend from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) talked about the strategic importance of Oman. My friend from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) earlier talked about the fact that Oman was the first gulf nation to host an Israeli Prime Minister.

We have talked about the fact that over the past many decades, we have seen a very important relationship that has existed between Oman and the United States of America. And one of the things that is important to note is that we, with huge bipartisan numbers, put into place the U.S.-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is by every account an even stronger, better agreement from the perspective of worker rights and the other issues that are raised by so many, better than the U.S.-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement.

Now, as I talk about the geopolitical issue, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to note that one of the things that we as an institution are doing on a regular basis is encouraging the building of democratic institutions around the world, political pluralism, the rule of law, self-determination.

And, frankly, we have as an institution been, I think, doing a great job in helping emerging and reemerging democracies. A year ago this spring, Speaker HASTERT and Minority Leader PELOSI put into place a great new commission, which I am privileged to chair, and our colleague from North Carolina, DAVID PRICE, serves as the ranking minority member on. It is a bipartisan, 16-member commission.

The Speaker pro tem is a member of our commission. And what we have done is we have said we need to take new and reemerging democracies around the world and help them build their parliaments.

□ 1115

Now, as we look at the geopolitical importance of this issue, Mr. Speaker,

I have to tell you that we just, 2 weeks ago, had our commission in Lebanon, and we just, days before the attack by Hezbollah against the Israelis, the kidnapping of the IDF troops, military, we were on the tarmac in Beirut, having just come from meetings with the Lebanese Parliament. There are parliamentarians in Lebanon and many other parts of the world who are hoping very much to be able to build those parliaments, to establish their libraries, to put into place a committee structure that will allow for adequate oversight of the executive branch, and to do many of the things that we have a tendency to take for granted around here.

Now, we know that Oman isn't an American-style democracy; we recognize that. A lot of people have been critical because of it. But the fact of the matter is, we need to do all that we can to help those countries that are moving towards the rule of law, and Oman is clearly one of them, living with a rules-based trading system, and other countries in the region that are seeking to stand up in this global war against Islamofascism to do all possible to help us.

Mr. Speaker, economic liberalization is a very important part of that goal. I can't think of a more important vote after, as Mr. MORAN said, the debate we had last night on the resolution that we are going to be voting on before too terribly long, supporting the State of Israel and their action and their right to defend themselves. And now this agreement really goes hand in hand with our quest to take on those who want to do in our way of life, who want to undermine opportunities for freedom.

This is a very good agreement. It is a good rule that, under the standard structure that we have, allows for its implementation. So Members should vote ''yes'' on the previous question when that vote comes forward, and they should vote ''yes'' for the rule and ''yes'' on final passage for the U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time and wish to say to my colleague from California who just left the podium that one of America's problems in the Middle East is that we have become too identified with the superrich, undemocratic leaders of those countries who ignore the teeming masses of the poor among them. That is where ''the resistance'' comes from.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. As I finish my statement, I will yield some time to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider another so-called free trade agreement, this time with Oman, a nation that is not a democracy. In fact, far from it. It is a sultanate with rule by the superrich. This agreement will yield no more liberty.

We should defeat the resolution and this bill. Oman is not a free country. Free trade should only exist among free people. Trade should enhance liberty and freedom, not undermine it by enshrining gross privilege.

Exploitation of Oman's working class by its own rulers, along with imported labor from poorer countries who have no rights, underpin the ugly underbelly of Oman, no matter how the gold on their palaces glitters.

Free trade should benefit America and America's workers, so name me a free trade agreement that has done that? The gentleman and I were here for the passage of the horrible NAFTA agreement—he voted yes, I voted no. It has put hundreds of thousands of our people in this country out of work, and it has hurt millions more people in Mexico.

NAFTA has yielded trade deficits with Mexico when we used to have surpluses. Trade deals with Canada, Vietnam, and China have not helped America. Free trade deals help a narrow band of invesors this gentleman is more than happy to help.

''Free trade'' cannot anchor America's democratic principles. Indeed, trade with an undemocratic society ultimately crushes liberty's cause.

Constitutions dedicated to liberties and rights and justice must come first. Is America so bankrupt and desperate for a landing pad in the Middle East that we cede more of our fundamental values of liberty globally with yet another repressive society?

Free societies exist because people of those nations believed in liberty first. America's trade policy should embody our enduring values of liberty, not enshrine pecuniary relationships without principle.

Oman should first take their place at freedom's table, and then let us talk about free trade.

I ask my colleagues to defeat the rule and to defeat the resolution on free trade with Oman. It is not a free country, and it is time America identified with those in the world who aspire for freedom themselves, not just the superrich.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. Let me begin by saying I have the utmost respect for my friend from Ohio. I greatly revere her passionate commitment to her goal.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we share the same goals. Those goals are to improve the quality of life for the middle class and those struggling working Americans here in the United States of America and in other parts of the world. I think that we just have a slightly different view.

You know, the gentlewoman pointed her finger at me and began engaging in very, very strong language about the North American Free Trade Agreement. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I believe that the North American Free Trade Agreement has been an overwhelming success. Today we enjoy a third of a trillion dollars, with a capital T, in crossborder trade between Mexico and the United States.

As President Bill Clinton said when he was eulogizing Lloyd Bentsen, the former Treasury Secretary and Senator from Texas, he said, were it not for the North American Free Trade Agreement, this very serious problem that we have of illegal immigration would be much, much worse today than it is.

Now, if one realizes that in Mexico we have a burgeoning middle class, a middle class that is today larger than the entire Canadian population, and it is continuing to grow, those areas that have benefited most greatly from the North American Free Trade Agreement in the northern states of Mexico have seen tremendous booms in their standard of living.

Ms. KAPTUR. Would the gentleman be happy to yield me a couple of seconds on his time?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my friend.

MS. KAPTUR. You know, it is amazing how two people can live in this world and view it so differently. The exploitation of Mexico's rural countryside is a continental sacrilege. The reason we have all this illegal immigration to our country is NAFTA wiped out the struggling poor of Mexico's countryside. Does the gentleman have no conscience for them?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker. May I reclaim my time?

Ms. KAPTUR. What about our workers? Millions lost jobs because of NAFTA.

Mr. DREIER. Could I reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker? Am I in control of my time?

She is claiming that I am somehow exploiting the underclass of Mexico.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The gentleman is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. DREIER. I would say to my friend, obviously we want to do everything that we can to see the standard of living and quality of life for that underclass that she refers to, as she leaves the floor, as I am trying to engage in this colloquy with her.

I will say that I believe that our policies have played a big role in enhancing the standard of living and quality of life, and I am not going to be satisfied until every single one of those individuals does, in fact, see their quality of life improve.

I believe in that economic liberalization and creating economic opportunity, which we have done for so much of Mexico, through the existence of the——

Ms. KAPTUR. Would you be kind enough to yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield.

Ms. KAPTUR. I will just say to the gentleman that post-NAFTA, the wages of Mexicans were cut in half. Two million people are streaming across this continent because their way of life has been destroyed. Travel with me to meet these people. In our Nation, the middle class has lost a million jobs to Mexico. Why is it the gentleman refuses to see this continental tragedy.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, that is just plain wrong. That is just plain inaccurate. If you look at, again, the standard of living and quality of life in Mexico, it is substantially greater today than it was before the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Ms. KAPTUR. Not for the ordinary people.

Mr. DREIER. I believe that these policies are very important for the United States and the world.

Ms. KAPTUR. Only for those at the top.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to make in order a critical amendment that was offered in the Rules Committee yesterday by Trade Subcommittee Ranking Member CARDIN, but unfortunately was rejected by a straight party-line vote.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print 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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. The Cardin amendment would close a dangerous loophole in the current agreement, a loophole that could jeopardize our Nation's port security. In other words, in its present form, this agreement would allow a foreign company based in Oman to operate U.S. port facilities. The Cardin amendment provides that the U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement cannot take effect until the U.S. withdraws its commitment to allow Omani companies to operate landside aspects of U.S. port activities.

Unless we vote on the Cardin amendment today, we could once again be faced with a risk that the management of our vital ports might again be handed over to a foreign entity.

The House must have the chance to weigh in on this matter of national security. It is time for this House to stop giving rubber-stamp approval to this administration at the expense of our national security. The Cardin amendment is the only way to ensure that this free trade agreement doesn't compromise our ports.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues may argue that the adoption of this important amendment will shut off the fast-track process in the Senate for this bill. True, perhaps, but we should not allow any process to trump our national security and the duty of this Congress to protect its citizens from harm.

If we have to send this agreement back to the drawing board, so be it. However Members of this House feel about this trade deal, I would hope that they would all realize the danger of leaving this loophole in place. Vote ''no'' on the previous question so we can protect our ports.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, if the issue is on port security, then I would like to remind my colleagues of what I had said earlier, that in these trade agreements there are articles that speak to essential security, and these articles are self-judging, which means it is up to the individual country to make the determination as to what their security interests are.

There is nothing in this agreement that can prevent us from applying what we consider to be security issues.

But don't take my word for it. The Congressional Research Service, a nonpartisan organization, said, in addressing this issue and having an international tribunal judge this, that national security issues have never been subjected to review by trade panels. That is a very important distinction.

Further, the Congressional Research Service goes on to say: ''The U.S. should appear to be on solid legal grounds for asserting not only that the panel does not, the independent panel, does not have legal authority to determine the validity of such a matter, but also that the inconsistent measure is permitted and justified, given the broad self-judging language in the national security exemption.''

So clearly the argument that the U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement will make our Nation less secure, in fact, has no basis in fact. There is no question, however, Mr. Speaker, that fair trade promotes economic development and political cooperation.

In fact, the 9/11 Commission specifically cited Middle Eastern free trade agreements and calls for action on a comprehensive U.S. strategy that President Bush has, I might add, engaged in that includes economic policies encouraging development, more open societies and opportunities for people to improve their lives.

Mr. Speaker, approving this agreement is a vital step towards our efforts against the war on Islamofascism and seeks to make our Nation more, not less, secure.

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

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 925—RULE FOR H.R. 5684, U.S.-OMAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5684) to implement the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Notwithstanding section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 and clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill shall be in order except the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution. The amendment may be offered only by Representative Cardin of Maryland or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendment specified in section 2 are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5684, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. CARDIN OF MARYLAND

At the end of section 101, add the following:

(c) ADDITIONAL CONDITION FOR ENTRY INTO FORCE.—In addition to the provisions of subsection (b), the President may not provide for the Agreement to enter into force with respect to the United States until the United States has included in its reservation relating to the provision of maritime transportation services and the operation of U.S.-flagged vessels, beginning on page 5 of the Schedule of the United States contained in Annex II of the Agreement, measures relating to the following: landside operations of port activities, including operation and maintenance of docks; loading and unloading of vessels directly to or from land; marine cargo handling; operation and maintenance of piers; ship cleaning; stevedoring; transfer of cargo between vessels and trucks, trains, pipelines, and wharves; and waterfront terminal operations.

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.''

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 to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 925 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 925, if ordered; and on the motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 921.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

YEAS—227

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Nunes
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—196

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Evans
Fortenberry
Lewis (GA)
McKinney
Northup
Nussle
Pence

□ 1153

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 187, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

YEAS—237

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Nunes
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—187

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—8

Buyer
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Evans
Fortenberry
McKinney
Northup
Nussle

□ 1203

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.

CONDEMNING THE RECENT ATTACKS AGAINST THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 921.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 921, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 8, answered ''present'' 4, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

YEAS—410

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick