

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce represents more than 3 million businesses that employ millions and millions of Americans. The overwhelming majority of these businesses are small business, the engine of our economy.

So it is more than a little surprising that the administration will be attacking this pro-job, pro-growth organization at a time when our economy is in the worst recession in 80 years. Shouldn't we be working together to create jobs and pull our country out of this economic mess? Shouldn't the Congress and the administration and the private sector all have a singular purpose of restoring America's economy and leading the worldwide economic resurgence?

Yet reports that I have read in recent weeks indicate a constant attacking of the Chamber and discrediting the Chamber of Commerce.

As a former chairman of the Florida Chamber of Commerce, we represented 139,000 small businesses in my home State of Florida. I urge the administration to drop its attack mentality and work together with the very groups responsible for creating jobs and growth in the United States of America.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, after World War II when our parents and, in some cases, our grandparents returned from victory, our country stayed to rebuild the countries of our former enemies and our friends. Each of these countries, with our help, established a national health care plan for their people. Our country did not since huge numbers of Americans at that time received health care through their employers. That is not true today.

My Texas district has the highest number of uninsured adults under 65 in the country. We need a national health care plan for all Americans. If you have Medicare or employer-based insurance, that's great.

Next week, let's do what we did after World War II for our enemies and our friends. Let's provide national health care for all Americans.

NEWSWEEK GIVES PRESIDENT FREE ADVERTISING

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, the poster to my left is the winner of the Media Fairness Caucus' "Worst of the Week" award for media bias.

The poster says, "Yes, He Can," a variation of the President's campaign slogan. While it appears to be a campaign poster, it actually is this week's

cover of Newsweek magazine. The poster provides an astounding example of the national media's liberal bias. Newsweek is the same magazine that during the Presidential campaign featured then-Senator Obama on its cover three times as often as Senator McCain.

No wonder 7 out of 10 Americans say the national media are intent on promoting the Obama administration, according to a recent public opinion poll. The national media should report the facts, not provide free advertising for the White House.

WHAT REFORM MEANS FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. SIREs. Madam Speaker, 23 percent. That is the percentage of those living without health insurance in my district, the highest rate in New Jersey. My constituents are looking to me and this Chamber to accomplish health care reform this year. We must finish our work, not only for those without insurance, but for the other 77 percent that have insurance but are finding coverage more expensive.

For those without insurance, we want to offer you affordable health care coverage. A new exchange will be created as a one-stop comparison shopping marketplace, including a public option to create competition for better prices and better coverage. To ensure coverage is within your means, affordability credits will be offered to help you buy insurance.

Our plan will end discrimination for preexisting conditions and require coverage for preventive care without copays. To ensure no one goes broke because they get sick, a yearly limit will be placed on how much you can be charged for out-of-pocket expenses. And if you lose or change jobs, you will be able to get your own affordable insurance.

This Nation deserves a more affordable, secure health care system. We cannot wait any longer for these reforms.

THE HONOR FLIGHT FROM OCALA, FLORIDA

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, as a veteran, I am especially proud of my involvement with Honor Flight, which brings veterans of World War II to Washington, D.C., to see the memorial and other cherished sites.

There are obviously many memorials and monuments in Washington, D.C. However, for too long, there was a glaring omission: no memorial to the men and women who defeated the Axis powers. I am pleased that this oversight was corrected with the World War II Memorial which was dedicated in May of 2004.

Today, Honor Flight is bringing over 100 World War II veterans from my hometown of Ocala, Florida, to Washington, D.C. I will meet them this afternoon at the World War II Memorial, and we will lay a wreath at the Florida column.

Our veterans have earned our respect, and they deserve to see that their sacrifice is still honored. I am proud to join in supporting the noble cause of Honor Flight.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2996, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 876 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 876

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2996) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. The conference report shall be considered as read. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

□ 1030

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from San Dimas, California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only, Madam Speaker.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 876.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, H. Res. 876 provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2996, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2010. The resolution waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The resolution provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. Finally, the resolution provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered without intervening motion, except for 1 hour of debate and one motion to recommit, if applicable.

This conference report makes available the necessary resources for the

Federal Government to protect our Nation's precious natural resources. It also provides to ensure clean and safe drinking water, to perform critical restoration work, and help Native American communities meet their needs.

It will help communities and public lands by focusing on five priority areas: water infrastructure and environmental protection; fire fighting and fuels reduction on Federal land; bolstering our public land management agencies; protecting public lands through the Land and Water Conservation Fund; and helping the most vulnerable Native American populations. Together, these priorities and their attendant policies provide for effective Federal stewardship of our environmental and cultural treasures while also improving the lives of all Americans who depend on these resources for their health and well-being.

Madam Speaker, it's worth noting some of the critical investments that the underlying legislation makes in essential programs and agencies.

The Environmental Protection Agency receives over \$10 billion to restore and protect the quality of our Nation's air, water and land, including over \$3.5 billion to help nearly 1,500 communities improve their drinking water and wastewater systems. Improving our Nation's water quality will have a direct and positive impact on overall public health, making this funding crucial to the bettering of the lives of all Americans. The EPA is also provided with increased funding to protect important bodies of water, such as the Great Lakes, San Francisco Bay, and the Chesapeake Bay, as well as significant funding to clean up dangerous toxic waste sites around the country.

Important climate change programs are also funded in this legislation, including money to implement the Energy Independence and Security Act, which will help the United States produce 36 billion gallons of renewable fuel by 2022, reducing our dependence on fossil fuels. Thousands of communities and millions of individual consumers will be able to receive assistance from the EPA to lower their emissions and adopt green technologies.

Native American and Native Alaskan programs receive hundreds of millions in increased funding from previous years, with an emphasis on supporting both federally and tribally operated health care programs, as well as bolstering law enforcement, education, and economic development programs throughout the country.

Recognizing the need for a dedicated, steady and predictable funding stream for wildfire suppression and fire-fighting activities, this legislation includes the Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement Act of 2009. In light of recent increases in the length, severity and exponential cost of wildfire seasons, the FLAME Act includes a number of budgetary reforms to ensure that government agencies and local communities will have the

necessary resources to handle large and complex fire events.

It is also worth noting that this legislation funds the Smithsonian to the appropriate level of support for the world's largest museum and research complex right here in our Nation's Capital. Here in Washington, we see the fruits of these efforts every day up and down the National Mall, as do our constituents when they visit us, and I am particularly pleased with the inclusion of \$20 million for planning and design of the new National Museum of African American History and Culture, which will be built on the Mall.

Madam Speaker, this legislation also includes the continuing resolution to fund government operations through December 18. Although we completed our appropriations work during the summer, this resolution is needed to allow our good friends in the other body, the Senate, more time to complete their work.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to address this report's provisions regarding Guantanamo Bay. I spoke on this matter when I managed the rule for the conference report on Homeland Security Appropriations 2 weeks ago. This body seems fit to include language on Guantanamo Bay in every appropriations measure that comes before us. I appreciate that many of our colleagues have objections to the various aspects involved in closing the detention facilities at Guantanamo, which President Obama has promised to do by January of 2010. But as I have maintained before, the problem is the policy, not the place.

The debate over Guantanamo, in my opinion, is missing the larger picture, and that is the need to reform our entire detention policy. Without a system of justice to deal with suspected terrorists wherever they are held, we are left with a broken system that has tarnished our image abroad and is used as a recruitment tool by al Qaeda and other groups which threaten our security. We need to deny them that image of America.

We need a judicial process that accomplishes three things: one, protects our national security by holding and prosecuting those who have committed crimes or who pose a threat to our country; two, upholds international standards of human rights by ensuring decent treatment and access to basic rights and resources; and three, strengthens our Nation's image as a country that upholds the rule of law. We must not resort to arbitrary justice, even while under threat. There is no reason why these three things cannot be accomplished, nor is there a reason to believe that American courts cannot deal judiciously with individuals suspected of criminal wrongdoing or acts of terrorism.

The appropriations season has so far brought forth a number of bills, almost all with language relating to Guantanamo. At some point, we're going to need to move beyond legislating this

matter into appropriations bills and, instead, establish new policies and guidelines to bring our national security needs in line with our historic national values. This matter cannot be left only to the executive branch or the judiciary. Congress makes laws.

We have to put aside political posturing and "gotcha" on Guantanamo Bay and "not in my backyard" and, instead, work together to reform a broken system. To that end, I am pleased to have introduced H.R. 3728, the Detainment Reform Act, which I believe will move us forward on this matter. I urge my colleagues in this body to support this effort. And I might add, I have no pride of authorship. What I am talking about is trying to get past where we are in this "not in my backyard" and deal with the needed policy that will deal with people who will do harm to this country, whether they're in Guantanamo or Bagram or Leavenworth or wherever they may be held.

Ultimately, Madam Speaker, the conference report before us today provides the necessary funding to carry on our Nation's critical environmental protection efforts to ensure that all Americans will have access to clean water and safe communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I want to begin my extending my appreciation to my friend from Fort Lauderdale and thank him for his very thoughtful and powerful statement that he has just delivered to us.

Madam Speaker, for the second time this fall, we're considering a continuing resolution to keep the Federal Government operating as the Democratic majority fails to complete action on Federal spending for the new fiscal year. Continuing resolutions are not new. Congress has frequently, under both political parties, taken the action of having a continuing resolution to avert a government shutdown while the difficult appropriations process is finalized.

What makes this particular series of continuing resolutions so significant—and I say again, we're on the second one so far—is that it exposes this year's unprecedented—and I underscore unprecedented—closed appropriations process for what it really is. It's an utterly hollow excuse, a hollow excuse because never before in the history of the Republic have we had the appropriations process shut down, as has been the case through this past summer.

Time and again, the Democratic leadership told us during the summer that they had no choice but to shut down the debate on the spending appropriations process because they had a

schedule to keep. In fact, they very solemnly spoke of the inviolable September 30, end of the fiscal year, and that we had to have the appropriations work completed by that September 30 date. There simply was no time for us to debate appropriations bills, no time for accountability or for the kind of scrutiny that has gone on under both political parties throughout the appropriations process. They were on a timetable and they just had to stick to it, regardless of the precedents and traditions that would be abandoned. In fact, Madam Speaker, as we all know, they were abandoned.

So what did the expediency bring about? Well, they completed one-twelfth of their appropriations work by that hard, fast, inviolable September 30 deadline. It's worth pointing out that the single appropriations bill that they managed to get done on time was, what? Congress' own funding bill.

The bill that funds the Congress was the only appropriations bill that's been completed. Not national security, not the very, very important issues, not the important issues that are addressed in this bill, I will acknowledge.

In fact, I thank my good friends Messrs. DICKS and SIMPSON. We had a lengthy discussion upstairs in the Rules Committee yesterday on the importance of the FLAME Act. Especially as a Representative from the Los Angeles area, we have gone through the worst fire in the history of Los Angeles County, the Station Fire, the loss of two firefighters, Ted Hall and Arnie Quinones, whom we continue to honor in southern California, and we've had other fires since the Station Fire. So the FLAME Act is a very important part of this measure, and I appreciate that.

We could have done this bill before we did Congress' own spending bill. So having taken care of their own funding needs, Madam Speaker, the Democratic majority turned to the rest of the country's priorities, and they gave themselves another month to finish the work.

□ 1045

Now the new deadline is rapidly approaching. Over the last month, we have inched forward, and we've completed three more appropriations bills. With the first extension about to expire, this Congress has now completed one-third of its appropriations duty—our constitutional responsibility. Remember, again, we had that inviolable September 30, end of the fiscal year, deadline we had to meet, and here we sit, approaching the 1st of November, and we've completed one-third of our appropriations work.

The underlying conference report that Mr. DICKS and Mr. SIMPSON are bringing forward here actually grants another extension. It's an extension to take us all the way to December 18. Now, despite the Democratic majority's penchant for making excuses, there are really no plausible excuses left.

Madam Speaker, I know that often the finger is pointed down this hallway to the other side of the Capitol, to our colleagues there. There are 60 votes that the Democratic majority has over there. We have the White House, as we all know, in the control of Democrats and a huge majority here in the House of Representatives. The majority is so ironclad that even their supporters are complaining about their lack of progress and empty excuses. We are hearing that from supporters of the Democratic majority.

In fact, the former staff member who was a Democratic strategist, David Sirota, told Congress Daily last week: Democrats decried their lack of 60 votes in the Senate as a campaign tactic between 2006 and 2008 as the reason why they couldn't get anything done.

Again, the fact that they didn't have 60 votes in the Senate was the reason that nothing could get accomplished and that things couldn't get done.

Well, Mr. Sirota, the Democratic strategist, goes on to say they got the 60 votes. He says: Mathematically, there are no excuses left. There are no excuses left.

Those are the words of the Democratic strategist, Mr. Sirota. Yet, Madam Speaker, here we are passing another continuing resolution because the Democratic supermajority still can't get the work done.

Again, these extensions are far from unprecedented. I know the continuing resolutions have taken place again under both political parties. What is unprecedented is the fact that an open debate of the Federal budget was completely abandoned for a deadline that has proven to be utterly meaningless.

We all have to acknowledge, Democrats and Republicans alike, that that September 30 deadline was utterly meaningless, and we were told constantly, having that calendar held up before us in the Rules Committee and here on the House floor, that it was absolutely essential that we meet that September 30 deadline. It was nothing more than a pretense for shutting out amendments for both Democrats and Republicans.

That's why, Madam Speaker, I argue that this is not a partisan statement because there were just as many, if not more, Democrats who were denied an opportunity to amend appropriations bills as Republicans. Rank-and-file Members of both parties were completely shut out and were refused the opportunity to freely offer their amendments to have a debate and to have an up-or-down vote.

That kind of open process had been the custom, as I say, for 220 years. An open amendment process is something that we all, again, under both political parties, were used to. Unfortunately, those days are now behind us. For what reason? So that we can end up right where we always are—passing a string of continuing resolutions.

The need for scrutiny of the majority's spending practices became clearer

than ever with the announcement of the \$1.4 trillion deficit. Even the continuing resolution that we're considering today includes a number of last-minute additions that further diminish the accountability of Federal spending.

For example, there is a provision that extends funding for organizations like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which are the very organizations that very heavily contributed to our current economic crisis, and those are extended until the end of next year. This is a very curious provision. The continuing resolution, itself, only goes, as I said, Madam Speaker, to December 18; yet this controversial funding provision is extended until after next year's election. It's very, very curious.

Another provision in the underlying measure provides a bailout for local housing authorities that intentionally issued vouchers that they could not afford. These agencies clearly believed that they could act with impunity because the Democratic majority would just bail them out. Clearly, Madam Speaker, they were right.

It is these kinds of practices that have driven up our deficit to unmanageable proportions and have destroyed public trust in this institution, and they are precisely why we need an open appropriations process. The American people want us to meet our priorities, but they also want us to rein in spending. Unfortunately, closing down that appropriations process denied Members the opportunity to scrutinize and then to, we hope, put together the votes to rein in spending.

The American people, Madam Speaker, have been deprived of their voice in this process, and they were promised timely action. Unfortunately, it just has not happened. With today's consideration of yet another continuing resolution, it's painfully clear that the American people have gotten neither the quick action that they were promised nor the accountability that they deserve.

So, again, I will say that there are items within the Interior Appropriations conference report that I support. I am concerned about the 17 percent spending increase that is there; but in light of the issue that I've raised and the fact that we've had an appropriations process that has been shut down for the first time in the history of our Republic, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and to vote "no" on the previous question as well.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, before yielding to my good friend, the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, Mr. DICKS, I want to make a couple of points segueing off of my colleague's comments, those of my good friend Mr. DREIER regarding the continuing resolution.

He and I have been in this back-and-forth process for a very long time. One thing I know that my good friend

knows is that the continuing resolution is necessary to keep the government operating until we're able to complete the appropriations process. It must be passed this week and including it in the Interior conference report is just the most expedient way to get it to the President's desk. It will merely ensure that government programs remain funded through December 18 while we move quickly to fulfill our congressional responsibilities to provide funding for the rest of the fiscal year.

In the meantime, the continuing resolution in this conference report is basically a clean CR with the addition of several vital programs to ensure that people do not lose their housing, so that people have mortgage origination, so that the market remains stable, and so that small businesses are able to get loans in this period of economic turmoil.

One of the most important responsibilities of Congress is to keep the government running efficiently and effectively. Even under the best of circumstances—and I've seen it now for coming up on 19 years—and with cooperation on both sides of the aisle, the annual appropriations process is a cumbersome and time-consuming process that must be completed with a relatively short lifetime.

Now, while I agree with my colleague from San Dimas—he's not on the floor. He is, but he's busy—his staff will tell him that we have, as he put it, a supermajority in the Democratic Party. We have the White House; we have the House of Representatives; and we have 60 votes, ostensibly, in the United States Senate. That is a good thing but I was here when the Republicans had the exact same thing and had control of both Houses. What they did not have was the 60 votes.

Now, what I want to make clear here for the American people so that we can get past this discussion, talking about 60 votes is not what is needed. You really don't need but 50 because the Vice President probably would vote with his party. Some would advocate that we do this measure this way because 67 percent, it seems, of the American public want us to move on the health care provision.

All things considered, what my colleague knows and what all of us in the House of Representatives know at every level is that the Senate is the other body, and each one of those Senators is an entity unto him- or herself. I refer to them as junior Presidents. They have enormous power. They have enormous independence, and it does not matter what party they're in when they are about the business of legislating what they want done. That's why the process has slowed down, not because of a majority. It has been slowed down forever, since I've been here—all of that time—for the reason that there is the other body that has their rules, their regulations, arcane though they may be, which make it difficult for us to do our business.

The House can pass stuff. The Senate has difficulty getting agreements to get to the numbers that are necessary to get past filibusters and the numbers to get the different things that each Senator wants for herself or himself in the measure.

Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, to one who has no peer in this body on the understanding of the Interior, the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, Mr. DICKS from the State of Washington.

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

Mr. DICKS. First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida for his extraordinary summary of this legislation. I have been on this subcommittee for 33 years. It's the only subcommittee that I've been on and for which I've served throughout my entire career in the House, and I want him to know that we have not forgotten the great State of Florida in this legislation.

Madam Speaker, we have funded major restoration projects. One is the Great Lakes, where the President requested \$475 million. There's \$475 million in this bill for Great Lakes restoration. One of the other major projects is the Everglades. We're working hard to restore the Everglades—I think this is a national treasure—the Sea of Grass—and all of those wildlife species in Florida which need to be protected. There is the Chesapeake Bay restoration. The administration has put a new EPA official in charge there. They're taking more dramatic steps in the Great Lakes. Also, for the first time, we're recognizing that there are some great national treasures on the west coast—Puget Sound and Hood Canal where I come from. The Pacific Ocean has difficulties and problems related to ocean acidification and climate change, and it has other difficulties due to dissolved oxygen. We have a major restoration project going for Puget Sound. The San Francisco Bay is also another national asset that we need to protect.

So all of these major environmental concerns, these five major restoration initiatives, are critical in our bill.

I also want to tell my colleagues that I've served on this committee for 33 years. I served on this committee with Congressman YATES from Illinois. I believe this is the best Interior Appropriations bill we've ever passed.

Now, I know my good friend from California mentioned the fact that there was a 17 percent increase this year in this bill. Let me explain why that was necessary.

First of all, between 2001 and 2008, the Interior Appropriations bill—this was, by the way, during the previous administration—was cut by 16 percent. So, when you add 17 percent, it's a 1 percent increase. That's not very much. When you divide that over 9 years, it's just a fraction.

The other thing I'd point out is that the EPA budget over that same time frame of 2001–2008 was cut by 29 percent. This is the most important environmental agency we have, and their budget had been drastically cut. There was a cut of the Forest Service, if you take fire out, of 35 percent.

□ 1100

This appropriations bill had been hammered, and funding for our Native Americans had been particularly hard hit. So I felt this was a restoration budget by the Obama administration. This is their first budget on Interior, and I think it was justified in every sense of the word.

Let me go through some of the major items which are so important to the American people.

First of all, the Environmental Protection Agency: \$10.3 billion, \$2.7 billion above 2009, to restore and protect the quality of our Nation's air, water and land.

I want to mention the clean water and wastewater treatment plants, the so-called revolving funds. We had \$3.6 billion to help nearly 1,500 communities improve their drinking water and wastewater systems, an increase of \$2 billion above 2009.

EPA estimates, listen to this, a \$662 billion construction backlog by 2019 for clean and safe drinking water infrastructure. Between our clean water and safe water infrastructure, if you took that and all of our highway projects, you would have well over \$1 trillion in backlog. So infrastructure in America needs to be fixed. This \$662 billion figure came from Christine Todd Whitman, the first EPA Administrator during the Bush administration. So this is a number that I don't think anyone can challenge.

Now, on this important infrastructure money, \$2.1 billion is for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to fund local sewer improvements and help communities meet the goals of the Clean Water Act.

\$1.38 billion for the Local Water State Revolving Fund to protect public health by improving drinking water systems. It has been proven that one of the most important steps in protecting the health of the American people and people around the world is having safe drinking water. This is a 99.9 percent issue with the American people. They care about safe drinking water, and this revolving fund gives money back to the States and the States then loan it out.

\$157 million for direct grants to States for clean drinking water. That is way too low. I am talking with Mr. OBERSTAR about this. We need to have more grant money to help rural communities, local communities, who can't afford to borrow the money. Now, we put a provision in this bill this year that 30 percent of it can be forgiven. That has never been in there until the stimulus package came through. This is critical to rural areas throughout

the country so that it can be more of a grant program.

I talked to my good friend, Bill Ruckelshaus, a good Republican from Indiana, twice former Administrator of EPA. He also stood up during the Saturday night massacre and refused to fire Archibald Cox, to his great credit. He is now living in Washington State. He reminds me that during the Nixon administration, we had \$4 billion to \$5 billion in grant money to go out to the local communities on an 80-20 basis. Now, think about that. That was in the 1970s, \$4 billion to \$5 billion. That has been taken away, and now we have just a tiny amount of grants and everything else is loans. If we are going to really do something about this infrastructure issue, we have got to deal with that.

I mentioned the great bodies of water. That is something I am very proud of, especially the effort on Puget Sound.

Hazardous waste and toxic site clean-up, \$1.5 billion, \$25 million above 2009, to clean up dangerous toxic waste sites around the Nation.

Climate change, one of the most important issues of our time, \$385 million, \$155 million above 2009, for programs that address global climate change.

We have all heard about the Energy Star program, and now we have a program that we helped create for local communities to have their own climate change program; \$17 million to continue development of a greenhouse gas registry, the first step in controlling greenhouse gases; \$55 million for the Interior Department's on-the-ground monitoring and adaptation to climate change impact in national parks, national wildlife refuges, and other public lands.

There is no question in my mind that climate change is occurring. We have had hearings and we brought in the Federal agencies, including people from Florida, who are very concerned about the impact of global warming. Global warming could be devastating to the Everglades and to the State of Florida. If the seas rise, because they have so many low level areas there, they would be adversely affected. So this is a serious issue that has to be confronted.

We also created a National Global Warming and Wildlife Science Center at the U.S. Geological Survey, and we are working together with the administration on that issue.

Most importantly, our trust responsibility for Native Americans and Alaska Native programs, \$6.7 billion, \$705.7 million above 2009 and \$91 million above the request, for programs to support and improve health care, education, public safety, and human services for Native Americans and Alaskan Natives throughout our Nation.

On the Indian Health Service, a program that has been underfunded for many, many years, \$4.1 billion, \$17.8 million above the request and \$471.3 million above 2009, to support both Federal and tribally operated national health care programs and facilities.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$2.6 billion—\$2.3 million above 2009 and \$82 million above the request—for education, law enforcement, and economic development programs that will strengthen native communities.

I brought back the hearing where we allow the Native Americans to come in and testify, which was ended under the previous regime. We put that back in place so we can hear of the concerns out there.

There are very serious problems in Indian country, none more serious than the law enforcement difficulties there, including the fact that Native American women are more often the victims of rape and other violent crimes and there is only a 1-year penalty under our Federal court system. This is intolerable. We have to change this, and this is something we are working on.

I know this is something my friend from California is concerned about, \$3.5 billion for efforts to prevent and fight wildfires at the Forest Service and the Department of Interior. We know the people of California have suffered some terrible fires out there, and I know that Mr. DREIER and Mr. LEWIS have been very concerned about that. There is \$1.855 billion for wildfire suppression, \$526 million above 2009.

We got the FLAME Act created. We actually did the work in our conference committee with the Senate. We think this is a great FLAME Act that will give us extra money when we overrun our accounts. This is so important, because in the past money would be taken from the Forest Service accounts, from the Interior accounts, and they would never get that money paid back, in most instances. So this FLAME Act will give us a second account to help when we have these major fires.

I want to point out, as my ranking member pointed out yesterday in the Rules Committee, 98 percent of the fires are stopped: 98 percent. But the 2 percent, the mega-fires that get underway, do this enormous damage to our national parks, to our Forest Service lands, to our BLM lands, and we need very serious funding to help that.

The parks are better off, wildlife refuges are better off, the endowments for the arts and humanities are better off.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. Yes, I will yield to my friend for a second.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I don't want to take a lot of time on the general debate, but I presume that the chairman is going to allow some time to discuss the question that has been raised regarding an exemption that affects ships among the Great Lakes, the Michigan boat question.

Mr. DICKS. Yes, we will be glad to discuss that. But this is the rule, as you know.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I just wanted to make sure we would have time during the general debate to discuss that. It won't take a lot of time, I am sure, but I didn't want to be left out.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman alerting us to his concern.

This is a great rule, a great bill. It is bipartisan. We do everything in my subcommittee on a bipartisan basis. Mr. SIMPSON has been just a delight to work with, and the Republican members have been at every hearing. We couldn't have better members on our subcommittee on both sides of the aisle.

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

Let me just close by responding first not to the very thoughtful remarks given by the subcommittee chairman. He didn't quite focus totally on the rule. We talked about everything from Watergate to California fires, and I appreciate his fine work there.

But I will say that as we look at the remarks that were offered by my friend from Fort Lauderdale at the outset, in which he talked about the 60 vote number that exists in the Senate and where we are, there are a couple of differences. We never had the 60 votes in the Senate, number one; and number two, we did not shut down the appropriations process, Madam Speaker. And that is what has happened throughout the past summer.

The American people had their ire raised on a procedural issue for the first time ever on June 26 of this year when early that morning, at 3 o'clock, while the motion was being offered in the Rules Committee to bring a special rule to the floor to consider the so-called cap-and-trade bill, my friend Mr. MCGOVERN was offering the motion, and I had a 300-page amendment dropped on my place at that moment. People have said: read the bill, deliberate, think about the process. That message is resonating across the country. That did not happen with this appropriations process.

Unfortunately, on consideration of this measure, we are having a continuation of that because one of the waivers provided in this rule is for the 72-hour layover, the 3-day layover requirement, which the American people believe we should have.

I am going to ask that my colleagues vote "no" on the previous question so we will be able to make in order the very thoughtful bipartisan effort launched by Messrs. BAIRD, CULBERSON and WALDEN that will, in fact, require the 3-day layover for measures as they move to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment, along with the explanatory material, appear in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, by funding the EPA, the Department of the Interior, the Forest

Service and other related agencies, the conference report provides the resources necessary to protect the environment and our natural resources. The attached continuing resolution ensures that the government will continue to function through December 18th.

The increases in this bill over previous years are essential to maintain and improve current programs and activities, bettering the lives of all Americans and their communities.

As I discussed before, I hope that this body will move beyond the debate over whether or not to close Guantanamo and, instead, work to develop comprehensive detainment policies that uphold the Constitution, human rights and the rule of law.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today the House of Representatives is voting on a motion to instruct conferees to insist on language that would prevent any funding in this bill from being used to implement an EPA rule requiring the largest manure management systems to report annual greenhouse emissions.

The EPA rule was finalized in September 2009. It would require entities emitting only more than 25,000 metric tons of greenhouse gases per year—the equivalent of emissions from 58,000 barrels of oil—to report on annual emissions. According to the EPA, the rule will impact approximately 100 manure management systems across the country, five of which operate in the state of Oregon. Small farmers—those emitting less than 25,000 metric tons of greenhouse gases per year—would be completely exempt from the rule.

I applaud the EPA's rule and President Obama's leadership in taking serious action on climate change. After losing eight years under the Bush administration in addressing the most serious environmental challenge of our time, it's time for bold U.S. leadership. Compiling accurate and complete data on greenhouse gas emissions is a critical piece to crafting a smart and effective climate policy.

For these reasons, I intend to oppose the motion to instruct conferees before the House today. Congress should not place funding restraints on the EPA that would prevent the agency from executing its Supreme Court-confirmed authorities to regulate greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 876

OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the resolution, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. On the third legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV and without intervention of any point of order, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 554) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that legislation and conference reports be available on the Internet for 72 hours before consideration by the House, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate

equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; (2) an amendment, if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee and if printed in that portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII at least one legislative day prior to its consideration, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit which shall not contain instructions. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 554.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous ques-

tion on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 876, if ordered, and suspension of the rules with regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 45.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 823]

YEAS—236

Ackerman	Davis (TN)	Jackson (IL)
Adler (NJ)	DeFazio	Jackson-Lee
Altmire	DeGette	(TX)
Andrews	Delahunt	Johnson (GA)
Arcuri	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Baca	Dicks	Kagen
Baldwin	Dingell	Kanjorski
Barrow	Doggett	Kaptur
Bean	Donnelly (IN)	Kennedy
Becerra	Doyle	Kildee
Berkley	Driehaus	Kilpatrick (MI)
Berman	Edwards (MD)	Kilroy
Berry	Edwards (TX)	Kind
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Ellsworth	Kissell
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Klein (FL)
Bocciari	Etheridge	Kosmas
Boren	Farr	Kucinich
Boswell	Filner	Langevin
Boucher	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Boyd	Frank (MA)	Larson (CT)
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Lee (CA)
Braley (IA)	Giffords	Levin
Brown, Corrine	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Butterfield	Gordon (TN)	Lipinski
Capps	Grayson	Loeb
Capuano	Green, Al	Lofgren, Zoe
Cardoza	Green, Gene	Lowey
Carnahan	Grijalva	Lujan
Carney	Gutierrez	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Hall (NY)	Maffei
Castor (FL)	Halvorson	Maloney
Chandler	Hare	Markey (CO)
Chu	Harman	Markey (MA)
Clarke	Hastings (FL)	Marshall
Clay	Heinrich	Massa
Cleaver	Herseth Sandlin	Matheson
Clyburn	Higgins	Matsui
Cohen	Hill	McCarthy (NY)
Conyers	Himes	McCollum
Cooper	Hinchey	McDermott
Costello	Hinojosa	McGovern
Courtney	Hirono	McIntyre
Crowley	Hodes	McMahon
Cuellar	Holden	McNerney
Cummings	Holt	Meek (FL)
Dahlkemper	Honda	Meeks (NY)
Davis (AL)	Hoyer	Melancon
Davis (CA)	Inslee	Miller (NC)
Davis (IL)	Israel	Miller, George

Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
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
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier

Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—183

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox

Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Ginny
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick

Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
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
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Abercrombie
Barrett (SC)
Buyer

Connolly (VA)
Engel
Fattah

McCotter

Michaud
Murphy, Patrick

Nunes
Oberstar

Pomeroy
Van Hollen

□ 1142

Messrs. JONES, DUNCAN, CASSIDY, BURGESS, DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and COSTA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 824]

YEAS—232

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccheri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)

Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebssack
Lofgren, Zoe

Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
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)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder

Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen

NAYS—184

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly

Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)

Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
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
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Abercrombie
Barrett (SC)
Burgess
Buyer
Deal (GA)
Emerson

Fattah
Hirono
LaTourette
Murphy, Patrick
Nunes
Pastor (AZ)

Scott (VA)
Sullivan
Velázquez
Waxman

□ 1150

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 for:

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 824, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ENCOURAGING IRAN TO REUNITE JOSHUA FATTAL, SHANE BAUER, AND SARAH SHOURD WITH THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 45, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 45.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 825]

YEAS—423

Ackerman	Capuano	Engel
Aderholt	Cardoza	Eshoo
Adler (NJ)	Carnahan	Etheridge
Akin	Carney	Fallin
Alexander	Carson (IN)	Farr
Altmire	Carter	Finer
Andrews	Cassidy	Flake
Arcuri	Castle	Fleming
Austria	Castor (FL)	Forbes
Baca	Chaffetz	Fortenberry
Bachmann	Chandler	Foster
Bachus	Childers	Fox
Baird	Chu	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Clarke	Franks (AZ)
Barrow	Clay	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Cleaver	Fudge
Barton (TX)	Clyburn	Galleghy
Bean	Coble	Garrett (NJ)
Becerra	Coffman (CO)	Gerlach
Berkley	Cohen	Giffords
Berman	Cole	Gingrey (GA)
Berry	Conaway	Gohmert
Biggert	Connolly (VA)	Gonzalez
Bilbray	Conyers	Goodlatte
Bilirakis	Cooper	Gordon (TN)
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Granger
Bishop (NY)	Costello	Graves
Bishop (UT)	Courtney	Grayson
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Green, Al
Blumenauer	Crowley	Green, Gene
Blunt	Cuellar	Griffith
Boccheri	Culberson	Grijalva
Boehner	Cummings	Guthrie
Bonner	Dahlkemper	Gutierrez
Bono Mack	Davis (AL)	Hall (NY)
Boozman	Davis (CA)	Hall (TX)
Boren	Davis (IL)	Halvorson
Boswell	Davis (KY)	Hare
Boucher	Davis (TN)	Harman
Boustany	Deal (GA)	Harper
Boyd	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Brady (TX)	Delahunt	Heinrich
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Heller
Bright	Dent	Hensarling
Brown (GA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger
Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Herseth Sandlin
Brown, Corrine	Dicks	Higgins
Brown-Waite,	Dingell	Hill
Ginny	Doggett	Himes
Buchanan	Donnelly (IN)	Hinche
Burgess	Doyle	Hinojosa
Burton (IN)	Dreier	Hirono
Butterfield	Driehaus	Hodes
Calvert	Duncan	Hoekstra
Camp	Edwards (MD)	Holden
Campbell	Edwards (TX)	Holt
Cantor	Ehlers	Honda
Cao	Ellison	Hoyer
Capito	Ellsworth	Hunter
Capps	Emerson	Inglis

Inslee	McNerney	Sarbanes
Israel	Meek (FL)	Scalise
Issa	Meeks (NY)	Schakowsky
Jackson (IL)	Melancon	Schauer
Jackson-Lee	Mica	Schiff
(TX)	Michaud	Schmidt
Jenkins	Miller (FL)	Schock
Johnson (GA)	Miller (MI)	Schrader
Johnson (IL)	Miller (NC)	Schwartz
Johnson, E. B.	Miller, Gary	Scott (GA)
Johnson, Sam	Miller, George	Scott (VA)
Jones	Minnick	Sensenbrenner
Jordan (OH)	Mitchell	Serrano
Kagen	Mollohan	Sessions
Kanjorski	Moore (KS)	Sestak
Kaptur	Moore (WI)	Shadegg
Kennedy	Moran (KS)	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Moran (VA)	Sherman
Kilpatrick (MI)	Murphy (CT)	Shimkus
Kilroy	Murphy (NY)	Shuler
Kind	Murphy, Tim	Shuster
King (IA)	Murtha	Simpson
King (NY)	Myrick	Sires
Kingston	Nadler (NY)	Skelton
Kirk	Napolitano	Slaughter
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Neal (MA)	Smith (NE)
Kissell	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)
Klein (FL)	Nye	Smith (TX)
Kline (MN)	Oberstar	Smith (WA)
Kosmas	Obey	Snyder
Kratovil	Olson	Souder
Kucinich	Oliver	Space
Lamborn	Ortiz	Speier
Lance	Pallone	Spratt
Langevin	Pascarell	Stark
Larsen (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Stearns
Larson (CT)	Paul	Stupak
Latham	Paulsen	Sullivan
LaTourette	Payne	Sutton
Latta	Pence	Tanner
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Taylor
Lee (NY)	Perriello	Teague
Levin	Peters	Terry
Lewis (CA)	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Lewis (GA)	Petri	Thompson (MS)
Linder	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (PA)
Lipinski	Pitts	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Platts	Tiahrt
Loebach	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Lofgren, Zoe	Polis (CO)	Tierney
Lowe	Pomeroy	Titus
Lucas	Posey	Tonko
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Towns
Lujan	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Lummis	Putnam	Upton
Lungren, Daniel	Quigley	Van Hollen
E.	Radanovich	Visclosky
Lynch	Rahall	Walden
Mack	Rangel	Walz
Maffei	Rehberg	Wamp
Maloney	Reichert	Wasserman
Manzullo	Reyes	Schultz
Marchant	Richardson	Waters
Markey (CO)	Rodriguez	Watson
Markey (MA)	Roe (TN)	Watt
Marshall	Rogers (AL)	Waxman
Massa	Rogers (KY)	Weiner
Matheson	Rogers (MI)	Welch
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Wexler
McCarthy (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
McCaul	Roskam	Wilson (OH)
McClintock	Ross	Wilson (SC)
McCollum	Rothman (NJ)	Wittman
McCotter	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
McDermott	Royce	Woolsey
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Wu
McHenry	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
McIntyre	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)
McKeon	Salazar	Young (FL)
McMahon	Sánchez, Linda	
McMorris	T.	
Rodgers	Sanchez, Loretta	

NOT VOTING—9

Abercrombie
Barrett (SC)
Buyer

Fattah
Murphy, Patrick
Nunes

Rush
Turner
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1158

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the

concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Speaker, had I been present for the vote on S. Con. Res. 45 I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, I regret that I missed rollcall vote Nos. 790, 798–818, and 823–825. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on votes 790, 798–800, 802–818, and 823–825. I would have voted "nay" on vote No. 801.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2996, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 876, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2996) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 876, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 28, 2009, at page H11871.)

□ 1200

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2996.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

It is my privilege and pleasure to present the fiscal year 2010 Interior, environment, and related agencies appropriations bill to the House today. This very fine bill is the product of many hours of work, always with bipartisan input and excellent participation. I especially want to thank my friend and ranking member, Mr. SIMPSON, for the outstanding participation and cooperation he offered throughout this process.

I want to thank Chairman OBEY for recognizing that the programs funded