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

NAYS—174

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

NOT VOTING—25

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

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

□ 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
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
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)

NAYS—18

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

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.