



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2010

No. 11

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

Rabbi Gil Steinlauf, Congregation Adas Israel, offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of all of our ancestors, we ask that the light of Your presence guide the hearts and minds of the leaders of this great Nation gathered here today.

May the wisdom of Your teachings guide them to act for justice, and to lift up the cause of the stranger, the orphan, and the widow.

Master of the universe, open the hearts of our leaders with Your compassion. Help them to lead with integrity, always remembering that Your wisdom resides in every heart as the deepest truth of our humanity.

May our leaders always remember that Your guidance is not in the heavens alone nor far beyond the sea, but within each of us, in our mouths and in our hearts, to carry into action in the world. May our leaders therefore serve as beacons of justice and compassion, making this country a light to the nations. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SHUSTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### HONORING RABBI GIL STEINLAUF

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to welcome Rabbi Gil Steinlauf of Adas Israel Congregation in Washington, DC, as our guest chaplain today.

When I was first elected to Congress and our family moved to Washington, we joined Adas Israel Congregation in Cleveland Park in the Washington, DC, area. Adas Israel is the largest conservative synagogue in our Nation's capital and one of its oldest. It also has a reputation for outreach to young families and Washington, DC, transplants. We have been members for more than 30 years.

Rabbi Steinlauf came to Adas Israel in August 2008 to serve as its senior rabbi. He quickly made his mark as a charismatic, energetic, and dynamic spiritual leader. It has been a great pleasure to get to know him and his family.

Originally from Jericho, New York, Rabbi Steinlauf was ordained in 1998 at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. He graduated from Princeton in 1991 with honors, and also studied at the Pardes Institute in Jerusalem and the University of Judaism, now known as the American Jewish University, which is located in my district in Los Angeles.

Rabbi Steinlauf is joined this morning by his wife, Rabbi Batya Steinlauf, and his children Elana, Noah, and Meirav, his parents Bernard and Sandra, some of his extended family, and a proud delegation of Adas Israel.

Thank you, Rabbi Steinlauf, for your inspirational words.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 additional 1-minutes on each side of the aisle.

### FINANCIAL REFORM, WALL STREET AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

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

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, the House passed the Wall Street Reform Consumer Protection Act.

It will reform the rules of the road that oversee Wall Street. It will end bailouts by helping ensure that taxpayers are never again on the hook for Wall Street's risky decisions.

It will protect retirement funds, college savings, homes, and businesses' financial futures from unnecessary risk by executives, lenders, and speculators.

It will protect consumers from predatory lending abuses, fine print, and industry gimmicks, and inject transparency and accountability into a financial system run amok.

It ends predatory lending practice with tougher enforcement.

We ask the Senate to pass this legislation to protect our consumers.

### IN MEMORY OF STAFF SERGEANT MATTHEW N. INGHAM, USMC

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, I attended the funeral service of a constituent, Staff Sergeant Matthew Ingham, United States Marine Corps, who was killed in action in southern Afghanistan on January 11, 2010. I rise today to recognize his life and his extraordinary service and sacrifice for our country.

Matt's parents, Gary and Tammi Ingham of Altoona, Pennsylvania, and

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H389

his wife, Yasmin Ingham, mourn the loss of a remarkable young man and a brave Marine. They are in my thoughts and prayers, and I pass on my sincere condolences.

Sergeant Ingham was awarded the Bronze Star with Valor for the heroic actions that ultimately led to his death. He was responsible for saving the lives of nine Marines by crawling to a radio to call in air support after his unit was ambushed. Although apparently wounded, Sergeant Ingham exposed himself to more enemy fire, and put the lives of his fellow Marines above his own.

Sergeant Ingham was a 2002 Altoona High School graduate. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in July 2002, and was promoted to staff sergeant in April. He served two tours in Iraq and went to Afghanistan in the fall as part of a reconnaissance outfit assigned to the 3rd Marine Division in Okinawa, Japan.

The Ninth District of Pennsylvania and our entire Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to Sergeant Matthew N. Ingham, his family, and all those who have sacrificed their lives in the pursuit of freedom.

#### JOBS

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of this Congress, this House has taken significant steps to grow our economy and create jobs at home.

Almost 1 year ago, we passed the Recovery Act to jump-start our economy by creating and saving millions of jobs while beginning to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure.

To build off this progress, in December we passed the Jobs for Main Street Act to create and save even more jobs at home, with targeted investment for highways, transit, and school renovations; the hiring of teachers, police, and firefighters; increased lending to small business; job training initiatives; and affordable housing.

Furthermore, to spur growth within small business, we passed the Small Business Financing and Investment Act to make it easier and more affordable for small businesses to get loans and access to capital, which in turn could save and create millions of jobs in this sector alone.

Mr. Speaker, while I am proud of the steps that this Chamber has taken to lift our economy, I know that our work is not done. We will continue to fight to create jobs until we find a solution to repair the damage left by the economic downturn of the last 8 years.

#### A DEAF GOVERNMENT ASLEEP IN DENIAL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, government's view of the economy could

be summed up this way: "If it moves, tax it. If it keeps moving, regulate it. And if it stops moving, subsidize it."

The American people are uneasy about their financial future. Taxing and borrowing and spending are out of control. Government is the problem. The people are frustrated.

We in Washington should listen to the people of America. They talked to us at town hall meetings. They got louder with their marches on Washington. The American people say stop the spending, cut up the credit cards. We should listen to America.

America is a representative Republic. That means the people talk, we listen. We implement their ideas. That is the way it works. Lately, the government dictates, the people comply. That is backwards, and it is arrogant.

In America, the people are the sovereign, not the government. We in Congress should make the government work for the people, work with them, not over them; stand by their side, not ride their backs. The people are talking, and their voices cannot continue to fall on a deaf government asleep in denial.

And that's just the way it is.

#### SUPREME COURT'S DECISION ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, among all of the potentially disastrous consequences of last week's Supreme Court decision on campaign finance, one of them is a really cruel irony. Those of us who think we need public financing of Federal campaigns may now watch as taxpayer dollars actually are used for Federal campaigns.

AIG, which this Congress and our taxpayers bailed out to the tune of \$180 billion, may now be able to spend our money, your money, to actually influence Federal elections.

Not only that. We passed the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to regulate Wall Street, finally, after they brought us to the brink of disaster. We spent a lot of money doing that, taxpayer dollars.

The companies that were saved by those dollars can now directly advocate for the election or defeat of candidates for Federal office.

This is a disgrace. And, unfortunately, we still haven't acted sufficiently to put an end to the risky behavior of Wall Street. I hope the Senate will act and we can sign the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act into law before the Supreme Court destroys the country.

□ 1015

#### CBO REPORTS MORE STIMULUS STUMBLES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office announced that the cost of the President's spending plan has jumped another \$75 billion. Stephen Dinan at the Washington Times reported that "the country faces giant budget deficits for the foreseeable future and has the biggest debt problem it has seen since just after World War II."

On the heels of these reports, the President will deliver the State of the Union address and will present his agenda tonight. I hope the President will be substantive about tackling out-of-control Washington spending to promote bipartisan cooperation. I believe we need to freeze spending based on 2008 levels. The Washington liberal majority needs to explain the 85 percent spending spike in just 2 years. American families who are trying to stay financially afloat do not have time for any more stimulus stumbles. We need jobs, not more spending.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Congratulations, Coach Darrin Horn and the USC Gamecocks, for their 68-62 victory over number one ranked Kentucky.

#### WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress, with the last administration, President Bush came to Congress during the financial meltdown, along with Secretary Paulson, and asked for hundreds of billions of dollars. They said they were going to use it to buy bad debt from the banks. It was threatening to bring down our financial system. Did they use it for that? No. Instead, they started to use it to nationalize American companies. They bought automobile companies; they bought banks. They used the government to take over the means of production.

It now falls to us to break this socialist stranglehold on our country. The Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is one of the first steps. We ban future TARP bailouts. We require the companies pay into a fund. No longer will companies be bailed out by taxpayer dollars. I call upon the United States Senate to pass the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act and for us to take additional steps to privatize these companies that the Federal Government now owns.

#### JOB CREATION ACT OF 2010

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced the Job Creation

Act of 2010. The number one priority in America should be jobs and helping small businesses. My five-point plan is to provide tax relief for small businesses. Instead of writing off equipment over 5 years, have them write it off over 1 year and sunset it in a year or two. Eliminate capital gains tax on companies. There's plenty of capital. People don't have confidence in the administration; they don't have confidence in this Congress. But there is capital to invest. The small businesses need that capital to create jobs.

We're taxing unemployment benefits at 11 percent. That needs to stop. We need to sunset that. TARP funds, \$750 billion: we committed to the American people that would be paid back. They are paying back much of the funds. It needs to go to pay down the \$12 trillion debt. Also, we need to curb frivolous lawsuits. It's driving up health care, it's killing businesses, it's killing jobs.

I urge Members from both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

#### RECOGNIZING THE SCOOTER STORE

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my good friend, Representative LAMAR SMITH, to honor The SCOOTER Store, a hometown business in our home State of Texas. They've been recognized by Fortune magazine as one of the top 100 places to work in America. Fortune magazine has recognized this excellent work environment for their employees, ranking The SCOOTER Store the 38th Best Place to Work in 2010. The SCOOTER Store was founded in New Braunfels, Texas, by Doug and Susanna Harrison almost 19 years ago. Today, they serve more than 460,000 people across 48 States and Puerto Rico, with more than 70 facilities and approximately 2,000 employees.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time they have been recognized. They were recognized 6 years ago. They're a company built on teamwork and good values. And this is why, Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to have the time to recognize The SCOOTER Store for their ranking as the 38th Best Place to Work in 2010 by Fortune magazine.

#### RONALD AND GLENDA KRONGOLD'S WORK WITH ISRAEL BONDS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I rise today to recognize two outstanding Americans, my good friends, Ronald and Glenda Krongold, constituents of my congressional district. For decades, the Krongolds have dedicated themselves to the safety and security of our democratic Jewish State of Israel, including through their leadership in the Na-

tional Israel Bonds Campaign. Ron served as vice chairman and chairman of new leadership.

Their work on Israel bonds has contributed greatly to Israel's thriving economy and its booming scientific, technological, and entrepreneurial sectors. Ron's expertise has also benefited our home State of Florida. He played a pivotal role in the negotiations of the Trade Understanding between our State of Florida and Israel, signed by then-Secretary of Commerce for Florida, Jeb Bush.

Ron and Glenda, for your dedication you have the appreciation of this House and of countless Americans and Israelis. Thank you for your work. Keep it up.

#### FREEDOM FROM FOREIGN-BASED MANIPULATION IN AMERICAN ELECTIONS ACT

(Mr. HALL of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of New York. I rise today to urge Congress to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling last week that allows corporations to buy Federal elections. Yesterday, I introduced the Freedom from Foreign-Based Manipulation in American Elections Act, which will prevent foreign-influenced companies from buying U.S. elections. Should a Chinese corporation decide U.S. copyright policy or civil rights law? Should Saudi Arabia have a say on American energy policy? How about Venezuela? Should Hugo Chavez have a voice in American elections? These are the questions we must ask if the Supreme Court's decision is allowed to stand.

The Court's decision flies in the face of a century of precedent keeping corporations out of elections. By giving corporations the same rights as individuals, the Court is handing corporations a blank check to decide elections instead of letting the voters do it. I urge my colleagues to join me in saying "no" to this decision and "yes" to democracy.

#### THANKS TO THE MINNESOTA RED BULLS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say welcome home to a group of Minnesota heroes, the National Guard's 34th Infantry Division, known as the Red Bulls. Many of the Red Bulls have begun arriving home from their most recent tour of duty in Iraq. These brave Minnesotans have played a very crucial role in transitioning security responsibilities from American troops to the Iraqi forces, as well as leading more than 1,000 new reconstruction projects to help the Iraqi people. The 1,200 soldiers that are now returning home come from more than 275

communities in Minnesota and represent the American spirit of selflessness, sacrifice, and service.

I had the chance to personally meet with some of the Red Bulls when I visited Iraq not too long ago. I was humbled to see their selfless work that they accomplish every single day. Today, I'm thrilled to see them returning home from Iraq safely to their friends, to their families, and to a State that is especially grateful for all that they do.

#### ECONOMIC CLIMATE FOR JOB GROWTH

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, we have asked the American people to do a lot over the past year in order to work together to rebuild our economy. Tonight, we await the President's words to see how the country will move forward to continue to put people back to work and make reforms necessary to jump-start our economy. I applaud the President for putting a freeze on all nonsecurity discretionary spending for fiscal year 2011, because as the American family tightens its belt, so must Congress. I would encourage the President to continue to call for increased fiscal responsibility in Congress, and I will do my part in ensuring that we spend responsibly to protect the people of my district.

I joined several of my Blue Dog colleagues in a letter led by Congressman PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania to call for a spending freeze earlier this month and will continue to look for ways that we can continue to hold ourselves fiscally accountable for PAYGO and other budget cuts. My predecessor in Congress used to say that we here in Congress can't create jobs, but we can create an economic climate for job growth and development to boost our local economies. That should be our primary goal in 2010.

#### A RETURN TO BALANCED BUDGETS AND JOB CREATION

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, according to a poll released this week by CNN, nearly three out of four Americans think that much of the money spent in the so-called stimulus plan has been wasted. I agree. Should we be surprised that a bill chock-full of earmarks and pet projects did nothing to inspire confidence among Americans? And with a record drop in real estate sales, a languishing stock market, and an unemployment rate remaining above 10 percent, should we blame them? The CBO just offered that after only 1 year in total control, Democrats more than tripled the annual deficit, from \$408 billion to \$1.4 trillion. These

are not the changes Americans voted for.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the idea of a spending freeze, this country needs more than just window dressing. It needs to return to balanced budgets and a real focus on job creation.

#### WORKING TOGETHER TO HELP THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. ENGEL. Tonight, when our President gives his State of the Union Address, I'm going to listen very intently. I know that he's going to talk about creating jobs, improving the economy, lowering unemployment, and also health care reform. Let's rally behind our President. The people sent us here to work together in a bipartisan fashion. Let's not talk about what is best politically for this party or that party, let's look at what is best for the American people.

I ask my Republican friends, stop being the Party of No. Work with us on health care. We can do it if we all put our heads together. Let me remind my friends that the TARP bailout and the bailout of the banks happened under President Bush. It was President Bush's recommendation, and I and other Democrats supported it because it was the right thing to do.

Let's support the President when he says the right things, as he will tonight. Let's understand that we can only succeed if we work together. We were left a mess by the previous administration. One year to clean it up is not enough. We prevented a depression. Now we have to move on. So I ask the other side of the aisle, please work with us. Please work with us to help the American people.

#### VISA FAILURE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we know that the best way to prevent an attack on U.S. soil is to ensure that terrorists are stopped before they reach our shores. Unfortunately, we failed to do so on Christmas Day and al Qaeda came close to significant victory. While the terrorist Abdulmutallab was noted in a terrorist identity database, he was not placed on a separate screening database and his U.S. visa was not revoked. Clearly, we did not connect the dots to notice that a man on a U.S. watch list also held a current U.S. visa. This has not been the first time terrorists have obtained U.S. visas. Several of the 9/11 hijackers did so as well.

We need to strengthen the visa application process. We need to streamline the intelligence gathering and sharing process. We need to end the visa lottery. We need to ensure that terrorists

are turned around before they get to the airport before they even attempt to go through security. Were it not for the quick action of passengers on that flight, 288 innocent lives would have been lost. Passengers should not have to rely on last-minute heroics in order to travel safely. This administration must get serious about addressing this problem.

□ 1030

#### OUR ELECTIONS ARE NOT FOR SALE

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Justice Brandeis got it right: democracy or wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but not both. And that's truer today as the United States Supreme Court just wiped away decades of legal precedent, allowing corporations to spend unlimited money from their treasuries in our elections.

The American people already believe that corporate special interests and their lobbyists run the show around here. I mean, the halls are crawling with them. But that's not enough. Now the Court says to the big banks, the credit card companies, the drug companies and to the insurance companies, Hey, all bets are off, and it's open season. Our elections are for sale. So that's right. If the corporations don't like what this Congresswoman is doing, they'll just forget the voters, buy TV ads, send robocalls, send a lot of mail, and beat her in November.

A law won't fix this. We have to fix it in the Constitution. So today I will introduce a constitutional amendment so that we, the people, can take back our elections and our democracy. This is not the People's House, Incorporated. We are the people. It's our House, it's our Constitution, and it's our elections. And we intend to take it back from the United States Supreme Court.

#### CREATING JOBS WHILE CLEANING UP THE ENVIRONMENT

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since the \$862 billion stimulus bill was signed into law last February, nearly 3 million more Americans have lost jobs. The projected deficit for this year is \$1.3 trillion, second only to last year's \$1.4 trillion. It's time to stop Washington's wild spending and start creating hometown jobs. Families want paychecks, not unemployment checks. That's why we introduced a bipartisan American Conservation and Clean Energy Independence Act, H.R. 2227, which opens up the U.S. coasts for environmentally responsible oil and gas exploration.

This bill produces 1.2 million new, good-paying jobs and an \$8 trillion eco-

nomics boost over 20 years. We will clean up America's waterways. We will clean our air by replacing old coal plants with new clean coal, nuclear, wind, solar, and geothermal energy generation. We will conserve energy by rebuilding our old infrastructure and a smart grid. Americans will modernize buildings to cut energy waste by 25 percent. We stop spending hundreds of billions of dollars on OPEC oil. We stop borrowing from China, and we do all of this without raising a single tax.

Join me in supporting H.R. 2227 with new jobs for a new energy-independent America.

#### THE PROPOSED 3-YEAR SPENDING FREEZE

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

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the President, according to the press reports that we are getting over the last couple of days, will be proposing a 3-year freeze on nonsecurity-related discretionary spending. This is a good and necessary first step to control government spending and reduce budget deficits.

However, our ballooning deficits mandate that we go even further. Wasteful and unnecessary programs need to be ID'd. They need to be reduced. They need to be eliminated, and they need to be eliminated immediately. I have and will consistently oppose legislation that I believe unnecessarily increases Federal spending or funding programs that do not warrant support during a recession, even when they are only a few million dollars.

You know, we must have the mindset that every little bit counts if we're going to be serious about cutting government wasteful spending. I hope the President goes further in explaining some of his proposals in the State of the Union tonight, and I will be listening very closely with many others.

Yesterday, the Blue Dogs, my colleagues, released a set of proposals that outline the steps that we must take to have meaningful budget reform. The President and leadership would be well-served to adopt and support these proposals in the coming weeks and months.

#### AMERICAN TAXPAYERS DO NOT WANT TO FUND ABORTION

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, almost 500,000 folks gathered at the Capitol to remind us once again that all life is precious and that the unborn are guaranteed the right to life. While abortion has been allowed in this country for the past 37 years, Americans have made it crystal clear that they do not want their tax dollars being used to pay for it.

For 34 years, the Hyde amendment has stopped Federal funds from being used to pay for abortion. The current bill passed by the Senate will erode this. This bill will change that long-standing law and allow for tax dollars to be used for abortion.

Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want their money to be used to pay for abortions. As we continue to debate the health care bill, we must honor their wish.

#### REBUILDING AMERICA'S ECONOMY

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, one year ago, our economy was on the brink of collapse; Wall Street was in a downward spiral, credit markets were completely frozen, and more than 700,000 Americans were losing their jobs every month. But President Obama and the Democratic-led Congress responded quickly and responsibly with historic measures. These measures may be unpopular, unpleasant, and expensive, but they have worked.

I have been meeting recently with business, labor, and community leaders throughout my district to get a better sense of how the recovery is working for Main Street. My constituents have made it clear to me that we have made great progress. Financial and housing markets have stabilized, monthly job losses have abated, and banks have begun to lend again. However, they also made it clear that they need more help, and that's why this Democratic-led Congress has passed the Jobs for Main Street Act in the House.

This plan builds economic opportunity for the long term, creates new jobs that are sustainable for years ahead, rebuilds our infrastructure, creates new energy sources, and develops the new technologies and innovative products that we and the world want to buy. We are committed to rebuilding America's economy, putting Americans back to work and ensuring our Nation's economic future.

#### RECOUPING MONEY LENT TO WALL STREET

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight the President of the United States will be addressing the Nation on where we are at, how we got here, and what we must do now to dig out of this economic mess.

Well, where are we? We're coming out of the deepest worldwide economic downturn of our time. And how did we get here? Never forget, never forget that it was George Bush's Republican policies that drove us into the ditch, and without paying a dime for them.

Republicans gave away huge tax cuts to the rich, got us into two wars at the

same time, created the biggest trillion-dollar prescription drug entitlement plan in American history, and deregulated the banks on Wall Street who looted our Treasury. And worse yet, they borrowed all the money from China, asking our children and grandchildren to pay it back. The fact is, we're cleaning up after the biggest elephant parade in American history. And never forget these facts.

Well, folks in the middle class rescued Wall Street, and now it's Wall Street's turn to turn back the favor. We want our money back, and that's why we are proposing a transfer fee on all trades on Wall Street speculators.

#### GETTING OUR FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mr. PENCE. Tonight, the President of the United States will return to this well of Congress and deliver his report on the state of the Union, and House Republicans welcome the President back to the people's House. Now we've heard that after a year of runaway Federal spending, trillion-dollar deficits, borrowing, bailouts, and Big Government schemes in energy and health care, after a year where Democrats have been on a spending binge, the President is going to tell us that he's going to get his party on the wagon here in Congress.

Well, let me say, we welcome that. We welcome word that the President may call for a 3-year spending freeze. Frankly, I never met a spending freeze I didn't like. But let me say this emphatically: House Republicans will welcome any effort to restore fiscal discipline to Washington, D.C., and work with this administration.

But Mr. President, the American people want action. We don't need another lofty speech from this historic well from the President of the United States. Mr. President, set aside your Big Government plans to take over health care, send us a budget that reduces spending and reduces taxes on the American people. Mr. President, deeds, not words—deeds, not words are what are required to put our fiscal house in order.

#### REMEMBERING HAITI

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the compassionate concern of Congress to those affected by the recent earthquake in Haiti, including thousands of American families of those missing and injured.

My thoughts are especially with the Gianacaci family of Hopewell, New Jersey, at this time from the appropriately named town of Hopewell.

Their daughter, Christine, a student of Lynn University, was doing service work in Haiti when the quake struck. I have assured the Gianacaci family that we will not rest until Christine and so many others are accounted for and returned to their loved ones.

I pay a special tribute to the Fairfax County Search and Rescue Team which, like others, have been at the Hotel Montana site continuously for more than 2 weeks looking for Christine and other Americans believed to be at the hotel. Also, thanks must go to the Department of State and the many people in the 82nd Airborne, the Marine Expeditionary Group, the DOT, HHS, and other government personnel who reflect and carry out the compassionate concern of the American people who again demonstrate their core generosity.

#### CHUTZPAH

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, and the only word that comes to mind is a Yiddish word called "chutzpah." Here my friends on the Republican side of the aisle are talking about the debt, they're talking about jobs, they're talking about fiscal restraint when, in fact, it was the Republican administration under George Bush and the Republican programs under their Congress that drove us in the ditch and created this mess that we have.

President Obama inherited a \$1.4 trillion deficit, the biggest debt ever in history. Now the Republicans would like to say, Hey, Democrats, why haven't you gotten rid of that? Hey, country, why don't you take care of this? Well, this was a big mess that was created under their watch. We have tried to create jobs. We're going to deal with this long-term debt, but the Republican prescription for America—you know what it is? Mass amnesia. They want people to forget. Well, we're not going to forget, and we're not going to let the people forget that the programs and the policies of the last administration almost took this country in the tank, and that's got to stop.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3726, CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2010 AND H.R. 4474, IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER FACILITIES ACT

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1038 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1038

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in

the House the bill (H.R. 3726) to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4474) to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1038.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1038 is a single rule that provides for separate consideration of two measures. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3726, the Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act, and H.R. 4474, the Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act.

□ 1045

Each bill has 1 hour of general debate to be controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule also allows a motion to recommit with or without instructions for each of the two bills.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3726, the Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2010, and H.R. 4474, the Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act,

are 2 pieces of legislation that represent years of hard work by their sponsors and the local communities that are at the heart of both bills. H.R. 3726, the Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2010, introduced by Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN, will add a new treasure to our Nation's National Park System. From the early times of Yosemite and Yellowstone to the national monuments right here in Washington, D.C., our country has had the foresight to preserve the tangible places which house our Nation's character, identity and history. Today, the Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2010 does the same for the history and identity of a unique place in our country, the U.S. Virgin Islands.

This area of St. Croix holds a great number of historical remnants, not only from the colonial age, when the West Indies played a prominent role in shaping world history, but also pre-Columbian archeological sites, continuing a proud and long tradition of preserving the remnants and artifacts of our first nations in this hemisphere begun by the Park Service in my State of Colorado with Mesa Verde National Park. Largely of Danish origin, the colonial history of St. Croix preserved at Castle Nugent is among the oldest in the West Indies. This national historic site preserves much more than history. It also preserves a great deal of natural habitat. The site includes sensitive sea turtle nesting areas and habitat, healthy and increasingly scarce coral reefs, and a lagoon that provides habitat to a wealth of wildlife and plants.

For any proposed National Park System addition, the first step is to have the Park Service complete a study of the proposed addition, and to ensure that the proposed addition does, in fact, deserve to be included among the treasures of our Nation that the Park System includes. The National Park Service concurred, and found that Castle Nugent area does in fact deserve to be included as a part of our Nation's national parks. This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 4474, the Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act, a bill that has undoubtedly been the focus of a great deal of work by its key sponsors, Congressman MINNICK of Idaho and Congressman SIMPSON.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 provided our Nation with a tool to preserve its last remaining wild places untrammelled by man. Like my home State of Colorado, Idaho's sweeping beauty, rugged mountains, wildlife, and waterways form the foundation of our country's cultural identity and our civic pride. The Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness area was created in 1946 as one of our country's first wilderness areas and has preserved the wild nature of a truly breathtaking landscape. Adjoining the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness area is the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness area designated in 1980. Predating the existence of these two wilderness areas, private land own-

ers had received permits to maintain and repair water diversions that existed on National Forest Service lands. Many of these permits have since expired, leaving those who own the water diversions unable to mechanically maintain their water systems since they're within designated wilderness areas.

H.R. 4474 would give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to issue special use authorization to owners of these water storage transport or diversion facilities to allow for their continued maintenance of their water facilities, allowing local water rights and ensuring that they continue to access their water.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and both these bills are straightforward and provide a great deal of benefit, not only to our country, but also to the communities and residents who are most directly involved and impacted. I urge passage of the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule, yet another closed rule before the Congress, and I object to the process by which this bill was brought to the floor. Last week, both of the bills we're discussing today under this rule failed to get the two-thirds vote in this body. Instead of working together to resolve the differences with the bills between the leadership, my friends on the other side of the aisle, the majority, simply rescheduled them for floor action today with no Republican input.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we're going to debate these bills, and once again, the Democrat leadership's priorities in this Congress—let's be honest about that—it's about spending money. Spending money, Mr. Speaker, is what this Democrat leadership priority is all about. However, tonight our body will welcome the President of the United States. And the President will be here for the State of the Union, and we will be able to hear from the President about his priorities and about—I think we will hear about how he wants us to work together, work together. Ideas from both sides.

Hey, I get it. The Republican Party is not in the majority. The American people get that. We're in the middle of Democrat majorities that have been in place for 3 years now. And I suspect we'll hear from the President about how important it is to work together and use bipartisan measures to reconcile our differences for the American people so that they can have confidence in Congress, our ability to work together on big issues and small issues, set priorities that the American people can understand.

Yet, Democrat leadership just last week took down the Idaho Wilderness bill and then placed it on the calendar for today with the exact same language, but they removed my colleague, a Republican, Dr. MIKE SIMPSON, as sponsor of the bill and replaced him

with a member of the majority party. Payback time, I guess, is once again in order here on the floor of the House of Representatives, on the exact same day that we're going to welcome the President, and we're all going to put that big smiley face on tonight. We're all working together. Boy, we don't know what's wrong with the problems of the country, but we're going to work together, and then be admonished about telling the truth, which is, Congress is the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is here to do the people's work. We're here to work together. We continue to have ideas that are shut out in the room just above this floor, just above this body, up there called the Rules Committee. We've been trying for years to do that. I wonder if the President would consider that working together by the way we're doing this. I hope he does not. I hope he admonishes us, and I hope he takes us to task and says that foolish political gamesmanship is wasting America's money and America's time, because time is important to the American people, because there are a whole lot of people who are without jobs. They're without jobs because of the lack of bipartisanship and working together in this body, all for spending money because that's what this Speaker wants to do. I think the American people want Democrats to rein in their borrowing, taxing, and spending ways. That's what I think. I don't know. Maybe you'd have to ask the American people.

Oh, by the way, I think they've spoken in New Jersey and Virginia and again last week in Massachusetts. I think they want Congress to stop talking about what they will do to provide jobs and talk about all the things that are happening and actually get to the work of getting it done.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot to say today, but at this time I'd like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) who, last night, very clearly in the Rules Committee, as ranking member talked about what Republicans' hopes and dreams were just on this bill and the process.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. I thank both of my Rules Committee colleagues for being here. And I will say that this is obviously a very important day. We're anxiously looking forward to the message that the President of the United States will be delivering right behind me here as he provides his State of the Union address. And there is an early indication of what it is that he might say. He is, according to reports, going to be talking about the need for fiscal responsibility, the need for us to do everything that we can to bring about a freeze in spending, and we all think that that's a good first step. I will say that if you look at the two omnibus appropriations bills, coupled with the

stimulus bill, the report that we just got of an additional \$75 billion on top of the \$787 billion for the stimulus bill, we have over the last 2 years seen an 86 percent increase in spending. An 86 percent increase. And I guess freezing with an 86 percent increase that is proposed in spending for the next 2 years is something that may not be all that painful for people who want to maintain a high level of Federal spending.

So, as we look at that, and then recognize that this measure that is before us, that allows for the up to \$50 million, \$50 million, not billion, not trillion, which are the terms we use around here, but \$50 million to be authorized for the purchase of beachfront property in St. Croix, I just don't understand how, on the day that we're going to have the President of the United States stand here talking about a spending freeze, that we could possibly consider taking action such as this.

The American people get it. Last night I had a telephone town hall meeting with my constituents in southern California in the Los Angeles area, and they have been raising grave concerns about the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government, and they have made it clear that they want us to work, not just to have a freeze, but to bring about major spending cuts. The message that the American people have been sending to us that we got, as my friend from Dallas said, a week ago yesterday, is that getting the economy back on track is a very, very high priority. Job creation is a high priority. And we know that.

In my State of California, where we have a national 10 percent unemployment rate in the area that I represent, suburban Los Angeles, we have an unemployment rate in some areas that is in excess of 14 percent. People are losing their homes and their businesses, and they want us to focus on creating good, long-term, private-sector, not temporary government, jobs, not jobs that are going to be engaged in collecting the numbers and information through the census and that sort of thing, those sorts of temporary jobs. They want long-term job creation. And we have an opportunity, in fact, the President has an opportunity, to do just that, Mr. Speaker.

If he were to send us the three pending trade agreements, and I know I've talked to my friend from Colorado about the issue of trade, and I know that he joins me in being a supporter of free trade. I would hope that if the President were to send the three pending trade agreements, Panama, Colombia, and South Korea, here to the Congress, I am convinced that at least the Panama and Colombia agreements, based on conversations that I've had with Members on both sides of the aisle, we could have a bipartisan win, and that in passing, if we passed these three agreements, we could create more than a quarter of a million good, private-sector jobs.

Why? Well, if you look on average, the tariff on manufactured goods and other products going into the 40 million-consumer-strong Colombia is 14 percent. That means union and non-union members who are working for Caterpillar in Peoria, Illinois, manufacturers working for Whirlpool in Ohio, would have an opportunity to sell their manufactured products, their tractors, their washing machines and refrigerators into this market.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what that would do is create again, good, long-term private-sector jobs. If we were to be able to do the Korea deal it would be the single largest trade agreement in the history of the world. Korea has a \$1 trillion economy, Mr. Speaker, a \$1 trillion economy. We have about \$83 billion in trade with Korea right now. By and large, Korean products, automobiles and other things get to the U.S. consumer tariff free, virtually tariff free. I think that's a good thing. I think imports benefit the consumer.

□ 1100

What we need to do is we need to pry open their market, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I won't take the 5 minutes. I am going to wrap up here because I think what we need to do is we need to not just talk, we need to engage in action.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was just mentioning Korea. The fact is we would have the single largest agreement that has ever been put together. They're our seventh largest trading partner right now, South Korea; and it would mean that while we have their products coming here virtually tariff free, there would be an opportunity for us to have access to the millions of consumers in South Korea which we don't today.

And I also have to say that our inaction, the fact that we've had these agreements signed by our executive branch, the executive branches of those countries, they're awaiting passage here in the United States Congress. Our inaction has really jeopardized our potential for economic growth. Why? If you look at the fact that Colombia has already embarked on a free trade agreement with Canada, if you look at the fact that South Korea is working with the European Union right now, there are other countries and blocs in the world that are taking advantage of our inaction here. And remember again, Mr. Speaker, our action is going to create probably in excess of a quarter of a million good private sector jobs.

So as the President talks this evening about job creation and economic growth and fiscal responsibility, I hope that he will follow his words because he has told me that he believes in free trade and wants to do this Colombia deal. We're awaiting it. We anxiously look forward to his sending it up

so that U.S. workers will have the opportunity to enjoy the kind of success we've seen in the past and I am convinced we will see in the future.

And I thank my friend for his yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. POLIS. I find little objectionable in what my colleague from California said. Certainly there is great opportunity for trade with South Korea and Panama and Colombia to create jobs, but none of those agreements are the topic of the rule before us today.

And I want to give a little background on this and talk about how we can move forward.

First of all, we could have moved forward in a more bipartisan way had these passed on suspension. What does suspension mean? A suspension requires a two-thirds vote of the House. The bills are nonamendable in that form. Both bills passed with a majority instead of two-thirds. H.R. 3726 passed 241-173 and H.R. 3538, which was the version identical to H.R. 4474, passed by 225-191.

So since they both passed by majorities but not two-thirds, they came before us in the Rules Committee. And we would have loved ideas. My colleague, Mr. SESSIONS, talked about how can we work better together. Well, there weren't any amendments that were submitted. This would have been the time, whether the ideas came from Republicans or Democrats, and our Rules Committee has an excellent record of allowing amendments from Members in the minority party as well as the majority party. And I know we take our role very conscientiously in terms of making sure that both parties are represented. There simply weren't any better ideas represented.

The fact is that both of these bills deal with important local issues. They have important buy-in from the stakeholders.

I have personally more familiarity with the wilderness designation aspects because we're working in Colorado in wilderness designation. It's a very real issue when you're dealing with legacy water installations, how can they be maintained if they're on wilderness, how do you grandfather them. And this affects real people.

And it took both Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. MINNICK working across the aisle in Idaho coming together and coming before Congress and saying this is our local solution and asking for us to approve it. It would have been nice if we had been able to get that done on suspension. If there weren't any other ideas to improve it, well, now is a good chance to have a good bipartisan vote to pass the bill.

Same with the other bill, the Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act. One key thing about this bill is it doesn't spend any money, doesn't spend one dime. You've heard the figure tossed around, oh, it might be worth \$40 million, might be worth \$25 million. This is merely an authorization bill, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are fully aware.

The bill simply designates this area as a new unit. But the bill contains no direct spending. And any land acquisition, if it occurs, would be subject to appropriations or to fund-raising or donations.

Enactment of this legislation is just the beginning of a very important process that we've been through with many other national monuments to preserve a unique and stunning area for inclusion in our national park system.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman said. I know he was busy. I find times when I cannot attend a Rules Committee meeting, and I know the gentleman was not there yesterday. But I need to help him with what actually happened.

As a matter of fact, the Republicans did ask for an open rule. We were not without ideas. You have to open the rule to get amendments in, and we were denied. I also would point to, you know, the idea that we're all sitting around here, Oh, golly gee, we're all bipartisan—when, in fact, the gentleman voted against the bill just this last week, I assume because he disagreed with the substance of the bill. But he was joined by lots of Democratic colleagues that actually took down the bill because once again, I assume substance—not because it was a Republican's name on there. It will be interesting to see what happens today when there is a Democrat Member's name on there to find out if the same policy differences that existed last week, even though it's the exact same bill, whether those same policy problems still exist today or really whether it was just politics.

And we'll be able to know this afternoon. We'll be able to know because it's the exact same bill and the argument the gentleman is making, we're just all getting our job done around here.

Mr. Speaker, we disagree with the bill. And we spoke yesterday not just about Dr. SIMPSON's bill; we also spoke about the bill with the \$50 million in St. Croix. And I am going to outline part of that here. But it's based upon substance. And the substance that we believe is important is directly related to the National Park Service giving us their study which they spent \$500,000 doing. And last night upstairs, we just blew it off: don't worry about that recommendation; National Park Service, they're going to say it's okay.

I'm sorry. In testimony: Do you know what the substance, what they're going to say? No, but I have a good idea. You know, I sit on the committee. I am a ranking member or I am the committee chairman.

Mr. Speaker, that's the wrong way to run this House. It's the wrong way to run the Rules Committee. That's the wrong way to do things, to ask somebody to do a study and spend half a million dollars and just go ahead and move the legislation without even hearing from people about the substance of the issue.

Forget about it being beachfront property, \$50 million, \$9 billion backlog of taking care of national parks in this country, and yet it's going to take another million dollars annually just to take care of this beachfront property that the Democratic leadership wants to push.

Americans across the Nation are struggling, Mr. Speaker. They're struggling to provide for their own families and their loved ones. Last week, the Department of Labor released data showing that 12 million Americans are collecting unemployment benefits and over 15 million are currently unemployed. That is double, that is double in 1 year.

There is only so much blame that goes around. At some point the Democratic leadership is going to have to say after 3 years of running this economy into the ground, they're going to have to stand up and be big about it. It's the policies of taxing and spending that the Democratic leadership, the Democratic Members are letting them get away with in this body.

I think somebody is going to have to explain the priorities at some point: why they're putting these two bills back to back, why they're trying to oppose it 1 week with the same policy, the next week presumably will pass it. I will watch with great interest, Mr. Speaker, to see exactly what happens today on the vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I take some degree of offense coming from Colorado if people were to call our wilderness area kind of denigrated as mountain-front property. It so happens that our State is a mountainous State so property happens to be mountainous.

Likewise, when you're talking about an island, you can call it beachfront property, but it's an island. It's by the beach. That is what an island is. We're a mountainous State; St. Croix is an island.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. Speaker, I heard my friend from Texas talk about our Rules Committee meeting last night, and what he forgot to mention to you and to this body was that this bill that is before us concerning the Virgin Islands is an authorization bill. Now, to the world, what does that mean? It means it only gives the authority for the National Park System to decide whether they want to accept a donation of the property, they want to pay for the property, or make an exchange for the property. There is no appropriation. There is no money spent.

And I appreciate my friend's comment about the need for the study. Well, the study will be there before any money is spent by the United States of America.

But according to the testimony, this is property that has cultural value as

well as scenic value, something that is important to the preservation of these islands and that is important to the United States of America. So this bill just authorizes it; doesn't pay anything for it.

Now, my friend from Texas talked about jobs. What he forgot to tell you, tell all of us, was that when George Bush left office last year, we lost 785,000 jobs in that month. Last month in December, we lost 85,000. Still not good enough, and we all know that. Still not good enough. But 785,000 at the end of the Bush administration and in 1 year we reduced that to 85,000 a month.

Now, we've got a lot of work to do, and we need to do it in a bipartisan way. So my friend is right; we need to work together. And I intend to work with him and with others to reverse this system and get people back to work. We've got to roll up our sleeves. We've got a big job ahead of us to get people back to work and to create jobs in this country.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it's all about priorities; and, you know, I welcome the debate that we're having here today.

We asked that we not do this. We asked, at the Rules Committee, let's not do this bill. Isn't it better that we don't go spend \$50 million right now?

It is an island. By the way, every piece of land on the island is not beachfront property.

The bottom line is that we are choosing because it's a priority to do this. It's a priority, and those priorities the Republican Party disagrees with.

Additionally, the second bill that comes under this rule that failed to get two-thirds vote last week is the one we're talking about, H.R. 3726, the Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act. And what this bill really does, as we've heard, is it authorizes but does not appropriate \$50 million. If there is anybody in this body who believes that we're going to have a significant debate about the \$50 million when it comes in a huge package of appropriations, they're wrong. This puts it in line to be a part of another massive spending bill.

Meanwhile, as we go and buy new Federal land in the Virgin Islands, unemployment rate at 10 percent, that's problematic to me. Even more, Americans, lots of them, don't even have the opportunity to go visit this new \$50 million purchase because economic climates are so bad. And you know, even if we weren't running a \$1.4 trillion deficit and raising the debt limit by another \$1.9 trillion in the next few weeks, there's still this backlog that we could prioritize and put the \$50 million in to take care of the \$9 billion maintenance backlog that we have in this country.

And by the way, that's cultural. Lots of sites in this country are cultural that are national parks. And the priorities should be of existing decisions that we have made.

□ 1115

I just think it's a bad way to go. But I think it represents exactly the mindset of the Democratic leadership: another good way to spend money, put a happy, smiley face on it, and talk about it's a really good thing for taxpayers.

We're going to find out more when the National Park Service finally releases their study. We are going to find out what they would say. But the Republicans up in the room in the Rules Committee last night said let's wait. Let's not spend the money. Let's wait to find out what we do. And most of all, let's make this an open rule so every Member can bring their ideas down here.

It's not going to happen. Party-line vote.

So what today's legislation should show the American people is about this Congress' priorities: First, that the Democrats refuse—once again, nothing new—to work with Republicans on anything from water bills to national health care reform. Secondly, that jobs and the economy come second to the \$50 million worth of taxpayer funds for beachfront property that most Americans will never, never, ever see.

Mr. Speaker, Americans want jobs. They want fiscal responsibility by this body. They want us to work together on the issues and the problems facing this country. And I think they are seeing, once again today, after what was called the wake-up call last week, that we are not doing any of those.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrat majority continues to serve initiatives and policies that will lead to more unemployment, more debt, and more taxation. This administration and the Democrat Congress promised Americans they would be serious about jobs, economic recovery, health care, cleaner energy, and better education. The list goes on and on and on. And what we see after 3 years, now entering the fourth, of Democratic leadership majority in this body is that they are driving our country to record deficits, record unemployment, record spending, and record inability to take responsibility for what they have done on their watch being the policy arm of this government.

This rule does not represent any commitment to fiscal sustainability, either. And with this legislation, Congress only continues to increase Federal debt, slows down our economic recovery, increases the Federal burden and the financial burden placed on our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration promised Americans if Congress passed the stimulus bill that unemployment would not go beyond 8 percent. That was a long time ago. They promised that it would save millions of jobs. Here we are 1 year later, record unemployment and more than 2 million Americans have lost their jobs since the package that was called the "jobs bill," a \$1.2 trillion stimulus package, and today in the papers we read about

not only is it not working, it is doing what Republicans said at the time. It is going to add to unemployment and debt that will increase at an exponential rate.

In June of last year, my friends on the other side of the aisle passed a cap-and-trade bill that would also raise prices on energy and goods and services for hardworking Americans across this country. In my home State of Texas, the average household would expect to pay more than \$1,100 extra a year. No wonder—no wonder there is an outcry. Once again, part of a legislative package, an initiative, that would lose 1.38 million manufacturing jobs. They are in the middle of that right now.

Somebody is going to have to stand up and take accountability for this, because it is happening on the leadership of the Democratic Party's watch. And today, despite these facts, we are spending more money and going to place America in a deficit position again.

Mr. Speaker, in November this last year, the Democrat-controlled House passed sweeping health care reform that effectively diminished employer-based insurance and now is a part of a debate as we continue to lose jobs. It's time that the Democratic Party began working with Republicans if you want to bring jobs back.

Mr. Speaker, the majority party is out of touch. They are out of touch with Americans. Their priorities on borrowing, taxing, and spending are killing our economy and ruining progress for job growth. I know, once again, today I, Republicans, are the minority party. All we can do is stand on the floor and talk. But we believe that the processes up in the Rules Committee are important. That's why we were there even last night trying to say this is the wrong thing to do and that \$50 million more does matter. We cannot remedy the economic circumstances that we're in by increasing spending, not on national parks in the Virgin Islands and not on a \$1.3 trillion health care bill that will destroy 5½ million jobs.

Huge energy and health bills are going to raise taxes and kill jobs, and certainly raise expenses for States. And people over the last year, we've heard our constituents say that they want stability, they want us to work together, and they want us to focus on the things that would bring about a better tomorrow.

I disagree with what we are doing again today, and I respectfully would say to the American people and my colleagues we should defeat this bill. It's the wrong direction. It's a bad idea, and the timing of this is very bad.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to welcome the President of the United States tonight. I hope we listen to what he says.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, once again, I want to reiterate that this bill does not cost \$50 million, does not cost \$40

million, does not cost \$30 million, and does not cost one penny. It's simply an authorization. And as my colleague knows in the scene he has gone through, it is just simply part of the process.

If there ever is an appropriation—and there are a number of avenues under which there might not even be an appropriation. There could be a donation of the property. There could be other involvement from other sources. If there is an appropriation, that's when this would be debated. That would be part of a bill, and somebody could offer an amendment that would come before the Rules Committee. And I would certainly support ruling that in order to make sure that that is a topic that this body has the time to discuss. But now is not the debate with regard to the expenditure of any Federal dollars with regard to this matter.

The procedure that has been used, again, when bills come up on suspension, as these bills did, there was no opportunity for the minority party or the majority party to amend the bills or offer alternatives. When the bill then did not get the requisite two-thirds, it came before our Rules Committee. There were no other amendments that were offered by members of the minority party or the majority party.

We are very open, along with my colleagues on the Rules Committee, and I know the House, as a whole, to ideas from both sides of the aisle regardless of where they come from. If somebody had an improvement to the settlement of the water rights in Idaho or adjustments to the borders of the proposed designation in St. Croix, I'm sure that they would have been likely referred to the House for full consideration.

In fact, the minority party has, under both this rule, the opportunity for a motion to recommit with or without instructions with regard to each of the bills. So there is ample opportunity, and we are hearing a deafening silence from the other side with regard to how to improve these bills. The door is more than open.

The first step, again, in finding that they were unable to reach a two-thirds majority was that they would be open for input. There were no amendments, not one, that was presented to the Rules Committee for either of these bills. And I look forward to seeing what the motions to recommit may entail. Again, if they are constructive and improve these bills in any substantial way, I'm confident that my colleagues will join me in supporting them.

I am the last speaker for my side, so I will reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman from Texas has closed for his side and yielded back the balance of his time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for representing the Democratic Party today. I think that it's important as we approach today that the hopes and expectations of a Nation who tonight will listen to our Presi-

dent will be in our hearts and our minds.

This country has had serious days in our past, and we are in serious days today. I don't think there is any problem bigger than a solution in this country. I do believe, however, and I have believed this, that when it comes to the economy, building jobs and working to create a better environment where America is competitive in the world, that it will require not just a basic sense of understanding marketplaces, but really, Mr. Speaker, of discipline, of seeing the problem for what it is.

It is a problem that has been self-induced. It is self-induced by this body, who in the midst of the greatest expansion—and I remember just a few years ago with my friends who were Democrats, oh, all this money that this country has, we are not spending it the right way. The priorities are mixed. We should go spend more money and help people who do not have the advantages because this booming economy has not gotten to them yet.

Mr. Speaker, I do understand that. I do understand that a lot. I spend a lot of time working with disabled people in this country. But what happened in that process was we flipped so far over to where we are now killing the goose that lays the golden egg, and that is the free enterprise system. The free enterprise system, as a result of this Speaker and the policies of the Democratic Party, are pushing an agenda that would lose this country 10 million jobs. We are in the middle of that.

The assault on employers is part of the political agenda. I get that. I think the free enterprise system gets that. But the American people have now caught on. And I think it's time, if we really want to talk about having jobs, jobs that can be competitive with the world, jobs that are not nickel-and-dime jobs or here today and gone tomorrow, that it will require a discipline and a philosophy of understanding how jobs are created and the free enterprise system and the decisionmaking.

The decisionmaking is that this Congress needs to do at least three things:

Number one, they need to make sure that we cut capital gains taxes so that people will invest in this country. They will invest in this country, and the creation of jobs will occur.

Secondly, we need to make sure that we do away with, or greatly diminish, depreciation. Depreciation is government competing against the free enterprise system for money.

And perhaps most importantly, or lastly, the death tax. The death tax because literally, after three generations, anybody who owns a family-owned business has to lose it. It's gone. It's gone from taxation from a Federal Government that is controlled by those who want to tax and spend and diminish that for the spending of the government rather than people who have jobs.

So, look, I think we ought to take the responsibility today. I think, just

like somebody going to a meeting and admitting that they made a mistake and they were wrong and they have a problem, being honest about the problem, the creation of jobs won't come through some trickery. It will only come from doing the things that business itself will tell you it needs: reducing capital gains on a permanent basis, reducing the problem that we have with depreciation, and lastly, the death tax. We don't have to take it to \$1 billion or half a billion dollars. We could move it probably to \$50 million or \$60 million and stop the burden, the bleeding, that is happening where people are losing their land, their property, and their businesses. But it takes someone who understands that.

I spent 16 years in the free enterprise system, 16 years where I never missed a day of work. I loved what I did. But I saw Washington as the problem. That's why I came to Congress. I still see government as being the problem. And here today, we give a lot of lip service to jobs, and people act like, well, I just really don't know what to do.

The fact of the matter is the political agenda of losing 10 million American jobs, which we are in the middle of, health care, cap-and-trade, and card check are strangling this country. If we want to be honest about this, just like an alcoholic showing up at an AA meeting and admitting there is a 12-step process to coming back, we need to understand that we are taxing too much, we are spending too much, we are borrowing too much, and the debt is strangling this country.

Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs?

I yield back my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned health care, cap-and-trade, and card check are strangling the country. Fortunately, none of those are included in this rule.

I hope my colleague will join me in support of this rule which simply brings to the floor two very important issues: the Castle Nugent designation as well as the settlement of access to wilderness area with regard to water rights in the State of Idaho.

Mr. Speaker, my district in Colorado is very lucky to have in it protected places, places that are important not only for the economic well-being of our State, but important for the very foundation of our civic pride and our identity. In many cases, these protections are also part of the fundamental basis of the economy in many of our tourist areas. We know the benefits to local communities from the National Park System. Recreation and tourism provide a long-term and sustainable economic base. Gateway communities thrive from recreationists basing their adventures and their experiences from these nearby communities.

□ 1130

Both the Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2010 and the Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act share the story that land preservation done right is a winning local

policy, and yes, a job creator and winning economic policy.

For the Castle Nugent area, this bill represents the preservation of historic habitat that will lead to future tourism and future small businesses and local sustainable jobs. The park proposal would preserve nearly 2,900 acres of former ranch lands as well as 8,600 acres just off the coast which is owned by the Virgin Islands, respecting the wishes of the local and current landowners that their land go towards preservation instead of development, landowners who have fought for years to fend off aggressive development.

For the communities that surround the Selway-Bitterroot and Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness areas, this means that the land that is protected will continue to draw backpackers, fishermen, hunters, climbers, and adventurers from all around to Idaho, and would ensure that the preservation of these valuable local assets would not mean the loss of others.

This bill includes a well-thought-out approach to this challenging set of circumstances, and ensures a number of safeguards that protect the wilderness and the wilderness act while protecting individual rights as well. The permits that this bill creates would only be issued if the owner could prove that the facility existed prior to the designated wilderness area designation, the facility had been used to deliver water to the owner's land since the designation, and the owner had a valid water right, and it would not be practical to move the facility outside the wilderness area.

Again, I would encourage any colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have constructive ideas to improve this bill, it would have been nice if they had offered amendments before, and I hope to hear any additional ideas in the motion to recommit.

It is estimated that several dozen different individuals or businesses have water diversions in the aforementioned wilderness areas. And this bill is a commonsense solution that balances the protection of wilderness areas with the important ability to maintain and access water rights for those who have historically used that water.

Mr. Speaker, passage of both these bills today will be a quick step forward that will benefit local economies at the same time as providing recreational users and tourists seeking exploration and discovery a great experience with history and nature.

I do share with my colleague from Texas, I agree that there is the opportunity to reduce capital gains tax to promote growth. I have two bills in that regard, H.R. 1783 and H.R. 1784, and I encourage my colleague to join me in cosponsoring these efforts. However, much to my chagrin, neither are scheduled for floor consideration in this rule either.

Again, this rule simply schedules for floor consideration the designation of the Castle Nugent Wilderness National

Historic Site Act of 2009 and the Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act. Both have the opportunity to have a strong bipartisan majority to settle the access to water rights in Idaho.

And again, with regard to St. Croix, there is zero taxpayer money being spent at this juncture. It is a very legitimate discussion when and if that time needs to arise do we want to spend money on this. That is a totally separate question, and I look forward to a debate regarding that matter. But the authorization is the first step. And I am hopeful that we can preserve the historic legacy and attract good jobs to the U.S. Virgin Islands.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the adoption of House Resolution 1038 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 1024.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 174, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]  
YEAS—234

Ackerman	Courtney	Hinchey
Adler (NJ)	Crowley	Hinojosa
Altmire	Cuellar	Hirono
Andrews	Cummings	Hodes
Arcuri	Dahlkemper	Holden
Baca	Davis (CA)	Holt
Baird	Davis (IL)	Honda
Baldwin	Davis (TN)	Hoyer
Barrow	DeFazio	Inslee
Bean	DeGette	Israel
Becerra	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Berkley	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Berman	Dicks	(TX)
Berry	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Kagen
Blumenauer	Doyle	Kanjorski
Boccieri	Driehaus	Kaptur
Boren	Edwards (MD)	Kildee
Boswell	Ellison	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boucher	Ellsworth	Kind
Boyd	Engel	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Kissell
Bralley (IA)	Etheridge	Klein (FL)
Bright	Farr	Kosmas
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Kratovil
Butterfield	Filner	Kucinich
Capps	Foster	Langevin
Capuano	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Cardoza	Garamendi	Larson (CT)
Carnahan	Gonzalez	Lee (CA)
Carney	Gordon (TN)	Levin
Carson (IN)	Grayson	Lewis (GA)
Chandler	Green, Al	Lipinski
Childers	Green, Gene	Loeb sack
Chu	Grijalva	Lofgren, Zoe
Clarke	Gutierrez	Lowe y
Clay	Hall (NY)	Luján
Cleaver	Halvorson	Lynch
Clyburn	Hare	Maffei
Cohen	Harman	Maloney
Connolly (VA)	Hastings (FL)	Markey (CO)
Conyers	Heinrich	Marshall
Cooper	Herse th Sandlin	Massa
Costa	Higgins	Matheson
Costello	Himes	Matsui

McCarthy (NY)	Peterson	Sires
McCollum	Pingree (ME)	Skelton
McDermott	Polis (CO)	Slaughter
McGovern	Pomeroy	Smith (TX)
McIntyre	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
McMahon	Quigley	Snyder
McNerney	Rahall	Space
Meek (FL)	Rangel	Spratt
Meeks (NY)	Reyes	Stark
Melancon	Richardson	Stupak
Michaud	Rodriguez	Sutton
Miller (NC)	Ross	Tanner
Miller, George	Rothman (NJ)	Teague
Minnick	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Mollohan	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Moore (KS)	Rush	Tierney
Moore (WI)	Ryan (OH)	Titus
Murphy (CT)	Salazar	Tonko
Murphy, Patrick	Sánchez, Linda	Towns
Murtha	T.	Tsongas
Nadler (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Neal (MA)	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Nye	Schauer	Walz
Oberstar	Schiff	Wasserman
Obey	Schrader	Schultz
Olver	Schwartz	Watson
Owens	Scott (GA)	Watt
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Weiner
Pascrell	Serrano	Welch
Pastor (AZ)	Sestak	Wilson (OH)
Payne	Shea-Porter	Woolsey
Perlmutter	Sherman	Wu
Perriello	Simpson	Yarmuth

NAYS—174

Aderholt	Gallegly	Murphy, Tim
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Alexander	Gerlach	Neugebauer
Austria	Giffords	Nunes
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Olson
Bachus	Gohmert	Paul
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Paulsen
Biggert	Granger	Pence
Billbray	Graves	Peters
Bilirakis	Griffith	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Pitts
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Platts
Blunt	Harper	Poe (TX)
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Bonner	Heller	Price (GA)
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Putnam
Boozman	Herger	Rehberg
Boustany	Hill	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Roe (TN)
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Inglis	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Johnson (IL)	Rooney
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Jones	Roskam
Buyer	Jordan (OH)	Royce
Calvert	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Camp	King (NY)	Scalise
Campbell	Kingston	Schmidt
Cantor	Kirk	Schock
Cao	Klaine (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Lamborn	Sessions
Carter	Lance	Shadegg
Cassidy	Latham	Shimkus
Castle	LaTourette	Shuler
Chaffetz	Latta	Shuster
Coble	Lee (NY)	Smith (NE)
Coffman (CO)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Cole	Linder	Souder
Conaway	LoBiondo	Stearns
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Sullivan
Davis (KY)	Lummis	Taylor
Dent	Lungren, Daniel	Terry
Diaz-Balart, L.	E.	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Mack	Thornberry
Donnelly (IN)	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Dreier	Marchant	Tiberi
Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Ehlers	McCaull	Upton
Emerson	McClintock	Walden
Fallin	McCotter	Westmoreland
Flake	McKeon	Whitfield
Fleming	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Foxo	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Franks (AZ)	Mitchell	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (NY)	

NOT VOTING—25

Abercrombie	Barton (TX)	Castor (FL)
Barrett (SC)	Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw

Davis (AL) Lucas  
Deal (GA) Markey (MA)  
Edwards (TX) McHenry  
Frank (MA) McMorris  
Johnson, E. B. Rodgers  
Kennedy Moran (KS)  
Kilroy Moran (VA)

□ 1200

Messrs. TURNER, UPTON, TERRY, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 2010, I voted “yea” on rollcall 20 for H. Res. 1024. Please let the RECORD show that my intention was to vote “nay” on agreeing to this resolution.

#### POVERTY IN AMERICA AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1024, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1024.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 18, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—387

Ackerman Bright Cuellar  
Aderholt Brown (SC) Culberson  
Adler (NJ) Brown, Corrine Cummings  
Akin Brown-Waite, Dahlkemper  
Alexander Ginny Davis (CA)  
Altmire Buchanan Davis (IL)  
Andrews Burton (IN) Davis (KY)  
Arcuri Buyer Davis (TN)  
Austria Calvert DeFazio  
Baca Camp DeGette  
Bachmann Campbell Delahunt  
Bachus Cantor DeLauro  
Baird Cao Dent  
Baldwin Capito Diaz-Balart, L.  
Barrow Capps Diaz-Balart, M.  
Bartlett Capuano Dicks  
Bean Cardoza Dingell  
Becerra Carnahan Doggett  
Berkley Carney Donnelly (IN)  
Berman Carson (IN) Doyle  
Berry Cassidy Dreier  
Biggert Castle Driehaus  
Bilbray Castor (FL) Duncan  
Billirakis Chaffetz Edwards (MD)  
Bishop (NY) Chandler Ehlers  
Bishop (UT) Childers Ellison  
Blackburn Chu Ellsworth  
Blumenauer Clarke Emerson  
Boccheri Clay Engel  
Boehner Cleaver Eshoo  
Bonner Clyburn Etheridge  
Bono Mack Coffman (CO) Fallin  
Boozman Cohen Farr  
Boren Cole Fattah  
Boswell Connolly (VA) Filner  
Boucher Conyers Fleming  
Boustany Cooper Forbes  
Boyd Costa Fortenberry  
Brady (PA) Costello Foster  
Brady (TX) Courtney Frelinghuysen  
Bralley (IA) Crowley Fudge

Gallegly Lungren, Daniel  
Garamendi E.  
Garrett (NJ) Lynch  
Gerlach Mack  
Giffords Maffei  
Gonzalez Maloney  
Goodlatte Manullo  
Gordon (TN) Markey (CO)  
Granger Markey (MA)  
Graves Marshall  
Grayson Massa  
Green, Al Matheson  
Green, Gene Matsui  
Griffith McCarthy (CA)  
Grijalva McCarthy (NY)  
Guthrie McCaul  
Gutierrez McCollum  
Hall (NY) McCotter  
Hall (TX) McDermott  
Halvorson McGovern  
Hare McHenry  
Harman McIntyre  
Harper McKeon  
Hastings (FL) McMahon  
Hastings (WA) McMorris  
Heinrich Rodgers  
Heller McNerney  
Herger Meek (FL)  
Hersteth Sandlin Meeks (NY)  
Higgins Melancon  
Hill Mica  
Himes Michaud  
Hinchey Miller (FL)  
Hinojosa Miller (MI)  
Hirono Miller (NC)  
Hodes Miller, Gary  
Hoekstra Miller, George  
Holden Minnick  
Holt Mitchell  
Honda Mollohan  
Hoyer Moore (KS)  
Hunter Moore (WI)  
Inglis Murphy (CT)  
Inslee Murphy (NY)  
Israel Murphy, Patrick  
Jackson (IL) Murphy, Tim  
Jackson Lee Murtha  
(TX) Myrick  
Jenkins Nadler (NY)  
Johnson (GA) Napolitano  
Johnson (IL) Neal (MA)  
Jones Neugebauer  
Kagen Nunes  
Kanjorski Nye  
Kaptur Oberstar  
Kildee Obey  
Kilpatrick (MI) Olson  
Kilroy Oliver  
Kind Owens  
King (IA) Pallone  
King (NY) Pascrell  
Kirk Pastor (AZ)  
Kirkpatrick (AZ) Paul  
Kissell Paulsen  
Klein (FL) Payne  
Kline (MN) Perlmutter  
Kosmas Perriello  
Kratovil Peters  
Kucinich Peterson  
Lamborn Petri  
Lance Pingree (ME)  
Langevin Pitts  
Larsen (WA) Platts  
Larson (CT) Polis (CO)  
Latham Pomeroy  
LaTourette Posey  
Latta Price (NC)  
Lee (CA) Putnam  
Lee (NY) Quigley  
Levin Rahall  
Lewis (CA) Rangel  
Lewis (GA) Rehberg  
Linder Reichert  
Lipinski Reyes  
LoBiondo Richardson  
Loebsack Rodriguez  
Lofgren, Zoe Roe (TN)  
Lowey Rogers (AL)  
Luetkemeyer Rogers (KY)  
Lujan Rogers (MI)

NAYS—18

Broun (GA) Franks (AZ) McClintock  
Burgess Hensarling Pence  
Carter Johnson, Sam Poe (TX)  
Conaway Kingston Price (GA)  
Flake Lummis Scalise  
Foxy Marchant Westmoreland

Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Salvarez Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
McGovern  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Taylor  
Teague  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Whitfield  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Abercrombie  
Barrett (SC)  
Barton (TX)  
Bishop (GA)  
Blunt  
Butterfield  
Coble  
Crenshaw  
Davis (AL)  
Deal (GA)  
Edwards (TX)  
Frank (MA)  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Issa  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jordan (OH)  
Kennedy  
Lucas  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Ortiz  
Radanovich  
Smith (NE)  
Speier  
Wamp  
Waters  
Welch

□ 1208

Messrs. WESTMORELAND, KINGSTON, and BURGESS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4508) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4508

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Act entitled “An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration”, approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109-316; 120 Stat. 1742), as most recently amended by section 1 of Public Law 111-89 (123 Stat. 2975), is amended by striking “January 31, 2010” each place it appears and inserting “April 30, 2010”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 30, 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

As we work to foster job growth, small businesses will be central to the equation. Time and again, when Americans face economic uncertainty, they respond with innovative ideas and new ventures. While larger companies are slower to reverse the trend and start hiring again, small firms are often more nimble and can lead us out of downturns more quickly.

□ 1215

For many dislocated workers, starting a new business can help pay the bills and even launch a new career. However, for entrepreneurs to fulfill their traditional role as job creators, they need the right tools.

The legislation before us today will extend programs at the SBA that help new businesses form and existing firms grow. This bill extends some of the agency's most valuable efforts. Reauthorizing certain capital access programs will help small businesses survive the credit crunch.

Earlier this year, the House passed legislation to strengthen those initiatives. We have also approved bills reauthorizing the Small Business Innovation Research initiative. However, before these measures are updated, they will have to be extended.

H.R. 4508 ensures these programs continue operating as we keep working with the Senate to fully update them. This bill is not a comprehensive reauthorization, but it does represent another step toward a more suitable solution.

Given the valuable role that small businesses play in our economy, we cannot afford any of the SBA services to lapse. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the chairwoman's request to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4508. The bill is straightforward, and it's a clean extension that prolongs the authorization of all programs authorized by the Small Business Act, Small Business Investment Act, and any program operated by the Small Business Administration for which Congress has already appropriated the funds. This extension is going to last until April 30, 2010. This legislation is essential because authorization for various programs operated by the SBA expire on January 31 of this year.

Over the past 3 years, our committee has worked in a bipartisan fashion, re-

ported out a number of bills to reauthorize and extend programs operated by the SBA. Despite our efforts to come to terms with the Senate over the broader reauthorization, the extension passed late last year will expire before the legislative process can run its course. Without enactment of this extension, a vital number of programs that the SBA operates would cease to function. Given the continued importance that small businesses play in the revitalization of the American economy, we simply cannot allow the SBA authorizations to run out.

The work needed to help America's entrepreneurs revitalize the economy simply cannot be accomplished within the time frame outlined in the current legislation. We not only need to reauthorize these critical programs, but also update them to respond to new economic conditions. The extra time contained in this legislation allows us to fully explore and implement the ideas that will give our Nation's entrepreneurs the tools they need to be successful.

Passage of this legislation will enable the House and the Senate to continually work in a conscientious manner to address the necessary changes to SBA programs. I urge all my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4508.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to Mr. DAVID WU from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I rise in somewhat reluctant support of this legislation which temporarily, among other things, extends the Small Business Innovative Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs. The truth is that we should have reauthorized these programs long ago, and we should not be dragging this process out. But that is not a problem that we have in this Chamber. It is very, very important because SBIR and STTR are innovation programs which invest in small businesses, the ones best positioned to drive economic growth and to create new jobs.

Innovation is the key to resuscitating our ailing economy and to creating good, family-wage jobs for the American middle class. By investing in innovation, SBIR and STTR create more than good-paying jobs; they encourage the development of growth industries. And that, Madam Speaker, is what our Nation needs most.

AMGEN, Apple, Microsoft, and Research In Motion all started out as cutting-edge small businesses. These creative, high-tech companies spurred new industries, new jobs, new technologies that now employ hundreds of thousands of Americans.

By facilitating creative renewal, SBIR and STTR are not only helping guide our economy out of a recession, they are building our Nation's capacity to thrive in a very competitive global economy. SBIR and STTR have a proven track record of over 25 years' suc-

cess in creating good-paying jobs in high-growth industries, and we must continue our commitment to these programs and reauthorize them immediately.

But we cannot continue to fuel the 21st century economy with 20th century programs. We must modernize SBIR and STTR so that they can meet their potential as innovation catalysts. Some of these improvements are simple, like making awards more reflective of today's technology development costs. Others, like ensuring that our most innovative companies are eligible for public investments regardless of their capital structure, require a more nuanced approach.

The Science and Technology Committee and the Small Business Committee, led by my colleague Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ, have been working hard with our Senate colleagues to strike the right balance for these improvements. We're not there yet, but I am confident that we will get there. In the meantime, we must pass today's temporary extension.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of this bill and its swift passage.

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Oregon. It's not this Chamber's fault that we have to pass an extension. The reauthorization should be finished by now. I want to thank the chairwoman for all of her work in the committee and the work that we've been able to accomplish so far in the committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4508.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### HONORING 95TH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK ACT

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1020) honoring the 95th anniversary of the signing of the Rocky Mountain National Park Act.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1020

Whereas, on January 26, 1915, President Woodrow Wilson signed the Rocky Mountain

National Park Act to establish Rocky Mountain National Park (RMNP) in the State of Colorado;

Whereas, years ago, the foresight of so many Coloradans to set aside and conserve RMNP benefits so many of us today;

Whereas, the fragile alpine tundra encompasses one-third of RMNP and is one of the largest examples of alpine tundra ecosystems preserved in the National Park System in the lower 48 States;

Whereas, RMNP remains a place for visitors to enjoy the Rocky Mountain West by hiking, backpacking, climbing, biking, picnicking, wildlife viewing, snowshoeing, cross-country skiing, and horseback riding;

Whereas, the National Park Service provides unique outdoor educational opportunities within RMNP and teaches visitors about the diverse park ecosystem, environmental stewardship, wilderness areas, and the principles of Leave No Trace so our recreational areas can be enjoyed by everyone;

Whereas, RMNP is the highest national park in the United States with at least 60 mountains higher than 12,000 feet including the highest summit, Longs Peak, at 14,259 feet;

Whereas, the Continental Divide runs through RMNP and the park contains the headwaters of several river systems including the Colorado River;

Whereas, RMNP is consistently one of the top 10 visited national parks in the United States with approximately 3 million visitors every year;

Whereas, on March 30, 2009, 249,339 acres of RMNP's total 265,770 acres was designated as Wilderness Area, thereby conferring the highest level of conservation protection for Federal lands to protect the park's majestic terrain from future development; and

Whereas this designation marks the culmination of decades of work by many committed stakeholders, from the local communities to the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives honors the 95th anniversary of the signing of the Rocky Mountain National Park Act and commends the National Park Service and so many Coloradans for their dedication to preserving this region of the Southern Rocky Mountains for future generations to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this resolution to honor the 95th anniversary of the signing of the act that created the Rocky Mountain National Park was introduced by Representative BETSY MARKEY and the entire Colorado delegation. President Woodrow Wilson signed the act on January 26, 1915, creating a park

that preserves the remarkable beauty of some of the highest peaks in the continental United States. Some 3 million people visit Rocky Mountain National Park each year, making it one of the top 10 most visited national parks in the United States.

In March of last year, Congress passed and President Obama signed legislation designating much of the park's majestic terrain as wilderness, marking the culmination of decades of work by many committed park supporters. Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is appropriate to mark this important anniversary for Rocky Mountain National Park, and I commend Representative MARKEY for introducing this resolution.

I ask my colleagues to support the passage of this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

House Resolution 1020 has been adequately explained by the majority, and we have no objection to this resolution.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, as we said, this resolution is an important resolution, marking the anniversary of the Rocky Mountain National Park.

I had hoped I would have another speaker. At this time, Madam Speaker, not seeing any other speakers on my side, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time and ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands has her time also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the time is reclaimed.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the Speaker, the gentleman from Washington, and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

I had a lot of interest in this bill because I have spent so many wonderful hours at the Rocky Mountain National Park. My family has been going there off and on for nearly 25 years about once a year, and I can tell you, there is not a greater playground in the United States of America if you like the outdoors, if you like elk, if you like mule deer, if you like family, if you like just to get out and exercise and do the fresh air.

I have had the experience of hiking up Longs Peak three times, and those of you out West are very familiar with that is. But for somebody who comes from zero sea level in Savannah, Georgia, to go 14,000 feet in altitude up in the tundra—the tundra starts at around 11,000—it is such a great thrill to go through the Keyhole, to go

through the Narrows, to go through the Boulder Field, to get on the summit of Longs Peak and look out for miles and miles. I will tell you, it is just such a great thrill.

I have also climbed Flattop Mountain, Chiquita, Otis, Hallett Peak, and Ypsilon Mountain. So many times doing that, I have done it with my family, my cousins, my small children and now my grown children. I have had a couple of them up on Longs with me.

My mother, who is now in her eighties, was the one who first got addicted to Rocky Mountain National Park. We had the opportunity many years ago to go to Chasm Lake together, and I remember my mother was probably in her seventies at the time, but that is a great hike. They actually rate hikes in terms of A, B, and C; A being the most difficult and C being a very moderately tough hike. Chasm Lake is one of those. My mother has been all over the Rockies, as has my sister Jean, both in snowshoes, in cross-country skis, and in tennis shoes and hiking boots.

I have gone trout fishing there many times with barbless hooks with my childhood friend Ross Fox. It's kind of discouraging for me to have to release trout, but I understand the big picture here. It has been a lot of fun. I have photographed elk and the deer and looked for marmots on the peak.

I just can't emphasize enough what a great vision that Enos Mills had, who is the father of the Rocky Mountain National Park, when he promoted this to become a national park. It was his vision. His brother Joe Mills also was a very passionate lover of the Rocky Mountain National Park. I have had the opportunity to meet Enos Mills' daughter who lives right next door to it. They are great advocates.

I'm sorry to rant and rave on a personal basis about something, but I want to recommend to anybody in Congress and anybody out there who is listening who doesn't live in Colorado who hasn't been there, it is a wonderful place. Regardless of your age, regardless of your interests, there is something there for you.

Madam Speaker, if you guys are interested—and I can tell you are—I would like to invite you to let me come show you my slides. I would be willing to do that. Y'all can come to my office and I'm going to show you my many picture albums, because it is something that is great.

Anyway, I'm glad we're doing this, and there are some things I think Congress does well. The National Park System certainly is one of those great things that Congress has done on a bipartisan basis and has a lot of support for it. So I thank the gentleman for letting me go down this personal trail today.

□ 1230

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield to Congresswoman MARKEY such time as she may consume.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote for House Resolution 1020, to honor the 95th anniversary of President Woodrow Wilson signing the Rocky Mountain National Park Act. And I thank my colleague for his offer of slides. I represent this beautiful district, and I also welcome anyone to come and visit Colorado and see for yourself this crown jewel of the West. This legislation set aside roughly 360 square miles of the southern Rockies to establish Rocky Mountain National Park. When the National Park Service was established the following year in 1916, the park was one of the original 12 parks transferred to the agency's control. Today the Rocky Mountain National Park remains one of Colorado's most treasured destinations, and is consistently one of the top 10 visited national parks in the United States.

Rocky Mountain National Park truly embodies the spirit of the conservation and preservation movement at the turn of the century. The park's ecosystems range from the montane low lands to the alpine tundra and includes a diverse range of flora and fauna. Rocky Mountain National Park also remains one of the largest examples of the alpine tundra ecosystem in the national park system in the lower 48 States and offers invaluable opportunities for visitors to learn and enjoy the great outdoors. On March 30, 2009, 405 square miles of the park were designated as a wilderness area, thereby conferring the highest level of conservation protection for Federal lands.

President Theodore Roosevelt once said, "Of all the questions which can come before this Nation, short of the actual preservation of its existence in a great war, there is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us." This week we celebrate the foresight of so many Coloradans to conserve this majestic landscape for the present and future generations to come.

I urge all Members to support this resolution.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 95th anniversary of the signing of the Rocky Mountain National Park Act and I commend the gentle lady from the Fourth District of Colorado for introducing this resolution. President Woodrow Wilson established Rocky Mountain National Park on January 26th, 1915, and preserved the acreage to be enjoyed by millions of visitors each year.

The Rocky Mountain National Park displays the majesty of Colorado, and some of the Nation's most striking scenery. As the country's highest National Park in elevation—with over 60 peaks reaching over 12,000 feet—the Rocky Mountain National Park is among the ten most visited national parks in the United States, drawing an average of 3 million visitors each year. The Continental Divide and headwaters for the Colorado River lie within the Park's boundaries, creating stunning vistas.

I am a frequent visitor of the Rocky Mountain National Park. Located in the Park is Trail

Ridge Road. According to the National Park Service, it is the highest continuous motorway in the United States, with more than 8 miles lying above 11,000 feet and a maximum elevation of 12,183 feet.

Like my fellow Coloradans, I am proud our State hosts this property, and would recommend my colleagues plan a visit to enjoy the magnificent natural beauty and plentiful recreational opportunities. It is a memorable experience our Nation is preserving for future generations. I commend the work of committed staff at the National Parks Service for preserving and facilitating ongoing access to this true national treasure. Rocky Mountain National Park is truly one of the crown jewels in our National Park System.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1020.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER FACILITIES ACT

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1038, I call up the bill (H.R. 4474) to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1038, the bill is considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4474

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act".

##### SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF EXISTING WATER DIVERSIONS IN FRANK CHURCH-RIVER OF NO RETURN WILDERNESS AND SELWAY-BITTERROOT WILDERNESS, IDAHO.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR CONTINUED USE.—The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue a special use authorization to each of the 20 owners of a water storage, transport, or diversion facility (in this section referred to as a "facility") located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-

River of No Return Wilderness or the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness (as identified on the map titled "Unauthorized Private Water Diversions located within the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness", dated December 14, 2009, or the map titled "Unauthorized Private Water Diversions located within the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness", dated December 11, 2009) for the continued operation, maintenance, and reconstruction of the facility if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the facility was in existence on the date on which the land upon which the facility is located was designated as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System (in this section referred to as "the date of designation");

(2) the facility has been in substantially continuous use to deliver water for the beneficial use on the owner's non-Federal land since the date of designation;

(3) the owner of the facility holds a valid water right for use of the water on the owner's non-Federal land under Idaho State law, with a priority date that predates the date of designation; and

(4) it is not practicable or feasible to relocate the facility to land outside of the wilderness and continue the beneficial use of water on the non-Federal land recognized under State law.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) EQUIPMENT, TRANSPORT, AND USE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In a special use authorization issued under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to—

(A) allow use of motorized equipment and mechanized transport for operation, maintenance, or reconstruction of a facility, if the Secretary determines that—

(i) the use is necessary to allow the facility to continue delivery of water to the non-Federal land for the beneficial uses recognized by the water right held under Idaho State law; and

(ii) after conducting a minimum tool analysis for the facility, the use of nonmotorized equipment and nonmechanized transport is impracticable or infeasible; and

(B) preclude use of the facility for the storage, diversion, or transport of water in excess of the water right recognized by the State of Idaho on the date of designation.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In a special use authorization issued under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to—

(A) require or allow modification or relocation of the facility in the wilderness, as the Secretary determines necessary, to reduce impacts to wilderness values set forth in section 2 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131) if the beneficial use of water on the non-Federal land is not diminished; and

(B) require that the owner provide a reciprocal right of access across the non-Federal property, in which case, the owner shall receive market value for any right-of-way or other interest in real property conveyed to the United States, and market value may be paid by the Secretary, in whole or in part, by the grant of a reciprocal right-of-way, or by reduction of fees or other costs that may accrue to the owner to obtain the authorization for water facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 4474.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4474, introduced by our colleagues, Mr. WALT MINNICK and MIKE SIMPSON of Idaho. This bill would authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located in wilderness areas on national forest system land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho. Predating the existence of the two wilderness areas, private land owners had received permits to maintain and repair these water diversions. The water is used for a combination of purposes, including drinking water for private cabins and ranches. Many of the permits have since expired, leaving those who own the water diversions without the ability to mechanically maintain the systems because they are located in designated wilderness. Under the terms of this legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture could only issue new permits if the owner demonstrates that the facility existed prior to the designated wilderness, the facility had been used to deliver water to the owner's land since the designation, the owner had a valid water right, and it would not be practical to move the facility out of the wilderness area.

This is narrowly tailored legislation designed to put in place a balanced reasonable solution to a specific conflict. Mr. MINNICK and Mr. SIMPSON are to be commended for working cooperatively and in a bipartisan fashion to craft this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I will first speak to the merits of this legislation before focusing on the partisan reasons why the House is having to debate this bill and this legislation for a second week in a row. This bill was originally introduced by Mr. SIMPSON of Idaho to require the Forest Service to issue special use maintenance permits to owners of a small number of existing water systems in two Idaho wilderness areas. Although these water diversions continue to operate, their owners currently lack the authority to maintain and repair these facilities. Failure to maintain these facilities can harm not only those who depend on access to the water that these structures provide but also damage the environment and watersheds of the Forest Service land.

H.R. 4474 will allow the owners of the existing water systems to do the necessary maintenance. The legislation is narrowly tailored to apply only to a small number of sites that meet specific criteria. To qualify, the water diversion facility must have been in ex-

istence on the date that the area was designated as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. It must have been in substantially continuous use since the date of that designation, and the owner of the facilities must hold a valid water right under Idaho law that predates the wilderness designation.

Additionally, sites can only be covered by the bill if it is not practical or feasible to relocate the facilities to land outside the wilderness area and continue the beneficial use of water recognized under State law.

This is a bill and policy that I believe merits strong support in this House. Congress needs to have a reasonable and commonsense approach to managing our Federal lands. Wilderness designations preclude such commonsense management. The restrictions on activity are so severe and inflexible, the designation is often applied to unsuitable lands, and problems and conflicts arise out of that designation.

And so here we are today. Congress must go back once again and fix the problems created by previous wilderness designation law. Congress needs to execute far more caution and care and forethought before designating wilderness areas, as the effects are to lock up these areas for human activity. We ought to be wise enough to devise sound conservation practices on our land without creating the unintended threats to neighboring families that poorly thought out wilderness designation can bring to many. There is no reason why we cannot be both good stewards and good neighbors.

So, Madam Speaker, as I said, this is a matter of good public policy, and I support the changes this legislation will make in the law. However, as a matter of how the Democrat leaders who control this House are choosing to operate this House, I object to the extreme partisan maneuvering surrounding this bill. Last week the House voted on this exact same bill, but there are only two differences between that bill and this bill. First, this is a new bill with a new number. And second, the lead sponsor is now a Democrat instead of a Republican. Last week this bill was H.R. 3538, sponsored by Republican MIKE SIMPSON of Idaho. Today the bill is numbered H.R. 4474, and the lead sponsor is Democrat WALT MINNICK of Idaho. So let me repeat. The bill is word for word the same that the House voted on last week, except the sponsorship has been switched so that a Democrat is now the prime sponsor.

Now, I have to say, Madam Speaker, this is truly a remarkable display of partisanship. First, Democrat leaders directed their Members to vote against this legislation last week because a totally separate piece of legislation failed to pass on the suspension calendar. And now these Democrat leaders are playing a partisan switcheroo in sponsorship of this bill so a Democrat gets credit for this bill's passing. I assume it's going to pass now that the

switcheroo has happened. I might add, by the way, that the area that we're talking about is in Mr. SIMPSON's district.

So, Madam Speaker, with unemployment in double digits, millions of Americans without jobs, and with record deficits set last year by a Democrat President and this Congress, one would think that this House would have more important things to do than to engage in such overt and obvious partisan tactics.

With that, Madam Speaker, I support the bill.

I reserve my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. I do appreciate the manner which the gentleman from Washington, the ranking member, has stressed the bipartisan nature of this legislation. As he knows, in our Committee on Natural Resources, it's always our effort to improve a product the second time we consider it, and that's what we're doing here today with this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. MINNICK), who has been so instrumental in bringing this legislation forward and worked so hard in crafting it.

Mr. MINNICK. I thank the chairman. And I would like to indicate that the partisanship which leads to this particular procedural process for bringing this bill back to the floor has nothing to do with the merits of the legislation. Congressman SIMPSON has done a great deal of work on these remote water systems that were ignored when two wilderness areas were protected, and exist in both of our districts, carefully crafting, as the ranking minority on the committee has stated, the Congressman from Washington, carefully crafting a very narrow bill which creates some exceptions that allow 22 land holders who have, since before these areas were created as wilderness, operated very simple gravity-fed water systems whose points of intake are now in wilderness because they're upstream, up small creeks in almost every incident, and who need to maintain these systems from time to time, occasionally using mechanical means.

Congressman SIMPSON looked and catalogued these 22 inholdings, drafted very carefully legislation to deal with this issue to correct the oversight. And the oversight was not the wilderness; it was just not considering the continued use of these private inholdings. The legislation will allow them to continue operating as they are in perpetuity. This is good legislation. It's good for Idaho. It's good for wilderness.

I want to congratulate my colleague on his diligence, and to urge my colleagues to support this remedial legislation.

□ 1245

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I wanted to respond to my distinguished chairman. It is true that we do have a lot of bipartisanship on our committee, and I appreciate the gentleman for making that point, and I am certainly doing everything on my part to ensure that that continues on. However, I will make the point we did have a hearing on H.R. 3538, the measure sponsored by Mr. SIMPSON.

We have not had a hearing, however, on H.R. 4474 which is before us today sponsored by Mr. MINNICK. I just wanted to point that out because we try to be in regular order as much as we possibly can, and I think that is worth pointing out.

So I would hope that this legislation does pass the House with strong bipartisan support. Maybe it will be able to send the signal that we can indeed work in a bipartisan way if only we change sponsorships of certain bills; but that remains to be seen, Madam Speaker, but I look forward to that time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4474, the Idaho Wilderness Water Resources Protection Act.

This bipartisan, non-controversial legislation is a technical fix intended to enable the Forest Service to authorize and permit existing historical water diversions within Idaho wilderness.

Last year, one of my constituents came to me for help with a problem. The Middle Fork Lodge has a water diversion within the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness Area that has existed since before the wilderness area was established and is protected under statute.

The diversion was beginning to leak and is in desperate need of repairs to ensure that it does not threaten the environment and watershed, but when the Forest Service began the process of issuing the Lodge a permit to allow them to make the necessary repairs, we discovered that the Forest Service did not have the authority to issue the required permit.

As we looked into this issue, we discovered that the Forest Service lacks this authority throughout both the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness, where there are a number of these diversions. These diversions are primarily used to support irrigation and minor hydropower generation for use on non-Federal lands.

The damage to the water diversion at the Middle Fork Lodge is severe enough that the Forest Service had to do temporary emergency repairs last fall, but without authority to issue them the necessary special use permit, they will be unable to do the work needed to permanently fix the problem.

While the urgent situation at the Middle Fork Lodge brought this issue to my attention, it is obvious to me that this problem is larger than just one diversion. At some point in the future, all 20 of these existing diversions will need maintenance or repair work done to ensure their integrity.

H.R. 4474 authorizes the Forest Service to issue special use permits for 20 qualifying historic water systems in these wilderness areas. I believe it is important to get ahead of this problem and ensure that the Forest Service has the tools necessary to manage these lands.

For these reasons I have worked with my colleague, WALT MINNICK, to introduce H.R. 4474. This legislation allows the Forest Service to issue the required special use permits to owners of these historic water systems and sets out specific criteria for doing so.

Providing this authority will ensure that existing water diversions can be properly maintained and repaired when necessary and preserves beneficial use for private property owners who hold water rights under State law.

I have deeply appreciated the cooperation of the Forest Service in addressing this problem. Not only have they communicated with me the need to find a system-wide solution to this issue, but at my request they have worked with me on this legislation to ensure that it only impacts specific targeted historical diversions—those with valid water rights that cannot feasibly be relocated outside of the wilderness area.

H.R. 4474 is bipartisan and non-controversial. It is intended as a simple, reasonable solution to a problem that I think we can all agree should be solved as quickly as possible. I was encouraged that the bill passed out of Committee without objection, and I am hopeful that today we can pass it without delay so that the necessary maintenance to these diversions may be completed before the damage is beyond repair.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield back my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1038, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam 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.

#### CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2010

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1038, I call up the bill (H.R. 3726) to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1038, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3726

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2010".*

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

*In this Act:*

(1) *HISTORIC SITE.*—The term "historic site" means the Castle Nugent National Historic Site established in section 3.

(2) *SECRETARY.*—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

#### SEC. 3. CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—There is established as a unit of the National Park System the Castle Nugent National Historic Site on the Island of St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, in order to preserve, protect, and interpret, for the benefit of present and future generations, a Caribbean cultural landscape that spans more than 300 years of agricultural use, significant archeological resources, mangrove forests, endangered sea turtle nesting beaches, an extensive barrier coral reef system, and other outstanding natural features.

(b) *BOUNDARIES.*—The historic site consists of the approximately 2,900 acres of land extending from Lowrys Hill and Laprey Valley to the Caribbean Sea and from Manchenil Bay to Great Pond, along with associated submerged lands to the three-mile territorial limit, as generally depicted on the map titled "Castle Nugent National Historic Site Proposed Boundary Map", numbered T22/100,447, and dated October 2009.

(c) *MAP AVAILABILITY.*—The map referred to in subsection (b) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(d) *ACQUISITION OF LAND.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the historic site by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

(2) *U.S. VIRGIN ISLAND LANDS.*—The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands owned by the U.S. Virgin Islands or any political subdivision thereof only by donation or exchange.

#### SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall administer the historic site in accordance with this Act and with laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(1) the National Park Service Organic Act (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(2) the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(b) *SHARED RESOURCES.*—To the greatest extent practicable, the Secretary shall use the resources of other sites administered by the National Park Service on the Island of St. Croix to administer the historic site.

(c) *CONTINUED USE.*—In order to maintain an important feature of the cultural landscape of the historic site, the Secretary may lease to the University of the Virgin Islands certain lands within the boundary of the historic site for the purpose of continuing the university's operation breeding Senepol cattle, a breed developed on St. Croix. A lease under this subsection shall contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate, including those necessary to protect the values of the historic site.

(d) *MANAGEMENT PLAN.*—Not later than three years after funds are made available for this subsection, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historic site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3726.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of the pending measure introduced by my very good friend and a valued member of our Committee on Natural Resources, the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands, Dr. DONNA CHRISTENSEN.

The pending legislation establishes the Castle Nugent National Historic Site on the island of St. Croix in the U.S. Virgin Islands. The Castle Nugent area possesses a wide range of historic resources, including the remnants of small Danish cotton, sugar, indigo, and cattle plantations. Pre-Columbian archaeological sites also exist on the property. The cattle ranch there is one of the oldest in the West Indies.

The diverse and undisturbed natural resources of the site include the most substantial black mangrove stand left in the Virgin Islands, sea turtle nesting areas, large and healthy coral reefs, and a lagoon that is home to many different species of birds and wildlife.

Congress authorized a special resource study for this area in 2006. The National Park Service has completed all of the work for that study and found that the area meets all of the applicable criteria for significance, suitability, and feasibility for designation as a National Park Service unit.

The proposed park would include 2,900 acres of privately owned ranch lands as well as 8,600 acres of submerged lands owned by the Government of the Virgin Islands. The family which owns the majority of the site has fought off aggressive developers for years, seeking instead to have their land preserved for future generations to enjoy.

This legislation includes no direct spending, and any land acquisition would be subject to appropriations. This is an excellent piece of legislation, and I commend once again Dr. CHRISTENSEN for her tireless efforts to preserve the unique and stunning resources that are located in her beautiful district.

Thanks to the recent Public Broadcasting System series by Ken Burns chronicling the amazing history of our National Park System, many Americans are asking themselves and asking this Congress what can we do to build upon the incredible legacy left to us by

those who invented the idea of national parks. The answer to that question is simple: work to identify and study significant, unique areas of natural and historic significance and then make certain they are protected.

The answer is to support the pending legislation, H.R. 3726.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I cannot support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it for two reasons.

First, this Congress in prior times enacted a law that authorized and directed the National Park Service to conduct a feasibility study on whether this site should be preserved and, if so, in what manner. Madam Speaker, we don't have that report. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent on this study, and yet this House is charging ahead, making a decision without having that study in our hands. I think that is wasteful, and I think it's irresponsible.

It has been said that the report is done, but Congress hasn't gotten a copy of that report. We are told its recommendations will support the approach taken in this bill, yet we don't know that because we have not received the report.

Even if the final report were to recommend establishing a historic site, we would benefit from the information they have gathered to better craft such legislation. This bill is clearly putting the cart before the horse.

The Park Service itself has testified on this Castle Nugent bill before us today, and they stated: "We would ask that the committee defer action on this legislation until the special resource study is completed, which is consistent with the Department's general policy on legislation establishing a new unit of the National Park System when a study is pending."

Madam Speaker, if the \$500,000 study that Congress passed to initiate is nearly completed, then we should wait to consider this bill until we have that information. That seems to be a rather logical conclusion of the events. There hasn't been a single compelling reason given as to the need to act right now before this study is in hand.

Now, Madam Speaker, the second reason for opposition to this bill is its cost. With 10 percent unemployment nationwide and with millions of Americans without jobs and the fact that we are running record budget deficits and the public debt is skyrocketing, now is not the time to potentially spend up to \$50 million of the taxpayers' money to buy nearly 3,000 acres of beachfront property on a Caribbean island. And on top of that, it will probably cost an estimate of \$1 million a year to maintain.

Madam Speaker, we can't afford the price tag for a new park in St. Croix, just as many Americans will never be able to afford a visit there. I had my

staff, Madam Speaker, actually look up the cost of getting to St. Croix over the Presidents' Day weekend next month. From my home town in Pasco, Washington, it would take two plane changes, over 12 hours of time and around a thousand dollars to visit the island which would be the home of this new park.

For a resident in the wild and wonderful State of West Virginia, just to pick a State, flying out of the Charleston airport, the time to get there is a little less, but the price is still around a thousand dollars.

On top of the cost of buying this beachfront Caribbean property and the yearly cost of maintaining it, we need to be honest about the backlog that we have in caring for land already owned by the Federal Government.

Madam Speaker, there is \$9 billion, that is billion with a "b," worth of needed repairs and maintenance on existing park lands. If we aren't caring for what we already have, then Congress shouldn't be making the problem worse by authorizing new park lands.

Our existing treasures should be our focus to ensure families that load up the minivan or SUV to take a summer vacation to a national park have a safe, enjoyable, and accessible visit, like my colleague from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) expressed a moment ago about the Rocky Mountain National Park. I guarantee you that no family from any State will ever load up their minivan and drive to this park in the Caribbean ocean.

This Congress must get serious about controlling spending. The American people are concerned. They're worried and they're angered by the spending that has gone on in Washington, D.C. In the first year of the Obama administration, the largest spending deficit in our Nation's history has been set.

Whether it's the \$787 billion stimulus bill that has failed to create the jobs that were promised or the government takeover—potential government takeover of the health care costs that will cost, if it is put in place—the health care bill that is being debated, over a trillion dollars—I think is very, very clear: spending in America's mind is out of control.

For Congress to buckle down, it needs to not only put the brakes on mega-spending bills but it also must start taking a hard look at smaller bills like this one.

Just take a look, Madam Speaker, at some of the bills that have been advanced out of the Natural Resources Committee this year. We passed a bill to create a \$700 million welfare program for wild horses; they've approved another bill to increase spending for neotropical birds by millions of dollars; and, today, there is a committee hearing on a bill to spend millions of more dollars overseas to assist apes.

There is a lot of talk that the President may propose a spending freeze in his State of the Union speech tonight. The news media and blogs have been

talking about it for several days; yet this House is positioned to vote on creating a new \$50 million park in the middle of the Caribbean ocean just hours before the State of the Union speech tonight. Madam Speaker, those that control this House will send quite a message on spending and their real priorities if it approves this bill before the President even makes it here to give his speech tonight.

So, Madam Speaker, for those two reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

And with that, I reserve my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am very happy at this point to yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands who has worked so long, so hard, so diligently, and so patiently to bring this bill before us today, Dr. DONNA CHRISTENSEN, such time as she may consume.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Chairman RAHALL, for yielding.

Today I rise once again to speak on behalf of H.R. 3726, a bill that I introduced to establish the Castle Nugent Historic Site on St. Croix, Virgin Islands, for the first time in the 110th Congress.

The introduction of this bill, or the reintroduction, stands as testimony to our country's legacy of preserving our Nation's special places. H.R. 3726 deepens the commitment of our conservation trail blazers such as Henry Thoreau, George Perkins Marsh, and John Muir who worked tirelessly to protect our collective natural history in such a way that it would live on for generations.

□ 1300

As noted by Ken Burns when discussing the need to document the National Park System, the chronicle of America's parks isn't a mere celebration of our Nation's national treasures, but also a story of our people, of the forces that help shape our lands and the influences that will guide our children.

The site to be designated as the Castle Nugent National Historic Site continues to be heralded as one of the last pristine areas in the region. Without hesitation, I can attest to the fact that the Castle Nugent Farm is worthy of preservation, worthy of inclusion in the National Park System and truly worthy of being shared as more than just a "beachfront property in the Caribbean" but, instead, as an invaluable chapter in our Nation's official record of the American story. The National Park Service testified as such in November at the subcommittee hearing.

H.R. 3726 calls for the preservation of 2,900 acres, which include a Caribbean dry forest, sea turtle nesting areas, large and healthy fringe coral reefs, and Great Pond Bay, home to numerous species of bird and other wildlife. Today the landscape remains pretty much as it did historically with its rolling hills and open grassy shrub plains sloping into the Caribbean Sea.

In addition to guaranteeing the protection of one of the most ecologically sensitive areas on the island, H.R. 3726 also preserves a rich part of our historical and cultural past by preserving the archeological remains of our indigenous Taino inhabitants as well as a Danish estate house now listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Estate Castle Nugent is one of the last working cattle ranches on St. Croix and one of the ranches instrumental in the development and exportation of the unique and sturdy Senepol cattle throughout the Caribbean and, really, throughout the world. H.R. 3726 would ensure the rearing of the Senepol cattle with a provision that guarantees a continued relationship with the University of the Virgin Islands Agricultural Experiment Station to support ongoing scientific research.

The family which owns the majority of this property has been incredibly patient. The pressure to sell their land to developers has been overwhelming and has created some conflict among family members, but they have held out because their first choice has always been that the ranch and its assets be preserved, which I agree is the best for all concerned.

There is no intent to interfere with privately held property. The sole purpose of this bill is to protect and preserve the historic, cultural, and environmental assets and the opportunity for the people of the Virgin Islands and our fellow Americans to continue to enjoy the area and to preserve it for future generations.

And while it might cost almost \$1,000 to get there on President's weekend, President's weekend is the most heavily traveled time of the year to any part of the Caribbean, and most times of the year the cost to get to St. Croix is far less.

There is also no final assessment of how much the site would cost. This simply authorizes the Secretary to acquire it. We do not know that the entire 2,900 acres will remain in the park, and we expect to acquire some of what would be the National Historic Site through donations, easements, and possibly also exchanges.

There is no substantive reason to oppose this legislation. This is a beautiful and important natural and cultural resource that is in danger of being lost to the Nation's public forever. If we do not move forward now without waiting for the final process to get the study here, after having heard from the National Park Service that it is indeed determined to have been appropriate for inclusion into the park, if we don't move forward today, there is a real risk that when the study is formally transmitted to Congress supporting the designation, the land will already have been sold and condominium owners will be the only people who ever get to visit the area.

In places such as the U.S. Virgin Islands, there is always a danger of de-

velopment getting out of control and the balance between development and conservation being lost in favor of development. With development brings the risk of restricting local residents' use of the area far more than park regulations would. There are examples, as well, of developers disregarding the relationship between the people of our community and the areas that they have purchased. Bringing this ranch into the Park Service is the best way to allow those who have purchased part of the property or adjacent property to develop, but to do so in a way that is sensitive to the importance of the land and least restrictive to all of my constituents.

Both the Bush and Obama administrations have supported this designation every step of the way. The current administration has determined that the site meets the criteria set by the National Park Service to determine national significance, suitability, and feasibility. The designation is supported by my constituents, including those who originally questioned the expansion of the park, and, as far as I'm aware, no one is challenging the conclusions of the study.

The people of St. Croix have long enjoyed the picturesque scenery and use of the area for various activities. For years, thousands of Virgin Islanders and visitors have frequented the property to learn about the natural, cultural, historical, archeological, and marine resources found in Estate Castle Nugent. Anyone who visits the property leaves with a deepened appreciation of our community's treasure and our place in American history. Failure to act now will guarantee the area to be developed privately, risking our historic and natural jewels and having them untold and lost to future generations.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Chairman RAHALL and Subcommittee Chair GRIJALVA for their support in ushering this bill through the Resources Committee and back to the floor. I would like to thank the numerous community members and organizations who wrote in support of it.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, on behalf of the people of the Virgin Islands, I ask for a "yes" vote on H.R. 3726. This is timely and responsible legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the ranking member of the National Parks, Forest and Public Lands Subcommittee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me some time.

It is with mixed emotions that I speak on this particular bill. This is not the worst bill our committee has ever produced. We have produced some real stinkers that we have hidden in other pieces of legislation. However, it

is symbolic of the problem that this administration and leaders of this Congress have.

We have a Secretary of the Interior who, every time we wish to use Federal land to actually help improve the lives of Americans or creating jobs, will always yell that we have a process we have to do; we cannot commit a rush to judgment. And now when we have a piece of territory, land that will be taken off the tax rolls in a territory that is in deep financial problems today, this historic cattle ranch is now considered something that we must hustle through the system.

We just voted on a bill to solve problems in the wilderness areas of Idaho, which, if we had taken the time to see what was in there instead of rushing to create the most restrictive environment we can on this land in Idaho, we would not have needed the legislation. That is why this administration and this Department of the Interior have said they want to wait until the study is completed and the process is done.

If one of the arguments in favor of passing this bill is we don't really know how much land we will ultimately have and how much it will ultimately cost, that is a great argument to wait until the study is done and we figure out how much land we really want to have and how much it will ultimately cost.

But it is also symbolic of a deeper problem. This Federal Government already owns 650 million acres of land. One-third of this Nation is owned by the Federal Government. Now think of that. One out of every three acres in this country is owned by the Federal Government. I have had three land transfer bills in the past few years here, and in each case, the land that was controlled by the Federal Government was land they did not need, they did not use, and in every case, they did not even know they had the land until a land title search pointed out that, indeed, it belonged to the Federal Government.

At some time you have to say enough is enough. The States with the biggest problem in funding their education system are found in States that have a predominance of public lands. It is a one-to-one relationship between States that have that problem. In my State of Utah, only 18 percent of the State is in private property. The Governor of Utah controls 18 percent. The rest of the State is under the heavy hand of the Secretary of the Interior, and both my adjective and noun are appropriate.

One of the issues that we simply have here is we will be hearing that we should have a spending freeze on non-defense and nonentitlement programs, and we will hear that tonight. Does it seem logical that we should spend up and then decide to freeze? Does that indeed solve our problem?

As I said before, this particular bill, which will probably cost \$50 million, give or take \$50 million, this particular bill is not necessarily bad in and of

itself, but it is symbolic of the problem that we have, that we do not have a large-scale picture of what this Nation should control, should own, should do, and we are moving in a pell-mell process to try and add more and more acreage to the heavy hand of the Federal Government. And at some time, we should stand up and say enough is enough.

One-third of this country owned by the Federal Government is enough. For that reason, we should at least wait until the Department of the Interior has finished their study and the process and they sign off and we actually know how much land and how much cost we are talking.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to a new member of the House Resources Committee, Mr. CHAFFETZ from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. With all due respect to the great people of the Virgin Islands and to my colleague, I stand in opposition to this bill. No doubt, the Virgin Islands is one of the most spectacular, beautiful places on the face of the planet. But this bill is about priorities of the United States of America.

We are \$12 trillion in debt. We are spending \$600 million a day just in interest on that debt. This Congress momentarily is going to have to raise the debt ceiling another \$1.8 trillion. We don't have the money to do this.

Currently, the National Park Service has an estimated \$9 billion in backlog, \$9 billion that they need to help with the national parks to preserve and to upgrade what we already have in our current holdings.

We don't have the money. We don't have the resources. If you look at what the President is probably going to say here in less than 8 hours, he might come in and try to create this air of, oh, we have to be a little fiscally responsible. We should probably freeze a few things.

For the second time in just over a week here, we are going to actually come and look at this bill to acquire at the cost of \$40 million to \$50 million property with funds that we don't have.

No longer can this government continue to use the government credit card to rack up debt. Those that decide to vote in favor of this bill, although it's just an authorization—I know it's not an appropriation—are saying, sure, yeah, let's go buy some beachfront property.

We don't have the money. Think of all the other things that we could do and should do in prioritizing this country. We have 1,500 people a day that die from cancer, and we're not adequately funding those types of things. We deal with homelessness, and we have Homeland Security issues. But this government continues to acquire private property and put it into the Federal Treasury. I think it's fundamentally wrong.

As was pointed out earlier, there is no report. The National Park Service does not recommend we make this transaction because they haven't even finished the study. Why does this government spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on a study if it doesn't matter? Maybe what we should have also done is add an amendment to stop the study and recover as much money in funds as we can. There is absolutely no reason, if the Democrats are going to move forward and push this thing through, to actually do the study. I don't care if it's \$2,000. Let's save it. And until this body has that type of attitude, we will continue to have the systemic problems that we have in this government.

Just yesterday, the Governor of the territory stood up before the people and said this: "However, the global economic crisis has had a great impact on our economy. It has devastated our government funds, where we are running a monthly deficit of \$25 million and our tax revenues fell by over 30 percent. This means that we had 234 million fewer dollars to spend than we had just the year before. To put this in perspective, \$234 million is almost half of the cost of salaries and benefits of our government workers for a full year."

Now some will say, well, we should move forward with this. Well, guess what? It's going to take property off of the tax rolls and put the burden on the Federal taxpayer. Why should the people of Iowa or Rhode Island or Utah or California have to continue to pay and supplement the people there on St. Croix for this property? I don't think it's fair. I don't think it's right. The Federal taxpayers will be the ones responsible for reimbursing on the lost property tax, plus the million dollars a year that it's going to take in order to just maintain the facility.

Again, as we said, there are existing parks that need our help, \$9 billion in backlog. If this was really such a great thing for the island and they really wanted to do it, my suggestion is to do it locally. Locally they can go and acquire this. It does not require the Federal taxpayers to take on this burden.

I think one of the arguments back to that would say, well, we can't afford it. Well, neither can the Federal taxpayers. Neither can the United States of America. It's time we stand up and say "no" to a bill like this.

□ 1315

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I had the privilege of hearing the esteemed economist, Art Laffer, who is credited with bringing the United States out of a worse recession than we are in right now by overcoming double

digit inflation, double digit unemployment, and double digit interest rates, and he did it by cutting taxes. Of course, we know taxes are going to jump up like crazy a year from now. But what he said is if you want to get this government out of the tremendous trouble we are in, quit buying things, quit buying land and things, and start selling off some of the assets.

That is what a regular family would do when they find themselves in debt. That is what I am doing right now to pay off student loans. We are selling our house and going to downsize. Why can't the government do that? Let's quit spending like crazy. Let's sell off some of our assets, pay down our debt, and let America find jobs again.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time pending any further speakers on the minority side.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I understand the gentleman from West Virginia is the final speaker on that side. With that, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this. And if you were listening to the debate here of the several speakers that we had on our side of the aisle, if you noticed, we were not criticizing the merits of this purchase. We are simply saying that there is a procedure that this Congress set up. That procedure was a study. Taxpayer dollars funded that study in order to see if this project actually merits congressional support.

Well, that study, Madam Speaker, is not made public. We have not seen the study. We don't know if it is good or bad. It may be good, as the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) said. In fact, he alluded that he has seen worse pieces of legislation rather than this one. But for goodness sakes, if we are spending taxpayer dollars on a study, then shouldn't we at least find out what the study says? That might lead us in the right direction of spending, as this bill would authorize, up to \$50 million without really knowing the ramifications.

So our argument on this side, and I think an argument on this side probably resonates better with the American people due to the fiscal health of our country, I think this resonates very, very well today, especially, as I alluded to in my earlier remarks, since the President is going to come and speak to a joint session of Congress tonight on fiscal responsibility, this is our opportunity on that very day to show some fiscal responsibility by saying "no" to this bill and waiting for the study to come back.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10½ minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Thank you. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would close this debate by making the following observations on the allegations that we have heard on the other side. With respect to the technicality that a new area study has not been sent to the Congress, let me state that at a hearing before the Parks Subcommittee held last November, the National Park Service testified on the record that the draft study is completed and finds that the site meets the NPS criteria for addition to the National Park System.

The official agency testimony goes on for four pages describing the amazing natural, cultural, and historical resources found on the site. For example, that testimony states that, and I quote, "Enactment of H.R. 3726 would provide the opportunity to preserve and protect this outstanding Caribbean cultural landscape and interpret the cotton era and related agricultural themes that have been instrumental in the development of St. Croix in the Virgin Islands. It would also help protect five pre-Columbian archeological sites, two of which are among the oldest sites on St. Croix."

I was not able to attend this hearing, but my staff does inform me that at no time did any member of the committee, even for a moment, question the conclusions or opinions that were expressed by the National Park Service. The formal findings contained in the study will be enormously valuable as the NPS moves forward creating a management plan for this area, and in future years as the Congress contemplates appropriating funds for the site.

For now, I am satisfied that the NPS has provided us more than ample information to move forward with the initial designation. The fact that the formal study has not been transmitted to the Congress is a technicality, one that is either significant or not to the other side, the minority, depending upon what day it is. House Republicans have supported designations with incomplete studies. House Republicans have supported designations with no study at all. House Republicans have opposed designations when the study was complete and fully supported designation. So this concern for NPS studies by those on the other side of the aisle is newly discovered. Their record on this is inconsistent and simply not credible.

Like the Republican concern for following the recommendations of NPS studies, this concern for the NPS maintenance backlog is newfound as well. The NPS maintenance backlog is real, no doubt about it, and needs to be addressed. Democrats are serious about addressing it. We continue to work closely with the agency to document the work that needs to be done to prioritize it and provide the funding and the people needed to get the most pressing work done.

But I completely disagree with the Republican claim that the National Park Service, quote, "can't take care of what it already owns." That kind of

park bashing may score some points, but it is nothing more than a low blow. Millions of American families visit our national parks every year and come away feeling inspired, energized, and downright patriotic. The National Park Service could use more money, but they are the very best in the world at what they do, and claims to the contrary are false. Our National Park Service takes care of what they already own, to the enormous satisfaction of most Americans, and they can take care of this beautiful area of St. Croix as well.

I would ask the American people to keep an eye on the issue. You watch. When the President submits his budget request for the next fiscal year, it will contain critical funding for the NPS. And Democrats will support that request and pass it. And many of the same Republicans on this floor today expressing deep concern over the NPS maintenance backlog will come to this floor and vote against the funding needed to address it.

In fact, it was Republicans who insisted on drastically underfunding and understaffing this agency that caused the maintenance backlog to increase on their watch. The future health and growth of our NPS system should not be stunted because Republicans mismanaged it when they were in charge of government. Democrats will correct the mistakes of the past, not be held hostage by them. And just like other arguments offered today, the Republican record on this issue is so inconsistent it simply cannot be taken seriously.

Finally, Madam Speaker, H.R. 3726 does not spend one dime, and every Member on this floor knows it. The legislation designates this area as a new unit, but the bill contains no direct spending. Any land acquisition will be subject, of course, to appropriations. Enactment of this legislation is the beginning of the process, not the end. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to preserve a unique and stunning area, and I fully support having this land at least be eligible for land acquisition funding over the next few cycles.

Yes, the former Republican majority went on an irresponsible spending spree that damaged this country and resulted in the largest increase in the deficit since World War II. And yes, fixing the damage caused by those Republican mistakes will be an enormous challenge for all of us going forward. But I believe Democrats can do it. I believe we can get our fiscal house in order, and when we do it, Castle Nugent should be a unit of the National Park System so we can allocate funding to protect it and preserve it for generations to come.

As for unemployment, the unemployment rate on St. Croix was 8.9 percent last November. If this private land is successfully transformed into a popular tourist destination, it will create jobs



Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 22 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

**CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2010**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of H.R. 3726, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 175, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—240

Ackerman	Fattah	McCarthy (NY)
Adler (NJ)	Filmer	McCollum
Altmire	Foster	McDermott
Andrews	Fudge	McGovern
Arcuri	Garamendi	McIntyre
Baca	Giffords	McMahon
Baird	Gonzalez	McNerney
Baldwin	Gordon (TN)	Meek (FL)
Barrow	Grayson	Meeks (NY)
Bean	Green, Al	Melancon
Becerra	Green, Gene	Michaud
Berkley	Grijalva	Miller (NC)
Berman	Gutierrez	Miller, George
Berry	Hall (NY)	Minnick
Bishop (NY)	Halvorson	Mollohan
Blumenauer	Hare	Moore (KS)
Bocchieri	Harman	Moran (VA)
Boren	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)
Boswell	Heinrich	Murphy, Patrick
Boucher	Herseth Sandlin	Murtha
Boyd	Higgins	Nadler (NY)
Brady (PA)	Hill	Napolitano
Braley (IA)	Himes	Neal (MA)
Brown, Corrine	Hinchee	Nye
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Capps	Hirono	Obey
Capuano	Hodes	Olver
Cardoza	Holden	Pallone
Carnahan	Holt	Pascrell
Carney	Honda	Pastor (AZ)
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Payne
Castor (FL)	Inslee	Perlmutter
Chandler	Israel	Perriello
Childers	Jackson (IL)	Peters
Chu	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Clarke	(TX)	Pingree (ME)
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Polis (CO)
Cleaver	Kagen	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Cohen	Kaptur	Quigley
Connolly (VA)	Kennedy	Rahall
Conyers	Kildee	Rangel
Cooper	Kilpatrick (MI)	Reyes
Costa	Kilroy	Richardson
Costello	Kind	Rodriguez
Courtney	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Ross
Crowley	Kissell	Rothman (NJ)
Cuellar	Klein (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kosmas	Ruppersberger
Dahlkemper	Kratovil	Rush
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Salazar
Davis (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	T.
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Delahunt	Levin	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Dicks	Lipinski	Schauer
Dingell	Loeb sack	Schiff
Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe	Schrader
Donnelly (IN)	Lowey	Schwartz
Doyle	Lujan	Scott (GA)
Driehaus	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Edwards (MD)	Maffei	Serrano
Edwards (TX)	Maloney	Sestak
Ellison	Markey (CO)	Shea-Porter
Ellsworth	Markey (MA)	Sherman
Engel	Marshall	Shuler
Eshoo	Massa	Sires
Etheridge	Matheson	Skelton
Farr	Matsui	Slaughter

Smith (WA)	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Snyder	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Space	Tierney	Watson
Spratt	Titus	Watt
Stark	Tonko	Waxman
Stupak	Towns	Weiner
Sutton	Tsongas	Wilson (OH)
Tanner	Van Hollen	Woolsey
Taylor	Velázquez	Wu
Teague	Visclosky	Yarmuth

NAYS—175

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)	Murphy, Tim
Akin	Gerlach	Myrick
Alexander	Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer
Austria	Gohmert	Nunes
Bachmann	Goodlatte	Olson
Bachus	Granger	Owens
Bartlett	Graves	Paul
Barton (TX)	Griffith	Paulsen
Biggert	Guthrie	Pence
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Petri
Bilirakis	Harper	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Blackburn	Heller	Poe (TX)
Blunt	Hensarling	Posey
Boehner	Herger	Price (GA)
Bonner	Hoekstra	Putnam
Bono Mack	Hunter	Radanovich
Boozman	Inglis	Rehberg
Boustany	Issa	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Bright	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Jones	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Jordan (OH)	Rohrabacher
Ginny	King (IA)	Rooney
Buchanan	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Kingston	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Kirk	Royce
Buyer	Kline (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	Lamborn	Scalise
Camp	Lance	Schmidt
Campbell	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	LaTourrette	Sessions
Cao	Latta	Shadegg
Capito	Lee (NY)	Shimkus
Carter	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Cassidy	Linder	Simpson
Castle	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Chaffetz	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Luetkemeyer	E.	Smith (TX)
Lummis	Lungren, Daniel	Souder
Lungren, Daniel	E.	Stearns
E.	Mack	Sullivan
Dent	Manzullo	Terry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Dreier	McCaul	Tiahrt
Duncan	McClintock	Tiberi
Ehlers	McCotter	Turner
Emerson	McHenry	Upton
Fallin	McKeon	Walden
Flake	McMorris	Westmoreland
Fleming	Rodgers	Whitfield
Forbes	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Fox	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	Young (FL)
Gallegly	Murphy (NY)	

NOT VOTING—18

Abercrombie	Deal (GA)	Schock
Barrett (SC)	Frank (MA)	Speier
Bishop (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Walz
Coble	Moore (WI)	Wamp
Crenshaw	Moran (KS)	Waters
Davis (AL)	Ortiz	Welch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1402

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4508, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4508.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 4, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—410

Ackerman	Clarke	Green, Gene
Aderholt	Griffith	Clay
Adler (NJ)	Cleaver	Grijalva
Akin	Clyburn	Guthrie
Alexander	Coffman (CO)	Gutierrez
Altmire	Cohen	Hall (NY)
Andrews	Hall (TX)	Cole
Arcuri	Conaway	Halvorson
Austria	Connolly (VA)	Hare
Baca	Conyers	Harman
Bachmann	Cooper	Harper
Bachus	Costa	Hastings (FL)
Baird	Costello	Hastings (WA)
Baldwin	Courtney	Heinrich
Barrow	Crowley	Heller
Bartlett	Cuellar	Hensarling
Barton (TX)	Culberson	Herger
Bean	Cummings	Herseth Sandlin
Becerra	Dahlkemper	Higgins
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Hill
Berman	Davis (IL)	Himes
Berry	Davis (KY)	Hinchee
Biggert	Davis (TN)	Hinojosa
Bilbray	DeFazio	Hirono
Bilirakis	DeGette	Hodes
Bishop (NY)	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Bishop (UT)	DeLauro	Holden
Blackburn	Holt	Holt
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart, L.	Honda
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoyer
Bocchieri	Dicks	Hunter
Boehner	Dingell	Inglis
Bonner	Doggett	Inslee
Bono Mack	Donnelly (IN)	Israel
Boozman	Doyle	Issa
Boren	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Boswell	Driehaus	Jackson Lee
Boucher	Duncan	(TX)
Boustany	Edwards (MD)	Jenkins
Boyd	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA)	Ehlers	Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Ellison	Johnson, Sam
Braley (IA)	Ellsworth	Jones
Bright	Emerson	Jordan (OH)
Brown (SC)	Engel	Kagen
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Brown-Waite,	Etheridge	Kaptur
Ginny	Fallin	Kennedy
Buchanan	Farr	Kildee
Burgess	Fattah	Kilpatrick (MI)
Burton (IN)	Filmer	Kilroy
Butterfield	Fleming	Kind
Buyer	Forbes	King (IA)
Calvert	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Camp	Fox	Kingston
Campbell	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Cao	Fudge	Kissell
Capito	Gallegly	Klein (FL)
Capps	Garamendi	Kline (MN)
Capuano	Garrett (NJ)	Kosmas
Cardoza	Gerlach	Kratovil
Carnahan	Giffords	Kucinich
Carney	Gingrey (GA)	Lamborn
Carson (IN)	Gohmert	Lance
Carter	Gonzalez	Langevin
Castle	Goodlatte	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Gordon (TN)	Larson (CT)
Chaffetz	Granger	Latham
Chandler	Graves	LaTourrette
Childers	Grayson	Latta
Chu	Green, Al	Lee (CA)

Lee (NY) Neugebauer Scott (VA)  
 Levin Nunes Sensenbrenner  
 Lewis (CA) Nye Serrano  
 Lewis (GA) Oberstar Sessions  
 Linder Obey Sestak  
 Lipinski Olson Shadegg  
 LoBiondo Oliver Shea-Porter  
 Loeb sack Owens Sherman  
 Lofgren, Zoe Pallone Shimkus  
 Lowey Pascrell Shuler  
 Lucas Pastor (AZ) Shuster  
 Luetkemeyer Paulsen Sires  
 Luján Payne Skelton  
 Lummis Pence Slaughter  
 Lungren, Daniel Perlmutter Smith (NE)  
 E. Perriello Smith (NJ)  
 Lynch Peters Smith (TX)  
 Mack Peterson Smith (WA)  
 Maffei Petri Snyder  
 Maloney Pingree (ME) Souder  
 Manzullo Pitts Space  
 Marchant Platts Spratt  
 Markey (CO) Poe (TX) Stark  
 Markey (MA) Polis (CO) Stearns  
 Marshall Pomeroy Stupak  
 Massa Posey Sullivan  
 Matheson Price (GA) Sutton  
 Matsui Price (NC) Tanner  
 McCarthy (CA) Putnam Taylor  
 McCarthy (NY) Quigley Teague  
 McCaul Radanovich Terry  
 McCollum Rahall Thompson (CA)  
 McCotter Rangel Thompson (MS)  
 McDermott Rehberg Thompson (PA)  
 McGovern Reichert  
 McHenry Reyes Thornberry  
 McIntyre Richardson  
 McKeon Rodriguez  
 McMahon Roe (TN) Tierney  
 McMorris Rogers (AL) Titus  
 Rodgers Rogers (KY) Tonko  
 McNerney Rogers (MI) Towns  
 Meek (FL) Rohrabacher Tsongas  
 Meeks (NY) Rooney Turner  
 Melancon Ros-Lehtinen Van Hollen  
 Mica Roskam Walden  
 Michaud Ross Velázquez  
 Miller (FL) Rothman (NJ) Visclosky  
 Miller (MI) Roybal-Allard  
 Miller (NC) Royce Walden  
 Miller, Gary Ruppertsberger  
 Miller, George Rush Wasserman  
 Minnick Ryan (OH) Schultz  
 Mitchell Ryan (WI) Watt  
 Mollohan Salazar Waxman  
 Moore (KS) Sánchez, Linda Weiner  
 Moore (WI) T. Westmoreland  
 Moran (VA) Sanchez, Loretta Whitfield  
 Sarbanes Wilson (OH)  
 Murphy (CT) Scalise Wilson (SC)  
 Murphy (NY) Schakowsky Wittman  
 Murphy, Patrick Wolf  
 Murphy, Tim Schauer Woolsey  
 Murtha Schiff Wu  
 Myrick Schmidt Yarmuth  
 Nadler (NY) Schrader Young (AK)  
 Napolitano Schwartz Young (FL)  
 Neal (MA) Scott (GA)

NAYS—4

Broun (GA) McClintock  
 Flake Paul

NOT VOTING—19

Abercrombie Deal (GA) Simpson  
 Barrett (SC) Foster Speier  
 Bishop (GA) Frank (MA) Wamp  
 Cassidy Johnson, E. B. Waters  
 Coble Moran (KS) Welch  
 Crenshaw Ortiz  
 Davis (AL) Schock

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes left on this vote.

□ 1409

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING 95TH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1020, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1020.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 0, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—408

Ackerman Chandler Goodlatte  
 Aderholt Granger  
 Adler (NJ) Chu Graves  
 Akin Clarke Grayson  
 Alexander Clay Green, Al  
 Altire Cleaver Green, Gene  
 Andrews Clyburn Griffith  
 Arcuri Coffman (CO) Grijalva  
 Austria Cohen Guthrie  
 Baca Cole Gutierrez  
 Bachmann Conaway Hall (NY)  
 Bachus Connolly (VA) Hall (TX)  
 Baird Conyers Halvorson  
 Baldwin Cooper Hare  
 Barrow Costa Harman  
 Bartlett Costello Harper  
 Barton (TX) Courtney Hastings (FL)  
 Bean Crowley Hastings (WA)  
 Becerra Cuellar Heinrich  
 Berkley Culberson Heller  
 Berry Cummings Hensarling  
 Berman Dahlkemper Herger  
 Biggert Davis (CA) Herseth Sandlin  
 Bilbray Davis (IL) Hill  
 Bilirakis Davis (KY) Himes  
 Bishop (NY) Davis (TN) Hinchey  
 Bishop (UT) DeFazio Hinojosa  
 Blackburn DeGette Hirono  
 Blumenauer Delahunt Hodes  
 Boccieri DeLauro Hoekstra  
 Boehner Dent Holden  
 Bonner Diaz-Balart, L. Holt  
 Bono Mack Diaz-Balart, M. Honda  
 Boozman Dicks Hoyer  
 Boren Dingell Hunter  
 Boswell Doggett Inglis  
 Boucher Donnelly (IN) Inslee  
 Boustany Doyle Israel  
 Boyd Dreier Issa  
 Brady (PA) Driehaus Jackson (IL)  
 Brady (TX) Duncan Jackson Lee  
 Braley (IA) Edwards (MD) (TX)  
 Bright Edwards (TX) Jenkins  
 Broun (GA) Ehlers Johnson (GA)  
 Brown (SC) Ellison Johnson (IL)  
 Brown, Corrine Ellsworth Johnson, Sam  
 Brown-Waite, Emerson Jones  
 Ginny Jordan (OH)  
 Buchanan Eshoo Kagen  
 Burgess Etheridge Kanjorski  
 Burton (IN) Fallin Kaptur  
 Butterfield Farr Kennedy  
 Buyer Fattah Kildee  
 Calvert Filner Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Camp Flake Kilroy  
 Campbell Fleming Kind  
 Cantor Forbes King (NY)  
 Cao Foster Kingston  
 Capito Foxx Kirk  
 Capps Franks (AZ) Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
 Capuano Frelinghuysen Kissell  
 Cardoza Fudge Klein (FL)  
 Carnahan Gallegly Kline (MN)  
 Carney Garamendi Kosmas  
 Carson (IN) Garrett (NJ) Kratovil  
 Carter Gerlach Kucinich  
 Cassidy Giffords Lamborn  
 Castle Gingrey (GA) Lance  
 Castor (FL) Gohmert Langevin  
 Chaffetz Gonzalez Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT) Napolitano Schwartz  
 Latham Neal (MA) Scott (GA)  
 LaTourette Neugebauer Scott (VA)  
 Latta Nunes Sensenbrenner  
 Lee (CA) Nye Serrano  
 Lee (NY) Oberstar Sessions  
 Levin Obey Sestak  
 Lewis (CA) Olson Shadegg  
 Lewis (GA) Oliver Shea-Porter  
 Lipinski Owens Sherman  
 LoBiondo Pallone Shimkus  
 Loeb sack Pascrell Shuler  
 Lofgren, Zoe Pastor (AZ) Shuster  
 Lowey Paul Simpson  
 Lucas Paulsen Sires  
 Luetkemeyer Payne Skelton  
 Luján Petri Smith (NE)  
 Lummis Perlmutter Smith (NJ)  
 Lungren, Daniel Perriello Smith (TX)  
 E. Peters Smith (WA)  
 Lynch Peterson Snyder  
 Mack Petri Souder  
 Maffei Pingree (ME) Space  
 Maloney Pitts Spratt  
 Manzullo Platts Stark  
 Marchant Poe (TX) Stearns  
 Markey (CO) Polis (CO) Stupak  
 Markey (MA) Pomeroy Sullivan  
 Marshall Posey Sutton  
 Massa Price (GA) Tanner  
 Matheson Price (NC) Taylor  
 Matsui Putnam Teague  
 McCarthy (CA) Quigley Terry  
 McCarthy (NY) Radanovich Thompson (CA)  
 McCaul Rahall Thompson (MS)  
 McCollum Rangel Thompson (PA)  
 McCotter McClintock Thornberry  
 McDermott Rehberg Tiahrt  
 McGovern Reichert Tiberi  
 McHenry Reyes Tierney  
 McIntyre Richardson Titus  
 McKeon Rodriguez Tonko  
 McMahon Rogers (AL) Towns  
 McMorris Rogers (KY) Tsongas  
 Rodgers Rogers (MI) Turner  
 McNerney Rohrabacher Upton  
 Meeks (NY) Rooney Van Hollen  
 Melancon Ros-Lehtinen Velázquez  
 Mica Roskam Walden  
 Michaud Ross  
 Miller (FL) Rothman (NJ) Walz  
 Miller (MI) Roybal-Allard Wasserman  
 Miller (NC) Royce Schultz  
 Miller, Gary Ruppertsberger Watson  
 Miller, George Rush Watt  
 Minnick Ryan (OH) Waxman  
 Mitchell Ryan (WI) Weiner  
 Mollohan Salazar Westmoreland  
 Moore (KS) Sánchez, Linda Whitfield  
 Moore (WI) T. Wilson (OH)  
 Moran (VA) Sanchez, Loretta Wilson (SC)  
 Sarbanes Frank (MA) Wittman  
 Murphy (CT) Scalise Wolf  
 Murphy (NY) Schakowsky Woolsey  
 Murphy, Patrick Schauer Wu  
 Murphy, Tim Schiff Yarmuth  
 Murtha Myrick Young (AK)  
 Myrick Schmidt Young (FL)  
 Nadler (NY) Schrader

NOT VOTING—25

Abercrombie Frank (MA) Ortiz  
 Barrett (SC) Gordon (TN) Schock  
 Bishop (GA) Higgins Slaughter  
 Blunt Johnson, E. B. Speier  
 Coble King (IA) Wamp  
 Crenshaw Linder Waters  
 Davis (AL) Meek (FL) Welch  
 Deal (GA) Moore (KS)  
 Fortenberry Moran (KS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes left on this vote.

□ 1417

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. REYES, from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 111-402) on the resolution (H. Res. 978) requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives all documents in the possession of the President relating to the inventory and review of intelligence related to the shooting at Fort Hood, Texas, described by the President in a memorandum dated November 10, 2009, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, from the Committee on Homeland Security, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 111-403) on the resolution (H. Res. 980) of inquiry directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of the Transportation Security Administration's Aviation Security Screening Management Standard Operating Procedures manual in effect on December 5, 2009, and any subsequent revisions of such manual in effect prior to the adoption of this resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. CONYERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 111-404) on the resolution (H. Res. 994) directing the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the Attorney General's possession relating to the decision to dismiss *United States v. New Black Panther Party*, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. On Monday the House is not in session.

On Tuesday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed, Mr. Speaker, until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business, and on Friday the House

will be in pro forma session at 9 a.m. No votes are expected in the House on Friday. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business Friday. In addition, we will consider H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Enhancements Act of 2009. Also possible consideration of Senate amendments to H.J. Res. 45, to permit continued financing of government operations.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, as this is the scheduling colloquy, I'd like to follow up with a few questions regarding the schedule. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the majority leader if he could tell us what he expects to have on the floor the second week of February, the week before we head into President's Day Recess.

Mr. HOYER. Well, as the gentleman probably knows, there are some 260 bills that we've sent from the House to the Senate and we look forward to them sending some of those back to us. And my expectation is they will. In addition to that, we are considering a number of pieces of legislation, but they are not yet ripe, and what I mean by that simply is the committee chairs have not signed off that they're ready to go, so we are still, frankly, working with the committees to see what legislation they will have ready to move forward. I know that wasn't very responsive, and I wish I had a more responsive answer but that's the accurate answer.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for his accuracy. And I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman could tell us whether he believed there would be a vote on another health care bill prior to President's Day Recess. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. It is possible, but, again, as the gentleman knows, given the differences between the two Houses, there's still ongoing discussions as to whether they can be resolved, and if they can't, what alternative steps should be taken. So it is possible.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of brevity, I just have one final question for the gentleman, and that is, we would anticipate the gentleman and his party bringing forward a budget at some point, and laying out the fiscal narrative, if you will, or plan for the year. And I know recent reports have indicated the President believes that Congress has a spending problem. We, and I'm sure the gentleman, accept the admonition that Congress does have a spending problem, and Mr. Speaker, I'd ask when we anticipate bringing that forward, and does the gentleman expect the House to follow the President's lead in freezing nonsecurity discretionary spending?

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question. As you know, the President has not yet submitted his budget, so anticipating when we're going to pass it or bring his budget to the floor is a little premature. But I would certainly hope that we would

bring it forward in the regular course of business. We're getting the budget significantly earlier this year. As you know, at the transition we get it later, as we did last year. But I expect to get it early. I think Mr. SPRATT and Mr. RYAN will be working on the budget, and I expect it to come forward certainly either late in March, which is when I would expect it to come forward.

The Easter break, as you know, is the last week in March, first week in April, I believe, so I would be hopeful—let me make it clear: I'm not saying that's when it's going to happen, but I'd be hopeful we'd do it before we leave on the Easter break. And the second part of your question, which I think is the most important part of the question, because the other is speculative, I would expect the Congress to honor the President's suggestion of freeze with respect to the overall numbers on discretionary spending. But let me make an observation that I know you know, but I think it's important for us to remember that we have: There is no doubt the deficits that confront us are of very large proportions. It is, I think, a critical problem confronting our Nation, not just the Congress, but our Nation. It is an issue on which I think we need to focus and address.

I will tell my friend, as he knows, that with respect to the freeze, that deals with a relatively small portion of the budget, about 14 to 15 percent of the budget. As the gentleman knows, defense discretionary spending is not covered by the President's. As you know as well, because of Afghanistan and Iraq, expenditures on defense have escalated substantially. And as the gentleman knows as well, the other portion of the budget deals with entitlements and interest payments on the national debt. So that I would simply observe that if we're going to get a handle on the budget and spending, sometimes people view spending as only spending on discretionary non-defense amounts. That's not accurate. Every nickel that we apply to some objective that we have decided to apply it to is spending. And we're, frankly, going to have to look at the whole gamut of spending if we're going to get back to a fiscal balance, which I think is absolutely essential. I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would first note, I agree with the gentleman. Discretionary spending is not the only piece that this Congress must address in terms of trying to get our fiscal house in order. But it is a point that should be made that over the last year, nondefense discretionary spending at the baseline has increased 67 percent. So that when we're calling for a small freeze, as the gentleman indicates, in terms of percentages of the budget, you know, we certainly could do more. As the gentleman knows, we have tried to advocate for a spending freeze that would incorporate rescinding some of

the increases, again, the 67 percent increases that we have seen over the last year.

As a result of all the spending, as the gentleman knows, the Nation's deficit now stands at a record \$1.35 trillion, something that all of us, I know, are very mindful of and would like very much to see reduced if not erased.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield just for one minute?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't want to get into what we've been getting into, but simply to observe that as the gentleman knows when he uses the 60 some odd percent, much of that, a significant part of that spending, was specifically not included in the baseline, so that it will not be incorporated in the freeze. It will be a lower number than that because, although some of it was in the baseline, a significant portion of it, as the gentleman knows, was not in the baseline.

□ 1430

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, again in trying to maintain my brevity today, we do know that in the omnibus spending bill there was a 12 percent increase in the spending of the omnibus bill, something that all of us should try and eliminate and erase, given working families and small businesses are having to do much more and actually cut their expenditures right now.

With that, I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 2010

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Friday, January 29, and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 2, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARAMENDI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 114(b) of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1103), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees for the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development for a term of 6 years:

Mr. Travis Childers, Booneville, Mississippi

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the Majority and Minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet tonight in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to her left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint session by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats only by physical presence following the security sweep of the Chamber.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 8:35 p.m. for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 8:35 p.m.

□ 2025

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

#### JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS PURSUANT TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 228 TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Majority Floor Services Chief, Mr. Barry Sullivan, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN);

The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER);

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL);

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER);

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER);

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS); and

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);  
The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY);

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ);

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN);

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL);  
The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER);

The Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI);

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE); and

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Majority Floor Services Chief announced the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Roble Olhaye, Ambassador from the Republic of Djibouti.

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Majority Floor Services Chief announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Majority Floor Services Chief announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered

the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m., the Majority Floor Services Chief and the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Wilson Livingood, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The PRESIDENT. Madam Speaker, Vice President BIDEN, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans:

Our Constitution declares that, from time to time, the President shall give to Congress information about the state of our union. For 220 years, our leaders have fulfilled this duty. They have done so during periods of prosperity and tranquility. And they have done so in the midst of war and depression, at moments of great strife and great struggle.

It's tempting to look back on these moments and assume that our progress was inevitable—that America was always destined to succeed. But when the Union was turned back at Bull Run and the Allies first landed at Omaha Beach, victory was very much in doubt. When the market crashed on Black Tuesday and civil rights marchers were beaten on Bloody Sunday, the future was anything but certain. These were the times that tested the courage of our convictions, and the strength of our union. And despite all our divisions and disagreements, our hesitations and our fears, America prevailed because we chose to move forward as one nation—as one people.

Again, we are tested. And again, we must answer history's call.

One year ago, I took office amid two wars, an economy rocked by severe recession, a financial system on the verge of collapse and a government deeply in debt. Experts from across the political spectrum warned that, if we did not act, we might face a second Depression. So we acted—immediately and aggressively. And 1 year later, the worst of the storm has passed.

But the devastation remains. One in 10 Americans still cannot find work. Many businesses have shuttered. Home values have declined. Small towns and rural communities have been hit especially hard. And for those who had already known poverty, life has become that much harder.

This recession has also compounded the burdens that America's families have been dealing with for decades—the burden of working harder and longer for less, of being unable to save enough to retire or help kids with college.

So I know the anxieties that are out there right now. They're not new. These struggles are the reason I ran for President. These struggles are what I've witnessed for years in places like Elkhart, Indiana, and Galesburg, Illinois. I hear about them in the letters that I read each night. The toughest to read are those written by children—asking why they have to move from their home, asking when their mom or dad will be able to go back to work.

For these Americans and so many others, change has not come fast enough. Some are frustrated; some are angry. They don't understand why it seems like bad behavior on Wall Street is rewarded but hard work on Main Street isn't; or why Washington has been unable or unwilling to solve any of our problems. They are tired of the partisanship and the shouting and the pettiness. They know we can't afford it. Not now.

So we face big and difficult challenges. And what the American people hope—that they deserve—is for all of us, Democrats and Republicans, to work through our differences, to overcome the numbing weight of our politics. For, while the people who sent us here have different backgrounds, different stories, different beliefs, the anxieties they face are the same. The aspirations they hold are shared. A job that pays the bills. A chance to get ahead. Most of all, the ability to give their children a better life.

And you know what else they share? They share a stubborn resilience in the face of adversity. After one of the most difficult years in our history, they remain busy building cars and teaching kids, starting businesses and going back to school. They're coaching Little League and helping their neighbors. One woman wrote to me and said, "We are strained but hopeful, struggling but encouraged."

It's because of this spirit—this great decency and great strength—that I have never been more hopeful about America's future than I am tonight. Despite our hardships, our union is strong. We do not give up. We do not quit. We do not allow fear or division to break our spirit. In this new decade, it's time the American people get a government that matches their decency, that embodies their strength.

And tonight, I'd like to talk about how, together, we can deliver on that promise.

It begins with our economy.

Our most urgent task upon taking office was to shore up the same banks that helped cause this crisis. It was not easy to do. And if there is one thing that has unified Democrats and Republicans and everybody in between is that we all hated the bank bailout. I hated it. You hated it. It was about as popular as a root canal.

But when I ran for President, I promised I wouldn't just do what was popular—I would do what was necessary. And if we had allowed the meltdown of the financial system, unemployment

might be double what it is today. More businesses would certainly have closed. More homes would have surely been lost.

So I supported the last administration's efforts to create the financial rescue program. And when we took that program over, we made it more transparent and more accountable. And as a result, the markets are now stabilized, and we recovered most of the money we spent on the banks—most but not all.

To recover the rest, I have proposed a fee on the biggest banks. Now, I know Wall Street isn't keen on this idea, but if these firms can afford to hand out big bonuses again, they can afford a modest fee to pay back the taxpayers who rescued them in their time of need.

As we stabilized the financial system, we also took steps to get our economy growing again, save as many jobs as possible, and help Americans who had become unemployed.

That's why we extended or increased unemployment benefits for more than 18 million Americans, made health insurance 65 percent cheaper for families who get their coverage through COBRA, and passed 25 different tax cuts.

Now, let me repeat: We cut taxes. We cut taxes for 95 percent of working families. We cut taxes for small businesses. We cut taxes for first-time home buyers. We cut taxes for parents trying to care for their children. We cut taxes for 8 million Americans paying for college.

As a result, millions of Americans had more to spend on gas and food and other necessities, all of which helped businesses keep more workers. And we haven't raised income taxes by a single dime on a single person. Not a single dime.

Because of the steps we took, there are about 2 million Americans working right now who would otherwise be unemployed. 200,000 work in construction and clean energy. 300,000 are teachers and other education workers. Tens of thousands are cops, firefighters, correctional officers, first responders. And we are on track to add another 1.5 million jobs to this total by the end of the year.

The plan that has made all of this possible, from the tax cuts to the jobs, is the Recovery Act. That's right—the Recovery Act, also known as the stimulus bill. Economists on the left and the right say this bill has helped saved jobs and avert disaster. But you don't have to take their word for it.

Talk to the small business in Phoenix that will triple its workforce because of the Recovery Act.

Talk to the window manufacturer in Philadelphia who said he used to be skeptical about the Recovery Act until he had to add two more work shifts just because of the business it created. Talk to the single teacher raising two kids who was told by the principal in the last week of school that, because of

the Recovery Act, she wouldn't be laid off at all.

There are stories like this all across America. And after 2 years of recession, the economy is growing again. Retirement funds have started to gain back some of their value. Businesses are beginning to invest again, and slowly, some are starting to hire again.

But I realize that, for every success story, there are other stories—of men and women who wake up with the anguish of not knowing where their next paycheck will come from, who send out resumes week after week and hear nothing in response. That is why jobs must be our number one focus in 2010, and that is why I am calling for a new jobs bill tonight.

Now, the true engine of job creation in this country will always be America's businesses. But government can create the conditions necessary for businesses to expand and hire more workers.

We should start where most new jobs do—in small businesses, companies that begin when an entrepreneur takes a chance on a dream or a worker decides it's time she became her own boss.

Through sheer grit and determination, these companies have weathered the recession, and they are ready to go. But when you talk to small business owners in places like Allentown, Pennsylvania or Elyria, Ohio, you find out that, even though banks on Wall Street are lending again, they are mostly lending to bigger companies. Financing remains difficult for small business owners across the country. Even those who are making a profit.

So, tonight, I am proposing that we take \$30 billion of the money that Wall Street banks have repaid and use it to help community banks give small businesses the credit they need to stay afloat. I am also proposing a new small business tax credit—one that will go to over 1 million small businesses who hire new workers or raise wages.

While we're at it, let's also eliminate all capital gains taxes on small business investment; and provide a tax incentive for all large businesses and all small businesses to invest in new plants and equipment.

Next, we can put Americans to work today building the infrastructure of tomorrow. From the first railroads to the Interstate Highway System, our nation has always been built to compete. There is no reason Europe or China should have the fastest trains or the new factories that manufacture clean energy products.

Tomorrow, I'll visit Tampa, Florida where workers will soon break ground on a new high-speed railroad funded by the Recovery Act. There are projects like that all across this country that will create jobs and help move our Nation's goods, services and information. We should put more Americans to work building clean energy facilities, and give rebates to Americans who make their homes more energy efficient,

which supports clean energy jobs. And to encourage these and other businesses to stay within our borders, it is time to finally slash the tax breaks for companies that ship our jobs overseas and give those tax breaks to companies that create jobs right here in the United States of America.

Now, the House has passed a jobs bill that includes some of these steps. As the first order of business this year, I urge the Senate to do the same, and I know they will. They will. People are out of work. They are hurting. They need our help. And I want a jobs bill on my desk without delay.

But the truth is, these steps won't make up for the 7 million jobs that we've lost over the last 2 years. The only way to move to full employment is to lay a new foundation for long-term economic growth and finally address the problems that America's families have confronted for years.

We can't afford another so-called economic expansion like the one from the last decade—what some call the "lost decade"—where jobs grew more slowly than during any prior expansion, where the income of the average American household declined while the cost of health care and tuition reached record highs, where prosperity was built on a housing bubble and financial speculation.

From the day I took office, I have been told that addressing our larger challenges is too ambitious—that such an effort would be too contentious. I've been told that our political system is too gridlocked and that we should just put things on hold for a while.

For those who make these claims, I have one simple question:

How long should we wait? How long should America put its future on hold?

You see, Washington has been telling us to wait for decades even as the problems have grown worse. Meanwhile, China's not waiting to revamp its economy. Germany's not waiting. India's not waiting. These nations, they're not standing still. These nations aren't playing for second place. They're putting more emphasis on math and science. They're rebuilding their infrastructure. They're making serious investments in clean energy because they want those jobs.

Well, I do not accept second place for the United States of America. As hard as it may be, as uncomfortable and contentious as the debates may become, it's time to get serious about fixing the problems that are hampering our growth.

Now, one place to start is with serious financial reform. Look, I am not interested in punishing banks; I'm interested in protecting our economy. A strong, healthy financial market makes it possible for businesses to access credit and create new jobs. It channels the savings of families into investments that raise incomes. But that can only happen if we guard against the same recklessness that nearly brought down our entire economy.

We need to make sure consumers and middle class families have the information they need to make financial decisions. We can't allow financial institutions, including those that take your deposits, to take risks that threaten the whole economy.

The House has already passed financial reform with many of these changes. And the lobbyists are trying to kill it. Well, we cannot let them win this fight. And if the bill that ends up on my desk does not meet the test of real reform, I will send it back until we get it right. We've got to get it right.

Next, we need to encourage American innovation. Last year, we made the largest investment in basic research funding in history—an investment that could lead to the world's cheapest solar cells or treatment that kills cancer cells but leaves healthy ones untouched. And no area is more ripe for such innovation than energy. You can see the results of last year's investments in clean energy—in the North Carolina company that will create 1,200 jobs nationwide, helping to make advanced batteries; or in the California business that will put 1,000 people to work making solar panels.

But to create more of these clean energy jobs, we need more production, more efficiency, more incentives. And that means building a new generation of safe, clean nuclear power plants in this country. It means making tough decisions about opening new offshore areas for oil and gas development. It means continued investment in advanced biofuels and clean coal technologies. And yes, it means passing a comprehensive energy and climate bill with incentives that will finally make clean energy the profitable kind of energy in America.

I am grateful to the House for passing such a bill last year. And this year, I am eager to help advance the bipartisan effort in the Senate. I know there have been questions about whether we can afford such changes in a tough economy. I know that there are those who disagree with the overwhelming scientific evidence on climate change. But here is the thing, even if you doubt the evidence, providing incentives for energy efficiency and clean energy are the right things to do for our future—because the nation that leads the clean energy economy will be the nation that leads the global economy. And America must be that nation.

Third, we need to export more of our goods. Because the more products we make and sell to other countries, the more jobs we support right here in America. So, tonight, we set a new goal: we will double our exports over the next 5 years, an increase that will support 2 million jobs in America. To help meet this goal, we're launching a national export initiative that will help farmers and small businesses increase their exports and reform export controls consistent with national security.

We have to seek new markets aggressively, just as our competitors are. If

America sits on the sidelines while other nations sign trade deals, we will lose the chance to create jobs on our shores. But realizing those benefits also means enforcing those agreements so our trading partners play by the rules. And that's why we will continue to shape a Doha trade agreement that opens global markets, and why we will strengthen our trade relations in Asia and with key partners like South Korea and Panama and Colombia.

Fourth, we need to invest in the skills and education of our people.

Now, this year, we've broken through the stalemate between left and right by launching a national competition to improve our schools. And the idea here is simple: instead of rewarding failure, we only reward success. Instead of funding the status quo, we only invest in reform—reform that raises student achievement, inspires students to excel in math and science and turns around failing schools that steal the future of too many young Americans, from rural communities to the inner cities. In the 21st century, the best anti-poverty program around is a world-class education. And in this country, the success of our children cannot depend more on where they live than on their potential.

When we renew the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we will work with Congress to expand these reforms to all 50 States. Still, in this economy, a high school diploma no longer guarantees a good job. That's why I urge the Senate to follow the House and pass a bill that will revitalize our community colleges, which is a career pathway to the children of so many working families. To make college more affordable, this bill will finally end the unwarranted taxpayer subsidies that go to banks for student loans. Instead, let's take that money and give families a \$10,000 tax credit for 4 years of college and increase Pell Grants. And let's tell another 1 million students that, when they graduate, they will be required to pay only 10 percent of their income on student loans, and all of their debt will be forgiven after 20 years—and forgiven after 10 years if they choose a career in public service. Because in the United States of America, no one should go broke because they chose to go to college. And by the way, it's time for colleges and universities to get serious about cutting their own costs—because they, too, have a responsibility to help solve this problem.

Now, the price of college tuition is just one of the burdens facing the middle class. That's why, last year, I asked Vice President BIDEN to chair a task force on middle class families. That's why we're nearly doubling the child care tax credit and making it easier to save for retirement by giving access to every worker a retirement account and expanding the tax credit for those who start a nest egg. That's why we're working to lift the value of a family's single largest investment—their home.

The steps we took last year to shore up the housing market have allowed millions of Americans to take out new loans and save an average of \$1,500 on mortgage payments. This year, we will step up refinancing so that homeowners can move into more affordable mortgages. And it is precisely to relieve the burden on middle class families that we still need health insurance reform.

Now let's clear a few things up. I didn't choose to tackle this issue to get some legislative victory under my belt. And by now, it should be fairly obvious that I didn't take on health care because it was good politics.

I took on health care because of the stories I've heard from Americans with preexisting conditions whose lives depend on getting coverage, patients who have been denied coverage, families—even those with insurance—who are just one illness away from financial ruin.

After nearly a century of trying—Democratic administrations, Republican administrations—we are closer than ever to bringing more security to the lives of so many Americans. The approach we've taken would protect every American from the worst practices of the insurance industry. It would give small businesses and uninsured Americans a chance to choose an affordable health care plan in a competitive market. It would require every insurance plan to cover preventative care. And by the way, I want to acknowledge our First Lady, Michelle Obama, who, this year, is creating a national movement to tackle the epidemic of childhood obesity and make kids healthier.

Our approach would preserve the right of Americans who have insurance to keep their doctor and their plan. It would reduce costs and premiums for millions of families and businesses. And according to the Congressional Budget Office—the independent organization that both parties have cited as the official scorekeeper for Congress—our approach would bring down the deficit by as much as \$1 trillion over the next 2 decades.

Still, this is a complex issue, and the longer it was debated, the more skeptical people became. I take my share of the blame for not explaining it more clearly to the American people. And I know that, with all the lobbying and horse-trading, the process left most Americans wondering, what's in it for me.

But I also know this problem is not going away. By the time I'm finished speaking tonight, more Americans will have lost their health insurance. Millions will lose it this year. Our deficit will grow. Premiums will go up. Patients will be denied the care they need. Small business owners will continue to drop coverage all together. I will not walk away from these Americans, and neither should the people in this Chamber.

So, as temperatures cool, I want everyone to take another look at the

plan we've proposed. There is a reason why many doctors, nurses, and health care experts, who know our system best, consider this approach a vast improvement over the status quo. But if anyone from either party has a better approach that will bring down premiums, bring down the deficit, cover the uninsured, strengthen Medicare for seniors, and stop insurance company abuses, let me know. I'm eager to see it. Here's what I ask Congress, though: Don't walk away from reform. Not now. Not when we are so close. Let us find a way to come together and finish the job for the American people. Let's get it done.

Now, even as health care reform would reduce our deficit, it's not enough to dig us out of a massive fiscal hole in which we find ourselves. It's a challenge that makes all others that much harder to solve and one that's been subject to a lot of political posturing.

So let me start the discussion of government spending by setting the record straight. At the beginning of the last decade, the year 2000, America had a budget surplus of over \$200 billion. By the time I took office, we had a 1-year deficit of over \$1 trillion and projected deficits of \$8 trillion over the next decade. Most of this was the result of not paying for two wars, two tax cuts, and an expensive prescription drug program. On top of that, the effects of the recession put a \$3 trillion hole in our budget. All this was before I walked in the door. I'm just stating the facts.

Now, if we had taken office in ordinary times, I would have liked nothing more than to start bringing down the deficit. But we took office amid a crisis, and our efforts to prevent a second Depression have added another \$1 trillion to our national debt. That, too, is a fact.

I'm absolutely convinced that was the right thing to do. But families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions. The Federal Government should do the same. So, tonight, I'm proposing specific steps to pay for the \$1 trillion that it took to rescue the economy last year.

Starting in 2011, we are prepared to freeze government spending for 3 years. Spending related to our national security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security will not be affected. But all other discretionary government programs will. Like any cash-strapped family, we will work within a budget to invest in what we need and sacrifice what we don't. And if I have to enforce this discipline by veto, I will.

We will continue through the budget line by line, page by page to eliminate programs that we can't afford and don't work. We've already identified \$20 billion in savings for next year. To help working families, we will extend our middle class tax cuts. But at a time of record deficits, we will not continue tax cuts for oil companies, for investment fund managers, and for those

making over \$250,000 a year. We just can't afford it.

Now, even after paying for what we spent on my watch, we'll still face the massive deficit we had when I took office. More importantly, the cost of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security will continue to skyrocket. That's why I've called for a bipartisan fiscal commission, modeled on a proposal by Republican JUDD GREGG and Democrat KENT CONRAD. This can't be one of those Washington gimmicks that lets us pretend we solved a problem. The commission will have to provide a specific set of solutions by a certain deadline. Now, yesterday, the Senate blocked a bill that would have created this commission. So I will issue an Executive order that will allow us to go forward because I refuse to pass this problem on to another generation of Americans. And when the vote comes tomorrow, the Senate should restore the pay-as-you-go law that was a big reason for why we had record surpluses in the 1990s.

I know that some in my party will argue that we can't address the deficit or freeze government spending when so many are still hurting. And I agree, which is why this freeze won't take effect until next year, when the economy is stronger. That's how budgeting works. But understand, if we don't take meaningful steps to rein in our debt, it could damage our markets, increase the cost of borrowing and jeopardize our recovery—all of which would have an even worse effect on our job growth and family incomes.

From some on the right, I expect we'll hear a different argument—that if we just make fewer investments in our people, extend tax cuts, including those for wealthier Americans, eliminate more regulations, and maintain the status quo on health care, our deficits will go away. The problem is, that's what we did for 8 years. That's what helped us into this crisis. It's what helped lead to these deficits. We can't do it again.

Rather than fight the same tired battles that have dominated Washington for decades, it's time to try something new. Let's invest in our people without leaving them a mountain of debt. Let's meet our responsibility to the citizens who sent us here. Let's try common sense—a novel concept.

To do that, we have to recognize that we face more than a deficit of dollars right now. We face a deficit of trust—deep and corrosive doubts about how Washington works that have been growing for years. To close that credibility gap, we have to take action on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue to end the outsized influence of lobbyists, to do our work openly, to give our people the government they deserve.

That's what I came to Washington to do. That's why—for the first time in history—my administration posts on our White House visitors online. That's why we've excluded lobbyists from policymaking jobs or seats on Federal boards and commissions.

But we can't stop there. It's time to require lobbyists to disclose each contact they make on behalf of a client with my administration or with Congress. It's time to put strict limits on the contributions that lobbyists give to candidates for Federal office. With all due deference to the separation of powers, last week, the Supreme Court reversed a century of law that I believe will open the floodgates for special interests—including foreign corporations—to spend without limit in our elections. I don't think American elections should be bankrolled by America's most powerful interests, or worse, by foreign entities. They should be decided by the American people. And I would urge Democrats and Republicans to pass a bill that helps correct some of these problems.

I'm also calling on Congress to continue down the path of earmark reform—Democrats and Republicans. You've trimmed some of this spending. You've embraced some meaningful change. But restoring the public trust demands more. For example, some Members of Congress post some earmark requests online. Tonight, I am calling on Congress to publish all earmark requests on a single Web site before there is a vote so that the American people can see how their money is being spent.

Of course, none of these reforms will even happen if we don't also reform how we work with one another.

Now, I am not naive. I never thought that the mere fact of my election would usher in peace and harmony and some post-partisan era. I knew that both parties have fed divisions that are deeply entrenched. And on some issues, there are simply philosophical differences that will always cause us to part ways. These disagreements about the role of government in our lives, about our national priorities and our national security, they've been taking place for over 200 years. They are the very essence of our democracy.

But what frustrates the American people is a Washington where every day is an election day. We can't wage a perpetual campaign where the only goal is to see who can get the most embarrassing headlines about the other side—a belief that, if you lose, I win. Neither party should delay or obstruct every single bill just because they can. I'm speaking to both parties now. The confirmation of well-qualified public servants shouldn't be held hostage to the pet projects or grudges of a few individual Senators. Washington may think that saying anything about the other side—no matter how false, no matter how malicious—is just part of the game. But it's precisely such politics that has stopped either party from helping the American people. Worse yet, it is sowing further division among our citizens, further distrust in our government.

So, no, I will not give up on trying to change the tone of our politics. I know it's an election year. And after last

week, it's clear that campaign fever has come even earlier than usual. But we still need to govern. To Democrats, I would remind you that we still have the largest majority in decades, and the people expect us to solve problems, not run for the hills. And if the Republican leadership is going to insist that 60 votes in the Senate are required to do any business at all in this town—a super majority—then the responsibility to govern is now yours as well. Just saying “no” to everything may be good short-term politics, but it's not leadership. We were sent here to serve our citizens, not our ambitions. So let's show the American people that we can do it together. This week, I'll be addressing a meeting of the House Republicans. I'd like to begin monthly meetings with both the Democratic and Republican leadership. I know you can't wait.

Throughout our history, no issue has united this country more than our security. Sadly, some of the unity we felt after 9/11 has dissipated. We can argue all we want about who is to blame for this, but I'm not interested in relitigating the past. I know that all of us love this country. All of us are committed to its defense. So let's put aside the schoolyard taunts about who is tough. Let's reject the false choice between protecting our people and upholding our values. Let's leave behind the fear and division, and do what it takes to defend our Nation and forge a more hopeful future—for America and for the world.

That's the work we began last year. Since the day I took office, we've renewed our focus on the terrorists who threaten our Nation. We've made substantial investments in our homeland security and disrupted plots that threatened to take American lives. We are filling unacceptable gaps revealed by the failed Christmas attack, with better airline security and swifter action on our intelligence. We've prohibited torture and strengthened partnerships from the Pacific to South Asia to the Arabian Peninsula. And in the last year, hundreds of al Qaeda's fighters and affiliates, including many senior leaders, have been captured or killed—far more than in 2008.

And in Afghanistan, we are increasing our troops and training Afghanistan Security Forces so they can begin to take the lead in July of 2011, and our troops can begin to come home. We will reward good governance, work to reduce corruption, and support the rights of all Afghans—men and women alike. We are joined by allies and partners who have increased their own commitments and who will come together tomorrow in London to reaffirm our common purpose. There will be difficult days ahead. But I am absolutely confident we will succeed.

As we take the fight to al Qaeda, we are responsibly leaving Iraq to its people. As a candidate, I promised that I would end this war, and that is what I am doing as President. We will have all

of our combat troops out of Iraq by the end of this August. We will support the Iraqi Government as they hold elections, and we will continue to partner with the Iraqi people to promote regional peace and prosperity. But make no mistake: this war is ending, and all of our troops are coming home.

Tonight, all of our men and women in uniform—in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and around the world—have to know that they have our respect, our gratitude, our full support. And just as they must have the resources they need in war, we all have a responsibility to support them when they come home. That's why we made the largest increase in investments for veterans in decades last year. That's why we're building a 21st century VA. And that's why Michelle has joined with Jill Biden to forge a national commitment to support military families.

Even as we prosecute two wars, we are also confronting, perhaps, the greatest danger to the American people—the threat of nuclear weapons. I've embraced the vision of John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan through a strategy that reverses the spread of these weapons and seeks a world without them. To reduce our stockpiles and launchers, while ensuring our deterrent, the United States and Russia are completing negotiations on the farthest reaching arms control treaty in nearly 2 decades. And at April's Nuclear Security Summit, we will bring 44 nations together, here in Washington, D.C., behind a clear goal—securing all vulnerable nuclear materials around the world in 4 years so that they never fall into the hands of terrorists.

Now, these diplomatic efforts have also strengthened our hand in dealing with those nations that insist on violating international agreements in pursuit of these weapons. That is why North Korea now faces increased isolation and stronger sanctions—sanctions that are being vigorously enforced. That's why the international community is more united and the Islamic Republic of Iran is more isolated. And as Iran's leaders continue to ignore their obligations, there should be no doubt: they, too, will face growing consequences. That is a promise.

That is the leadership we are providing—engagement that advances the common security and prosperity of all people. We are working through the G-20 to sustain a lasting global recovery. We are working with Muslim communities around the world to promote science and education and innovation. We have gone from a bystander to a leader in the fight against climate change. We are helping developing countries to feed themselves, and continuing the fight against HIV/AIDS. And we are launching a new initiative that will give us the capacity to respond faster and more effectively to bioterrorism or an infectious disease—a plan that will counter threats at home and strengthen public health abroad.

As we have for over 60 years, America takes these actions because our destiny is connected to those beyond our shores. But we also do it because it is right. That's why, as we meet here tonight, over 10,000 Americans are working with many nations to help the people of Haiti recover and rebuild. That's why we stand with the girl who yearns to go to school in Afghanistan, why we support the human rights of the women marching through the streets of Iran, why we advocate for the young man denied a job by corruption in Guinea. For America must always stand on the side of freedom and human dignity. Always.

Abroad, America's greatest source of strength has always been our ideals. The same is true at home. We find unity in our incredible diversity, drawing on the promise enshrined in our Constitution: the notion that we are all created equal, that no matter who you are or what you look like, if you abide by the law, you should be protected by it; if you adhere to our common values, you should be treated no different than anyone else.

We must continually renew this promise. My administration has a Civil Rights division that is, once again, prosecuting civil rights' violations and employment discrimination. We finally strengthened our laws to protect against crimes driven by hate. This year, I will work with Congress and our military to finally repeal the law that denies gay Americans the right to serve the country they love because of who they are. It's the right thing to do. We're going to crack down on violations of equal pay laws—so that women get equal pay for an equal day's work. And we should continue the work of fixing our broken immigration system—to secure our borders and enforce our laws and ensure that everyone who plays by the rules can contribute to our economy and enrich our nation.

In the end, it is our ideals, our values, that built America—values that allowed us to forge a nation made up of immigrants from every corner of the globe; values that drive our citizens still. Every day, Americans meet their responsibilities to their families and their employers. Time and again, they lend a hand to their neighbors and give back to their country. They take pride in their labor and are generous in spirit. These aren't Republican values or Democratic values that they're living by; business values or labor values. They are American values.

Unfortunately, too many of our citizens have lost faith that our biggest institutions—our corporations, our media and, yes, our government—still reflect these same values. Each of these institutions are full of honorable men and women doing important work that helps our country prosper. But each time a CEO rewards himself for failure or a banker puts the rest of us at risk for his own selfish gain, people's doubts grow. Each time lobbyists game the system or politicians tear each other down instead of lifting this coun-

try up, we lose faith. The more that TV pundits reduce serious debates to silly arguments, big issues into sound bites, our citizens turn away.

No wonder there's so much cynicism out there.

No wonder there's so much disappointment.

I campaigned on the promise of change—change we can believe in, the slogan went. And right now, I know there are many Americans who aren't sure if they still believe we can change—or that I can deliver.

But remember this—I never suggested that change would be easy or that I could do it alone. Democracy in a nation of 300 million people can be noisy and messy and complicated. And when you try to do big things and make big changes, it stirs passions and controversy. That's just how it is.

Those of us in public office can respond to this reality by playing it safe and avoid telling hard truths and pointing fingers. We can do what's necessary to keep our poll numbers high and get through the next election instead of doing what's best for the next generation.

But I also know this: If people had made that decision 50 years ago or 100 years ago or 200 years ago, we wouldn't be here tonight. The only reason we are here is because generations of Americans were unafraid to do what was hard, to do what was needed even when success was uncertain, to do what it took to keep the dream of this nation alive for their children and their grandchildren.

Our administration has had some political setbacks this year, and some of them were deserved. But I wake up every day knowing that they are nothing compared to the setbacks that families all across this country have faced this year. And what keeps me going—what keeps me fighting—is that, despite all these setbacks, that spirit of determination and optimism—that fundamental decency that has always been at the core of the American people—lives on.

It lives on in the struggling small business owner who wrote to me of his company, "None of us," he said, "are willing to consider, even slightly, that we might fail."

It lives on in the woman who said that, even though she and her neighbors have felt the pain of recession, "We are strong. We are resilient. We are American."

It lives on in the 8-year-old boy in Louisiana, who just sent me his allowance, and asked if I would give it to the people of Haiti. And it lives on in all the Americans who've dropped everything to go someplace they've never been and pull people they've never known from the rubble, prompting chants of "USA! USA! USA!" when another life was saved.

The spirit that has sustained this Nation for more than two centuries lives on in you, its people.

We have finished a difficult year. We have come through a difficult decade.

But a new year has come. A new decade stretches before us. We don't quit. I don't quit. Let's seize this moment—to start anew, to carry the dream forward, and to strengthen our union once more.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 10 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Majority Floor Services Chief escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet; the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court; the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

#### JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

#### MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 29, 2010, at noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5817. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy,

transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons [Docket No.: EEWAP0515] (RIN: 1904-AB97) received January 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5818. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Certain Consumer Products (Dishwashers, Dehumidifiers, Microwave Ovens, and Electric and Gas Kitchen Ranges and Ovens) and for Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment (Commercial Clothes Washers) [Docket Number: EERE-2006-STD-0127] (RIN: 1904-AB93) received January 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5819. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, United States Agency for International Development, transmitting letter to provide formal response of the Agency to the GAO report numbered GAO-10-1; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5820. A letter from the Executive Director, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting the Fellowship's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5821. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5822. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1196; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-170-AD; Amendment 39-16146; AD 2008-09-12 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5823. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Availability of Records received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5824. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-38; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket FAR 2009-0002, Sequence 9] received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5825. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-38; Item VII; Docket 2009-0003; Sequence 6] received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5826. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2006-024, Travel Costs [FAC 2005-38; FAR Case 2006-024; Item VI; Docket 2009-0044, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AK86) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5827. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2006-021, Postretirement Benefits (PRB), FAS 106 [FAC 2005-38; FAR Case 2006-021; Item V; Docket 2009-0043, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AK84) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5828. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2008-017, Federal Food Donation Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110-247) [FAC 2005-38; FAR Case 2008-017; Item IV; Docket 2009-0007, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL49) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5829. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2005-041, Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) [FAC 2005-38; FAR Case 2005-041; Item III; Docket 2009-0042, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AK57) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5830. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2006-026, Governmentwide Commercial Purchase Card Restrictions for Treasury Offset Program Debts [FAC 2005-38; FAR Case 2006-026; Item II; Docket 2009-0041, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AK87) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5831. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2009-017, Revocation of Executive Order 13201, Notification of Employee Rights Concerning Payment of Union Dues or Fees [FAC 2005-38; FAR Case 2009-017; Item I; Docket 2009-0040, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AL47) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5832. A letter from the Acting Director, Trade and Development Agency, transmitting the Agency's fiscal year 2009 annual report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5833. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's 2009 Report to Congress for the North Slope Science Initiative; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5834. A letter from the Writer/Editor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Safe-Harbor Procedures for Employers Who received a No-Match Letter: Rescission [ICE 2377-06; DHS Docket No. ICEB-2006-0004] (RIN: 1653-AA59) received January 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5835. A letter from the Acting Director, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Report to the Nation 2009" from the Office for Victims of Crime for fiscal years 2007-2008, pursuant to Section 1407(g) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5836. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes Equipped with a Digital Transient Suppression Device (DTSD) Installed in Accordance with Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) ST00127BO [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0521; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-187-AD; Amendment 39-16034; AD 2009-20-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5837. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Arriel 1A1, 1A2, 1B, 1C, 1C1, 1C2, 1D, 1D1, 1E2, 1K1, 1S, and 1S1 Turbohaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0544; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-16142; AD 2009-26-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5838. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AeroSpace Technologies of Australia Pty Ltd Models N22B, N22S, and N24A Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0987; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-054-AD; Amendment 39-16143; AD 2009-26-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5839. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 767-200, -300, -300F, and -400ER Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1195; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-152-AD; Amendment 39-16145; AD 2008-11-01 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5840. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing 737-300, -400, -500, -600, -700, -700C, -800, and -900, and 747-400 Series Airplanes; and Model 757, 767, and 777 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0911; Directorate Identifier 2002-NM-12-AD; Amendment 39-16138; AD 2009-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5841. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, -700C, -800, and -900 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2007-29087; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-094-AD; Amendment 39-16139; AD 2009-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5842. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Model PC-7 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0938; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-052-AD; Amendment 39-16140; AD 2009-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5843. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Riverside/Rubidous Flabob Airport, Riverside, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0690; Airspace Docket No. 09-AWP-6] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5844. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D and E Airspace and Modification of Class E Airspace; State College, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0750; Airspace Docket No. 09-AEA-16] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5845. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Sarasota, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0652; Airspace Docket 09-ASO-21] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5846. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D and E Airspace; Albemarle, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0203; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-12] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5847. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Spencer, WV [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0602; Airspace Docket No. 09-AEA-13] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5848. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Gadsden, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0955; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-28] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5849. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Burnet, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0859; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-23] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5850. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Myrtle Beach [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0650; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-20] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5851. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 707 Airplanes, and Model 720 and 720B Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1209; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-151-AD; Amendment 39-16147; AD 2008-04-11 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5852. A letter from the Deputy Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Privacy Office's report entitled, "2009 Data Mining Report to Congress", pursuant to Public Law 110-53 (121 Stat. 266); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REYES: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. House Resolution 978. Resolution requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives all docu-

ments in the possession of the President relating to the inventory and review of intelligence related to the shooting at Fort Hood, Texas, described by the President in a memorandum dated November 10, 2009, adversely; (Rept. 111-402). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON: Committee on Homeland Security. House Resolution 980. Resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of the Transportation Security Administration's Aviation Security Screening Management Standard Operating Procedures manual in effect on December 5, 2009, and any subsequent revisions of such manual in effect prior to the adoption of this resolution, adversely; (Rept. 111-403). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 994. Resolution directing the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the Attorney General's possession relating to the decision to dismiss United States v. New Black Panther Party, adversely; (Rept. 111-404). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 4061. A bill to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOWNS: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1387. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require a preservation of certain electronic records by Federal agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4526. A bill to establish a program that enables college-bound residents of the Northern Mariana Islands to have greater choices among institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DRIEHAUS:

H.R. 4527. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require certain campaign-related communications paid for by a corporation or labor organization to include a statement identifying the chief executive officer of the corporation or the president of the labor organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H.R. 4528. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require individuals to provide their Social Security number in order to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H.R. 4529. A bill to provide for the reform of health care, the Social Security system,

the tax code for individuals and business, job training, and the budget process; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, Rules, the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. KILROY):

H.R. 4530. A bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADLER of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. LEE of New York):

H.R. 4531. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny Federal retirement benefits to an individual convicted of a felony which occurred in connection with such individual's Government employment or service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TANNER (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LINDER):

H.R. 4532. A bill to provide for permanent extension of the attorney fee withholding procedures under title II of the Social Security Act to title XVI of such Act, and to provide for permanent extension of such procedures under titles II and XVI of such Act to qualified non-attorney representatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4533. A bill to provide for a study and report on access by blind consumers to certain electronic devices and to provide for the establishment of minimum nonvisual access standards for such devices and for the establishment of an office within the Department of Commerce to enforce such standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4534. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to require that restrooms in

public buildings be equipped with baby changing facilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 4535. A bill to reduce and prevent the sale and use of fraudulent degrees in order to protect the integrity of valid higher education degrees that are used for Federal employment purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOCCIERI:

H.R. 4536. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1332 Sharon Copley Road in Wadsworth, Ohio, as the "Emil Bolas Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. GRAYSON):

H.R. 4537. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the express authorization of a majority of shareholders of a public company for certain political expenditures by that company, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. WATT):

H.R. 4538. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require the inclusion of credit scores with free annual credit reports provided to consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 4539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the treatment of foreign investments in United States real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KAGEN, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 4540. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend the ban on election activity by foreign nationals to election activity by domestic corporations which are subsidiaries of foreign principals; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WALZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BUYER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MASSA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 4541. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exempt reimbursements of expenses related to accident, theft, loss, or casualty loss from determinations of annual income with respect to pensions for veterans and surviving spouses and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr.

ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DENT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CAO, and Mr. AUSTRIA):

H.R. 4542. A bill to prohibit the use of funds made available to the Department of Justice to prosecute individuals detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 4543. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4285 Payne Avenue in San Jose, California, as the "Anthony J. Cortese Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H.R. 4544. A bill to change references in Federal law to mental retardation to references to an intellectual disability, and change references to a mentally retarded individual to references to an individual with an intellectual disability; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4545. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to establish an Office of Rural Broadband Initiatives in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 4546. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain institutions of higher education to commit to, and provide notice of, tuition levels for students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SESTAK (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DENT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 4547. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 119 Station Road in Cheyney, Pennsylvania, as the "Captain Luther H. Smith, U.S. Army Air Forces Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 4548. A bill to enforce the restriction on in-State tuition for aliens unlawfully present in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4549. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to make grants to small business concerns to assist the commercialization of research developed with funds received under the second phase of the Small Business Innovation Research Program; to the Committee on Small

Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 4550. A bill to prohibit entities from using Federal funds to contribute to political campaigns or participate in lobbying activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SHEA-POR-TER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. JONES, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PAUL, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HARE, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee):

H.R. 4551. A bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PITTS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. JONES):

H.J. Res. 73. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to balance the Federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland):

H. Con. Res. 233. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MINNICK (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H. Res. 1041. A resolution congratulating and commending the University of Idaho's football team for winning the 2009 Humanitarian Bowl in Boise, Idaho; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINNICK (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H. Res. 1042. A resolution commending the Boise State University Broncos football team for winning the 2010 Fiesta Bowl; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H. Res. 1043. A resolution recognizing Brescia University for 60 years of leadership in higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. MACK):

H. Res. 1044. A resolution commemorating the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, a Nazi concentration and extermination camp, honoring the victims of the Holocaust, and expressing commitment to strengthen the fight against bigotry and intolerance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. Res. 1045. A resolution recognizing First Friday Main Line and its executive director Sherry Tillman and publicist Carla Zambelli for launching "Operation Angel Wings"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. WATT, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 1046. A resolution recognizing the significance of Black History Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KILROY (for herself, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SPACE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. TONKO):

H. Res. 1047. A resolution commending The Ohio State University Buckeyes football team for its victory in the 2010 Rose Bowl; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 1048. A resolution commending the efforts and honoring the work of the men and women of USNS Comfort and the United States Navy in the immediate response to those affected by the earthquake that struck Haiti on January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

Congress of the United States to work with General Motors Corporation to ensure that the General Motors brand dealership owners are treated justly and compensated fairly; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 211: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H.R. 268: Mr. MASSA.  
 H.R. 303: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. BACHUS.  
 H.R. 417: Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H.R. 500: Mr. SESTAK.  
 H.R. 558: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 613: Mr. BOUCHER.  
 H.R. 615: Mr. MASSA.  
 H.R. 669: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 690: Mr. PERRIELLO.  
 H.R. 840: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 930: Mr. LYNCH.  
 H.R. 1067: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1079: Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.R. 1161: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 1166: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.  
 H.R. 1205: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. HIMES.  
 H.R. 1324: Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. HALL of New York.  
 H.R. 1423: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. COLE, and Mr. EHLERS.  
 H.R. 1443: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
 H.R. 1444: Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 1500: Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H.R. 1640: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. PERRIELLO.  
 H.R. 1740: Mr. CAPUANO.  
 H.R. 1766: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
 H.R. 1844: Mr. MCINTYRE.  
 H.R. 1879: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota and Mr. KISSELL.  
 H.R. 1964: Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H.R. 1990: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 2193: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 2220: Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 2256: Mr. HALL of New York.  
 H.R. 2262: Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 2308: Mr. HALL of New York.  
 H.R. 2324: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TONKO.  
 H.R. 2365: Mr. LEE of New York and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
 H.R. 2406: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 2446: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.  
 H.R. 2478: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 2517: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
 H.R. 2546: Mr. CONAWAY.  
 H.R. 2556: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mrs. LUMMIS.  
 H.R. 2578: Ms. FUDGE.  
 H.R. 2594: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2692: Mr. SPACE.  
 H.R. 2764: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, and Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 2819: Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 2866: Mr. SCHOCK.  
 H.R. 2906: Mr. TONKO.  
 H.R. 2963: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. CARNAHAN.  
 H.R. 3024: Mr. DEFAZIO.  
 H.R. 3047: Ms. FUDGE.  
 H.R. 3070: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
 H.R. 3101: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mrs. MALONEY.  
 H.R. 3106: Mr. SESTAK.  
 H.R. 3110: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
 H.R. 3149: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 3185: Mr. ELLISON.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

231. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 399 memorializing the

- H.R. 3227: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 3256: Mr. TERRY.  
H.R. 3289: Mr. COBLE.  
H.R. 3294: Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
H.R. 3308: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
H.R. 3363: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.  
H.R. 3393: Mr. BOYD, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.  
H.R. 3401: Ms. TITUS, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. CLAY.  
H.R. 3421: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 3510: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 3519: Mr. MARSHALL.  
H.R. 3551: Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 3578: Ms. KOSMAS.  
H.R. 3656: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 3699: Mr. MASSA.  
H.R. 3712: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 3715: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 3724: Mr. REICHERT.  
H.R. 3758: Mr. WITTMAN and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
H.R. 3813: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 3936: Ms. KILROY, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. DRIEHAUS.  
H.R. 3974: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
H.R. 3986: Mr. PIERLUISI.  
H.R. 3990: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 4000: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 4004: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. SCHOCK.  
H.R. 4034: Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 4046: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.  
H.R. 4070: Mr. MCINTYRE and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.  
H.R. 4114: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.  
H.R. 4128: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PERRIELLO, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. DELAURO.  
H.R. 4150: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 4160: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
H.R. 4190: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. ISRAEL.  
H.R. 4198: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
H.R. 4220: Mr. TIAHRT.  
H.R. 4247: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. SIREs.  
H.R. 4255: Ms. NORTON, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MAFFEL, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mrs. EMERSON.  
H.R. 4268: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 4278: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.  
H.R. 4296: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
H.R. 4301: Mr. FILNER and Mr. PETRI.  
H.R. 4302: Mr. BARROW, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. HODES.  
H.R. 4308: Mr. PAUL and Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 4325: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 4341: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
H.R. 4371: Mr. COBLE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. KIRK, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.  
H.R. 4375: Ms. WATSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 4377: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 4386: Mr. TONKO and Mr. MCNERNEY.  
H.R. 4396: Mr. BOYD, Mr. KAGEN, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.  
H.R. 4402: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. BERMAN.  
H.R. 4403: Mr. BARROW, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. MASSA.  
H.R. 4415: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. DENT.  
H.R. 4426: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, and Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 4436: Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mrs. MYRICK.  
H.R. 4463: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.  
H.R. 4464: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 4465: Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 4466: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. MASSA.  
H.R. 4490: Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. MARCHANT.  
H.R. 4503: Mr. PENCE and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.  
H.R. 4517: Mr. KAGEN and Mr. SCHAUER.  
H.R. 4522: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. SERRANO.  
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. COOPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.  
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. DEFazio.  
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. OWENS.  
H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. CLEAVER.  
H. Res. 526: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. BALDWIN.  
H. Res. 542: Mr. TIAHRT.  
H. Res. 699: Mr. MASSA and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H. Res. 763: Mr. ROHRBACHER.  
H. Res. 869: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. OLSON.  
H. Res. 902: Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MACK.  
H. Res. 959: Mr. SCALISE.  
H. Res. 974: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H. Res. 975: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
H. Res. 977: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.  
H. Res. 982: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. PENCE.  
H. Res. 1014: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. WEINER.  
H. Res. 1019: Mr. CAO.  
H. Res. 1022: Mr. ISRAEL.  
H. Res. 1026: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. BACHUS.  
H. Res. 1032: Mr. DREIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

102. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Center for Regulatory Effectiveness, District of Columbia, relative to requesting that the EPA be in compliance with the Congressional Review Act; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.