

dollars in illegal subsidies. This distorts the marketplace and gives EADS a clearly unfair advantage in the competition. The Department of Defense is also waiving five expensive regulations for the French company, but not for the American workers. This makes the American tanker more expensive and less competitive.

The Pentagon should develop a fair level playing field for the air refueling tanker competition, and this can only happen when these illegal subsidies are considered and all regulations are equally applied to both competitors.

#### WINNERS AND LOSERS

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the illegal subsidies that have been given to Airbus by the European governments. It's been widely reported that the World Trade Organization found the EU guilty of providing Airbus with billions of dollars in illegal and improper subsidies. These subsidies gave Airbus an unfair advantage for years, costing good-paying American jobs. At the same time we're fighting Europeans over their illegal subsidies, our Nation is considering buying \$35 billion worth of Airbus aerial refueling tankers.

Now who wins if we ignore these subsidies? European taxpayers will get a huge return on their illegal investment in subsidies for Airbus and European workers who are designing and building the Airbus airplanes.

Who loses? U.S. workers, who will lose their jobs, and I think our men and women in uniform, who might get an illegally subsidized tanker instead of the best tanker for their mission.

Airbus' history of subsidies should not be ignored in this tanker competition.

#### GITMO

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Well, the administration announced it would hold civilian trials in New York for the 9/11 mastermind and other terrorists. I suspect the administration hopes this move will hasten the closure of Guantanamo.

The administration's announcement is exasperating, irresponsible, and absurd. Terrorists just do not deserve the same right to trial as Americans. Moving terrorists to New York will give those who wish to harm us constitutional rights that they do not deserve. Also, it will expose our intelligence-gathering methods to the world.

For the safety of all Americans, the trial should be held in military courts in Guantanamo. The administration

should never put the rights of terrorists above the rights of Americans.

God bless America.

#### MORE OF THE SAME FROM DRUG MANUFACTURERS

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, amidst one of the worst recessions in our Nation's history, as Americans are tightening their budgets, our friendly drugmakers are flying high. While promising to support the health care overhaul by cutting \$8 billion per year from our Nation's prescription drug costs, they're busy raising the prices of brand-name drugs by 9 percent. That will add more than \$10 billion per year to prescription drug costs.

While the Consumer Price Index has fallen, the drugmakers are creating the highest annual rate of inflation for drug prices since 1992. It was only 3 years ago, in 2006, as the new Medicare part D program was going into effect, our prescription drugmakers raised their prices by four times the general inflation rate for the first quarter of that year.

America, we have foxes in our hen house. Drugmakers are up to the same old tricks again, gouging America's senior citizens while pretending to work cooperatively with us on the health reform effort. Their profit margins are their only concern. How could we have expected anything else?

#### GIVE AMERICA A FAIR SHAKE

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

Mr. REICHERT. I raise my voice loudly today on behalf of more than 22,000 Boeing workers in my district and all those thousands of workers across the State of Washington. The Department of Defense has pledged a fair and transparent process when it comes to awarding a new tanker contract for the Air Force. It must take a long, hard look at every angle when dealing with these decisions about the manufacturing of critical military equipment.

Billions of dollars of European "launch aid" subsidizes Airbus and gives them a grossly unfair competitive advantage in the global marketplace. This must not be ignored in awarding a tanker contract.

This is about fairness, it's about common sense, and has serious implications for our economy and our national security. Boeing workers produce the best planes in the world. They represent a long tradition of excellence and innovation. Let's give America a fair shake. Let's let the people of Boeing build this airplane.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2781, MOLALLA RIVER WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 908 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 908

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2781) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Molalla River in Oregon, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 908.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 908 provides for consideration of H.R. 2781, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Molalla River in Oregon as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, under a closed rule.

□ 1030

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except for clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that 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. The rule waives all points of order against the bill, as amended. Finally, the rule provides for

one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 2781, would add two segments of the Molalla River totaling 21.3 miles in northwestern Oregon to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The two segments, 15.1 miles on the main stem of the Molalla River, and 6.2 of the Table Rock Fork, would be designated as a recreational river.

The Molalla rises in the Cascade Range, east of Salem. From its headwaters above the Table Rock Wilderness Area, the river flows through cedar, hemlock and old-growth Douglas fir forests, and basalt rock canyons until it meets the Willamette River near Canby. The Molalla River is an essential wildlife area for the pileated woodpecker and both golden and bald eagles. It is also within an hour's drive of the Portland and Salem metropolitan areas and provides significant recreational opportunities for fishing, hunting, canoeing, kayaking, white-water rafting, mountain biking, horse-back riding, hiking, camping, picnicking, swimming and diving, all wonderful, great traditional American recreational activities.

These opportunities and a 20-mile hiking, mountain biking area and equestrian trail system draw over 65,000 visitors annually. I would add that the Molalla River also served as both a trail for indigenous Molalla Indians and as a vital trade route between pioneers in Oregon. The river is also where the cities of Molalla and Canby derive their drinking water.

In earlier planning analyses, the Bureau of Land Management determined that most of the river and the Table Rock Fork should be considered for designation as wild and scenic rivers. In testimony before the House Natural Resources Committee, BLM stated, "the designation called for in H.R. 2781 would be largely consistent with management currently in place, and would cause few changes to BLM's current administration."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) for bringing this legislation to the floor today so we can ensure America's beauty and natural wonderment is preserved both now and for future generations.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleague from California for yielding me time. I am opposed to the rule and the underlying bill for reasons that I will make clear and that my colleagues will make clear.

At this time, I would like to recognize my colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule because an amendment that was under my name was not admitted in the rule by the

Rules Committee. However, the issue at hand in both that amendment and the underlying bill is very small. It's 400 acres in Oregon. That is truly, in the scope of things, an insignificant number. What is significant, though, is the concept behind it, because it represents a larger, more pernicious issue that simply the leaders of this Congress are failing to address or even acknowledge.

Now, I have to admit that the fact that I am an old public schoolteacher is part of the problem. I spent 16 years in the Utah Legislature serving on the Public Education Subcommittee. I understand how difficult it is for those of us who are in the West, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from the other side, how difficult it is for us to fund our public education system. And part of it is from the example that I have before me.

This chart simply shows the amount of Federal land that is owned in each State. As you notice, there is a somewhat disproportionate amount in the West. The Speaker's State of Arizona has a great deal; my State does; the State of Oregon, a little bit less. But nonetheless, there is a significant amount of land that is controlled by the Federal Government.

Many of our friends in the East who don't have that same opportunity have a hard time understanding what it's like to be a public land State. However, the second one, perhaps the more difficult one, is this chart which simply shows the number of States in red are the ones that have the most difficult time funding their public education system. These are the States whose growth in public education funding is the slowest, the most difficult.

You will notice that there is a unique correlation to the amount of Federal land that is owned and the inability of States to fund their public education system. It's almost a one-to-one relationship that happens to be there. So the 400 acres that would be taken out, the potential timberland that would be taken out of potential production in this particular bill, actually is land that no longer produces timber today. That's part of the problem.

It's one of the reasons why we received a letter from California and Oregon county officials who have what's called O&C land. O&C land is land that is dedicated for timber production. This 400 acres is not considered O&C, but it is the same concept. It is land that could be used for timber production.

What this bill will do in taking this small amount of land is to finalize and put in statute the bad administrative decisions of the past which have taken it out of production so it no longer can produce the revenue that we desperately need in these States to try to fund public education. The sponsor of this piece of legislation understood that. He got it right. When he came before the committee in our hearing, he simply used this statement when he

asked the ranking member and the chairman to find an offset so that they did not lose the value of this small amount, 400 acres.

Unfortunately, we did not find an offset, and that was the crux of my amendment, both in committee as well as before the Rules Committee. There needs to be some kind of offset.

It says something even more disgusting as well, that if the Interior Department—of all the vast acreage of land that the Federal Government owns, 1 out of every 3 acres in this Nation—cannot find 400 acres as an offset for the State of Oregon, there is something terribly wrong in the mindset of the Interior Department here in Washington.

The issue is schoolkids. Are we going to try to help States fund their education system or not? I recognize that my amendment was ruled nongermane. Our germaneness rule is used more in its absence than in its regulation. But the issue at hand is simply, the gentleman from Oregon was right in the hearing—he got it right when he wanted an offset. The leadership of this Congress was wrong when they decided not to heed his warning and not to give his request. Today it's 400 acres. Tomorrow it may be 16,000 acres in another bill or 9.8 million acres in another bill.

It simply says, our kids are props for political purposes around here, but we really don't care about trying to find a long-term funding solution. The Rules Committee made this amendment out of order. I recognize that they can justify that on the grounds of germaneness. They could have just as easily incorporated the amendment without that as well. We do it all the time.

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. We justify those kinds of decisions all the time. I recognize that the Rules Committee will take its orders from leadership. That has to happen. They cannot ignore those things. But at the same time, had the Rules Committee followed the wishes of the gentleman from Oregon, we could actually be setting a precedent to help kids. When the Rules Committee failed to heed the request of the gentleman from Oregon, the sponsor of this piece of legislation, when he was justified and correct in coming before our hearing, what it simply said was that we put kids at a lesser priority than other protected kinds of issues.

Once again, this is the problem. It is this amount of land that causes the difficulty of Western States—all of our Western States on a State level—to provide for their needs. And that's what our amendment could solve. That amendment was not made in order. That is simply wrong. Please vote down the rule so that we can put this amendment back in place.

Mr. CARDOZA. In response to the gentleman from Utah, I would say the

following. Two of the amendments that the gentleman offered to the Rules Committee on H.R. 2781—one amendment was nothing more than political talking points with zero substance. The second, the other amendment, was both nongermane and a violation of PAYGO under the House rules.

Further, I would add in response to the questions with regard to the Obama administration that, on November 13, the Obama administration reiterated in a letter to Chairman GRIJALVA, stating, “There are no timber contracts within the Federal lands proposed for designation under H.R. 2781.” I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the department indicating that to the chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, DC, November 13, 2009.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks,  
Forests, and Public Lands, House Committee  
on Natural Resources, House of Rep-  
resentatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed are responses prepared by the Bureau of Land Management to questions submitted following the Subcommittee's Thursday, October 1, 2009, hearing on, H.R. 2781, “Molalla River: National Wild and Scenic River System.”

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this material to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and public Lands.”

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER P. SALOTTI,  
Legislative Counsel, Office of  
Congressional and Legislative Affairs.

Enclosure.

QUESTIONS FOR ROBERT ABBEY, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Questions from Representative Grijalva:

1. How does BLM usually manage private land within wild and scenic river corridors?

Answer. Under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the Federal government has no authority to manage private lands within wild and scenic river corridors.

2. Are there any timber contracts within the corridor of the proposed designation for the Molalla?

Answer. The BLM in Oregon informs me that there are no timber contracts within the Federal lands proposed for designation under H.R. 2781, which designates segments of the Molalla River in Oregon as components of the National Wild and Scenic River System.

Third, with regard to Mr. SCHRADER's comments, the gentleman said that we should have heeded Mr. SCHRADER's comments. Well, guess what. Representative SCHRADER, who represents this area, expressed a concern, as the gentleman indicated, about this issue at the Natural Resources Committee hearing in October. He also states in a letter to us, that I will have inserted in the RECORD, that since that time he has investigated this concern with the agencies on the ground and wrote the committee on November 10 to say that he was totally satisfied that the bill will not remove trees from the timber stock because there are no timber contracts planned in the area, and there are none now, and there are none planned. So I would like to submit for the RECORD Mr. SCHRADER's letter.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, November 10, 2009.

Hon. NICK RAHALL  
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to express my support for the committee's amendments to my bill, H.R. 2781, to designate segments of the Molalla River in Oregon as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

At the October 28th markup of H.R. 2781, mention was made of a statement in my testimony regarding 420 acres of timber management, or “matrix,” lands that will be within the river corridor when my bill is enacted. Since the October 1st hearing before the National Parks, Forests and Public Lands Subcommittee at which I testified, I have consulted both the Bureau of Land Management and committee staff about those matrix lands. I am satisfied that this designation will not remove trees from the timber stock: there are no timber contracts in that area, and no timber sales are planned.

I reserve the right to offset logging acreage in future bills I might introduce, but I see no need to add such language to H.R. 2781 at this time. Thank you for your support of this legislation which has overwhelming support within my district and thank you for all your work you do as Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Sincerely,

KURT SCHRADER,  
Member of Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the comments made by the gentleman from California, and I think I tried to state those comments earlier on.

The letter we received from the Association of O&C Counties—that's Oregon and California—concerned about this particular issue does include and specifically mentions these 411 acres in this National Wild and Scenic Rivers bill. I also recognize that the gentleman from Oregon, who is the sponsor of this bill, has since sent a letter that says that it does not have an impact. It does not have an impact because of bad administrative decisions made earlier that have already taken this out of timber production.

What we are doing with this bill is now putting that in statute so that we cannot at some time reverse that with the ease with which we took them out in the first place. We have made bad decisions time after time after time, which has impacted the timber industry in these States and has impacted their ability to fund their local governments and especially their education system. That was the fundamental reason it was ruled out of order. It violated PAYGO because, if you actually did put that, those funds would have to be shared with the local States.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this, as I appreciate his clarity in moving it forward. It is my privilege to represent part of

Clackamas County in my congressional district. Now while I don't actually have the area in question, I have worked very hard with my colleague Congressman SCHRADER to make sure that the interests of this diverse county are, in fact, represented. And if one came from Mars and listened to the debate, they might be a little confused on this point.

First, the land in question is not O&C land. It is BLM land. There is no fiscal impact here. There is no timber that is involved. I worked very closely with this county and have for decades. The county commissioners now, as they have in the past, have been very careful to heed the balance of resource protection, economic development, the environment, and tourism in the broad range of areas. I have worked with them on wilderness legislation, in wild and scenic legislation, including the one signed into law by President Obama at the beginning of this year.

I have had times when they have been hesitant because they have had questions about whether the benefits of economic development of tourism, of wilderness protections, would offset potential loss of timber production. The county has gone through the process here yet again. It is their judgment, and one that I strongly support, that the resource protections to have this stretch of the Molalla River being granted Wild and Scenic protection is well worth it.

There is a minuscule amount of land that would not be removed from potential harvest, but it's not going to be harvested now. It's not going to be harvested in the future. If the gentleman would come with me to Clackamas County, Congressman SCHRADER and I would be pleased to show him this precious resource and why there was never any question that this would not be harvested.

So people can go on and confuse BLM land with O&C land. They can talk about their disputes with this administration and past administrations about timber practices. That's fair game. And they will battle that. Frankly, the American public supports wilderness protection. The American public wants the protection not just of Wild and Scenic Rivers but of our precious watersheds where half the people in my State get their water from national timberland. As my friend from California knows, this is a very sensitive issue these days.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this rule. I am proud to support this underlying legislation. It has been carefully crafted by my friend, the gentleman from Clackamas County. He lives in this county not very far from the river that would be so designated. It is a testament to his quick assimilation into the ways of the House of Representatives, to be able to move forward with significant wild and scenic legislation, to be able to work with the

local environmentalists, work with the county commission, to come forward with something that not only will protect a natural resource for years to come, but it is also going to enhance the local economy.

This will in fact deal with the future of the children of Clackamas County because the economic development potential that will be generated by people who use this waterway, you come year round and not just in high water times, people navigate these waters in Clackamas County. It is a growing and thriving area of economic development, of recreation for people young and old, and for the character of a unique county in our State and in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak in support of the rule, the underlying legislation, and I look forward to passage of both.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, Republicans are getting very tired of being accused of not being sensitive to our environment. We are very sensitive to the environment. We want to protect water everywhere. We have been very, very vocal on that issue, especially this session, especially as it has related to the West, and my colleague on the Rules Committee knows that.

However, we are also concerned about jobs for the American people. We know that the unemployment rate has recently reached a record high of 10.2 percent, the highest unemployment rate our country has in 26 years, and aptly described in a Wall Street Journal editorial this week, "It is no wonder Americans seem to have only three things on their mind right now: jobs, jobs, and jobs."

If nothing else, the Federal Government should do no harm to the job market—that is common sense—but that is exactly what the Democrats in charge are doing with this legislation today. They are going to be harming American families by increasing unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), who is going to deal with some of the issues that our colleague from Oregon has raised on this issue.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

I am sorry that the gentleman from Oregon came in late during the discussion and has left that side of the aisle. I want to make it very clear, when I was making my first statements, I did not say that these 400 acres were O&C lands—I made that very clear—but they are treated like O&C lands, which is why the local leaders from Oregon and California sent the letter and specifically asked any kind of lands taken out of the ability to be used for timber production be offset. They specifically requested in a number of other areas this particular area that will be made wild and scenic. This is the request that comes from the local leaders in

California and Oregon which recognizes what happens when these lands are taken out of production, and they clearly, as I do, understand that there is economic development from tourism. There is also economic development from manufacturing and there is also economic development from timber harvest, and they each have a different role to play. And each have a different amount of money they do to help kids.

These local leaders recognize that fact which is why they supported what the sponsor of this bill originally wanted to do. Unfortunately, the House leadership has not recognized what his wishes were and has not done what the sponsor originally wanted to do. Though he has now changed his mind, he says these lands are not now producing timber, that is not the issue. The issue is will they ever be useful in that particular effort. That is what we are trying to do with the amendment which should have been made in order. It should have been part of the original bill that came out of the committee. There is no reason why it should not have been.

Now, I recognize there is a significant issue, Mr. Speaker, and let me do just one thing very quickly, because what these local leaders are talking about is specifically allowing them to have some kind of control over their own destiny. We see that played out in bill after bill and issue after issue on this floor.

The other week we passed a small bill, maybe some of you have read about it in the papers, about health care. One of the issues of that bill is it stops local, creative, alternative approaches.

The State of Utah started a local approach for health care reform. They got it right. It was based on empowerment of individuals by employers who would now have a common understanding of what they would have to spend on health care, to be able to give that to their employees, so the employers go to a State index where they have presently 66 options from which to choose. It was an effort to empower individuals. It is an effort of States to solve their own problems because States understand the unique demographic needs that they have in those particular States. Unfortunately, the bill that was passed, if it were to go all of the way through the system, stops the States dead in their tracks from actually implementing their own local reforms, just like this would stop the local areas from implementing their own local reforms.

Now, I hope we understand how significant it is that you can't get enough experts here in one particular room to solve all of the problems in the world, and we should look at the concept of States and local governments having their own ability to experiment and their own ability to meet their local demographic's needs and their own ability to come up with unique and clear ideas, and we should be empow-

ering local governments to make those decisions, not restricting them with a one-size-fits-all mentality or telling them what they will and will not do on the local level.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, as part of the course of debate, the gentleman from North Carolina indicated that they have been very supportive of the environment, and she has indicated that they are getting a bad rap, as it were, for not being supportive of the environment. I would like to ask the gentlelady how many wild and scenic bills have they supported on the floor this session of Congress. I know we have had a number, and I don't recall a one that they have supported.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding.

We have voted for all of the wild and scenic bills that have met the proper definition of wild and scenic rivers.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Okay. That would raise a further interrogatory with me: How many did you deem in your opinion met the proper definition?

I yield.

Ms. FOXX. Not the one in Massachusetts, the Taunton River, and not this one.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Thank you.

Reclaiming my time, it is interesting to me, and I represent one of the districts most impacted by changes in Federal forest policy and suffering some of the highest rates of unemployment in the United States, and it is interesting to hear the gentleman from Utah now come before us as such a tremendous advocate for local governments with revenues created or shared from Federal lands, because when we were in a crisis, the Bush administration having made no changes in Federal forest policy and still limping along during the 6 years that the Republicans controlled the House, the White House and the Senate, the guarantees that had been put in place to ameliorate the impact of the Clinton forest plan, which I opposed, expired. They just expired while George Bush was in the White House and the Republicans controlled the House and the Senate.

Now I wonder about that tremendous concern. At that time when they controlled everything, they had an opportunity to continue a program that would fund sheriffs and would maintain our jail space and would fund our roads, bridges, and highways on the county system, would help fund schools, they just walked away from it. They let it die. And it took the Democrats 5 months to pass, after we took control from the Republicans, despite the objections of the Republicans and

the Bush administration, to pass legislation to give emergency payments for 1 year, and then yet again the Democrats in the last Congress extended the program for 4 years with a phasedown.

I actually did bring my bill for authorizing programs to the floor of the House last year on June 5, 2008. It was brought up under a suspension of the rules, unfortunately. Because of Republican opposition to the bill, it was deemed it would have to come up under suspension of the rules. We got 218 positive votes; 16 of those were Republican, 16, but it was not the gentleman from Utah. He opposed my proposal.

Suddenly, now, over a little 400 acres of land, which does not have any potential to produce any large amount of money, if any, under the current forest management, he wants to block this bill. But last year when the opportunity to vote to extend funding to all of the counties and school districts in America, and his State would have been one of the greatest beneficiaries outside of Oregon and California, he voted "no."

So sometimes around here, I think the proof is in the pudding on how you vote. I think it is an objection of convenience on the part of the gentleman, this sudden, newfound concern for local governments and schools for the non-existent revenue from this very small parcel of land as opposed to the benefits that would accrue to that area by the protection of this. The local governments and all of the other officials in that area support the legislation. They aren't concerned about some theoretical, infinitesimal loss of money. They are more concerned about protecting the resource and developing that area into a recreation corridor that will attract people from around the State and perhaps from around the Nation to that area. That is part of their local economic development strategy, and that is what the local governments want. That is what the Representative for that district wants. That is what I support, and I will just say that any specious argument that somehow this hurts local government, hurts schoolkids, hurts public safety, coming from someone who opposed an opportunity to give robust funding for public safety, schoolkids all across America, to all of these distressed counties, is a little bit out of line.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, from almost the very first day when I came here, I heard my colleague from Oregon blaming George Bush for everything insufficient in this country. That started in 2005 and he is still doing that, just like many of our colleagues here. But the Democrats in charge can't hide from the fact that they now control the House, the Senate, and the White House, and what are they doing to solve the problems? Very little.

I want to say that the sponsor of the bill actually brought up this issue that our friends across the aisle are trying

to say now is our issue, but unfortunately the sponsor of the bill has been helped to change his mind on the issue by the Democrats in charge because it suits their purposes more.

And actually, the GOP has been the leader in starting good environmental programs in this country, just as we were the people who passed the civil rights bills back in the sixties without very much help from our colleagues across the aisle. They love to engage in revisionist history.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this bill could have been brought to the floor under an open rule, and we could have been debating amendments. But it's been brought in a closed rule. Actually, this bill is probably going to pass, the rule and the bill will pass overwhelmingly; and the real reason that we're doing this today is to kill time again. We've been voting on a lot of things we haven't really needed to vote on with a recorded vote because the majority wants to, again, kill time in order to be dealing with problems where their majority is not going to hold very well.

What we are going to be voting on a little later today, we think, is a bill which our colleagues across the aisle call the "doc fix" but we call the "doc trick." It's really a Trojan horse. Supposedly it is going to take care of the reimbursements for physicians in our country that are scheduled to be cut next year by 20 percent.

But this "doc trick," as I said, is really a Trojan horse because it is not deficit neutral, and it is a bill that is going to increase spending by at least \$209 billion plus another \$70 billion that's hidden in administrative actions by the Department of Health and Human Services. So it's going to really cost \$279 billion. When you take the "doc trick" in combination with the health care bill, the combination increases the deficit by \$100 billion.

This is unconscionable in a time when we have the largest deficit ever in the history of this country, which is the biggest concern of the people in this country. They are not as concerned about health care as they are about jobs and about the horrible debt that we are incurring not only for ourselves but for our children and our grandchildren.

Republicans have made a commitment that if we take back the majority next year, we will fix this reimbursement for physicians permanently. But that's not what's going to happen with the "doc trick" shell game that is being brought to us. And what they're going to do is say that it's going to be compliant with PAYGO.

You know, every time I hear the term "PAYGO," we know, and the American people are beginning to notice, that it is a big joke. It's been talked about as a joke by almost every editorial in the country. The Washington Post has called it a shell game,

budgetary smoke and mirrors. It's going to add billions to the deficit even though President Obama promised, "If you're a taxpayer concerned about deficits, I want to reassure you that I am too. That's why I have pledged I will not sign health insurance reform that adds even one dime to our deficit over the next decade and I mean it." This was said by President Obama in Shaker Heights, Ohio, on the 23rd of July.

We also know that the Senate has already rejected a bill almost exactly the same as the one that's going to be voted on today. Thirteen Democrat Senators opposed it. Senator KENT CONRAD said, "I don't agree with just adding that amount to the debt." He happens to be a Democrat from North Dakota. Senator EVAN BAYH, a Democrat in Indiana, said he couldn't support it at a time when we are hemorrhaging red ink. Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, independent, but caucusing with the Democrats said, "Out of nowhere we're asked to provide \$250 billion to cover services without any payment for it, increasing the debt by that amount." He added that if lawmakers pass health care reform that includes a public option, the debt crisis will only worsen.

This is the wrong direction to be going in this country, Mr. Speaker, because we're adding debt; and, as I say again, the bill that's going to be presented today is a Trojan horse. It is not going to help our physicians dealing with reimbursements. It is a trick to say that it is being taken care of. It was taken out of the major health care bill.

Those are the kinds of things that we should be dealing with on this floor. We should have open rules, and they should not be doing their best to fool the American people on what is really happening with our debt and with costs.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, in the 7 years that I have been here and the years that I have watched this Congress beforehand, I sometimes watch the floor and I can't believe what I'm hearing. I can't believe my ears. Today what I'm hearing on the floor really takes the cake.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina in her statement just now indicated that the Republican GOP had passed the Civil Rights Act legislation with almost no help from the Democrats. I can't believe my ears. It was the Kennedy and Johnson administrations where we passed that Great Society legislation. It was over the objections of people like Jesse Helms from the gentlewoman's State that we passed that civil rights legislation.

JOHN LEWIS, a Member of this House, was beaten on the Edmund Pettus Bridge to get that civil rights legislation passed. Tell JOHN LEWIS that he wasn't part of getting that legislation passed.

I sometimes cannot believe what I hear on this House floor. And I will tell

you today that I will stand by these statements, and I am very proud of what my party has done to advance civil rights legislation in the United States of America.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out to the gentleman from California that Senator Helms was not elected to the United States Senate until 1972 and was not in the Congress when the civil rights legislation was passed in the 1960s.

Mr. Speaker, if this legislation passes as it's written right now, 420 acres of timberland will be lost and along with it local jobs and funding for local schools. As Mr. BISHOP has suggested with an amendment he offered in the Rules Committee on Tuesday, a better name for this bill would be the "School Children and Jobs Left Behind Act."

Even worse, Oregon's unemployment level in September 2009, the latest on record, was 11.5 percent, up almost double from 6.8 percent in the same month last year.

Most of Oregon's economic output depends on the State's timber industry. Valuable revenue needed to fund schools has been lost as well. According to the Pew Center on the States, Oregon has lost 19 percent of its revenue in the last year and faces a budget gap of 14.5 percent in fiscal year 2010. According to the U.S. General Services Administration, the Federal Government already owns 53 percent of the State of Oregon, 53 percent. Apparently that's not enough to satisfy special interest groups to which the Democrats are beholden. This bill will lock up 420 more acres that could be used to produce much-needed revenue for the State while at the same time refusing to open up an equal amount of Federal land to offset more job losses during a recession.

As Ranking Member HASTINGS described to the Rules Committee, it's longstanding tradition that the Natural Resources Committee be respectful of the views of those elected to represent a district and show deference when a Member opposes an action that's proposed in the district that Member was elected to represent.

In his testimony to the subcommittee, Mr. SCHRADER specifically asked that as this bill moves forward, work be done to ensure that there will be no net loss of acres available for timber management as a result of this legislation. However, Democrats on the Natural Resources Committee blocked an amendment offered by Mr. BISHOP to ensure the lost timberlands were offset and the health of the local economy be maintained. Mr. BISHOP again offered an amendment to provide an offset for lost timberlands, but it was rejected by the Democrats on the Rules Committee.

In fact, the rule we have before us today is a closed rule, as I said earlier. No amendments were allowed by Democrats in charge of the Rules Com-

mittee. By choosing to operate in this way, the majority has again cut off the minority and their own colleagues from having appropriate input in the legislative process.

By choosing to stifle debate, the Democrats in charge have denied their colleagues on both sides of the aisle the ability to do the job they have been elected to do: offer ideas that represent and serve their constituents. They are denying Members the ability to offer improvements to this legislation, and this is an injustice to their colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Our colleagues across the aisle are limiting what ideas can be debated on the floor and which constituents can be adequately represented in the House. Our constituents in both Republican and Democrat districts are struggling to make ends meet, are facing unemployment, and yet are simultaneously being cut out of participating in a debate over how their hard-earned taxpayer dollars are being spent by the Federal Government.

Why is the majority blocking debate on such important legislation? Are they afraid of debate? Are they protecting their Members from tough votes? Are they afraid of the democratic process?

Mr. Speaker, it's troubling to me we're debating this legislation today when my constituents and all Americans are confronted with dire economic hardships that remain unaddressed. Families all over the country are struggling to find jobs to provide for their children and keep food on their tables. Yet while Rome burns, this Congress is wasting the day talking about whether or not a river should be designated as "wild and scenic" and trying to pass a policy that will do even more harm to the economy.

We cannot afford to lose more jobs. The U.S. national debt is currently \$12 trillion. With over 300 billion people in the United States today, each citizen's share of this debt right now is \$38,800. The national debt has continued to increase at an average of \$3.88 billion per day since September 28, 2007.

We can no longer blame the deficit and the economic difficulties today on the previous administration. As I said earlier, the Congress and the administration are now controlled by Democrats. They continue to borrow money, and it's being spent by Speaker PELOSI and the Obama administration; and as a result, the unemployment rate continues to rise and the deficit continues to rise.

Since the Democrats took control of Congress on January 4, 2007, the national debt has increased by \$3.282 trillion. Since President Obama was inaugurated just 10 months ago in January, the national debt has increased by \$1.325 trillion. Almost 1 year after President Obama was elected and 3 years since the Democrats took majorities in Congress, the Department of Treasury has reported that under the Democrats' control, 2009 was the worst

fiscal year in this Nation's history. The results get more disastrous with each passing day.

I have opposed all these efforts to raise the debt limit, and we're going to be facing that again very shortly. According to analysis by the Heritage Foundation, the White House projects \$10.6 trillion dollars in new deficits over the next decade. That is nearly \$80,000 per household in new borrowing. It's beyond time to stop digging. The new budget estimates, including an estimated total national debt of \$24.5 trillion in 2019 under President Obama's budget, are alarming and unsustainable. The result will be the highest level of spending and debt in American history.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be dealing with this. We need to be putting people back to work. We don't need to be increasing the debt with every passing day by passing bills that will do that and playing a shell game with the American people.

One of the best things that's happened this year is that the American people are paying much closer attention to what is going on in the Congress. They've learned they can read the bills if the bills are ever put out for them to read. They spoke in New Jersey, they spoke in Virginia in the election earlier this year, and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to start paying attention, as we have been paying attention all year long.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the gentlewoman's statement where she talked at great length about the fact that the House is being closed down, that the debate is being stifled. And I would like to remind the House of an earlier statement that I made that there were only two amendments submitted to the Rules Committee on H.R. 2781.

One of the amendments was nothing more than a change of the title which consisted of political talking points, added zero substance to the bill. The other amendment was both non-germane and a violation of the PAYGO requirements of this House, two of the most important rules that are part of the conducting of debates in this House.

So the gentlewoman is advocating that we break the House rules and agree to an amendment that is really de minimis to the grander aspect of what we're trying to do here.

□ 1115

The local community has asked for this designation, the local Congressman. In fact, you've heard today that three Members of Congress from Oregon all advocate for this bill. I'm sure there are more. The reality is that the local folks have determined that this is the best way to create economic development, and the 420 acres that are being so grandly discussed by the other



side as reason to oppose this bill, that are going to cause economic devastation for both this area and the country—well, the local folks don't believe it, and neither does anybody else.

This is a good bill, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to now yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentlelady's concerned about two things, the deficit and jobs. I share those concerns. But again, we have a little problem with consistency. When she was offered an opportunity, just in September, to extend the national surface transportation investment, fully paid for through user fees, gas tax and other fees, fully paid for, a program that creates millions of jobs, construction jobs, she voted "no." She voted to end all funding for investment in our national transportation infrastructure, an extraordinary vote, unbelievable for someone who cares about jobs and cares about the deficit, because it was paid for and it creates millions of jobs.

And on October 1 that program was going down, and tens of thousands of people across the United States of America would have been unemployed, private sector people, construction workers who are already hard-hit in this recession. If the Republicans and she had their way, that program would have ended on October 1.

Now, it's pretty hard to justify that vote. I don't quite understand it. But she also has the same consistency problem as the gentleman from Utah; that is, when there was an opportunity to help those school districts, those local communities fund critical public safety, sheriffs and jail beds, she voted "no" along with a large majority of Republicans against my legislation last May.

Now, there's this suddenly newfound interest in a community that doesn't want her interest. They want self-determination. They support this legislation. The elected Representative supports this legislation. But, no, the Republicans from elsewhere around the country, they know better than the people of Oregon. They know better what would help the people of Oregon.

Except, again, back to the Bush administration and the Republicans running Congress, when the Bush administration had an opportunity to continue payments to those counties, or change the forest policy, they did neither. They didn't change the Clinton forest plan, which I opposed, which has devastated communities. And they allowed the legislation signed by President Bill Clinton to give assistance to those counties impacted by his forest policies assistance—they allowed that to expire, too, when they were in charge. And the gentlelady said nothing at that time. She didn't help support us in that effort. She didn't support that. She didn't support it last year when I offered it.

So let's not have a false debate here about what's better for the people of Oregon, coming from even a near

neighbor in Washington State, or from the gentleman in Utah, or a woman from back East. Let's respect the local will of the people.

When DON YOUNG chaired the Resources Committee, we kind of had a rule. We didn't mess around in each other's districts. I kind of liked that rule. We're messing around in someone else's district here. We're messing around with the local will. And let's not have newfound sympathy for my constituents who've been hit so hard when you didn't lift a finger to help them when you ran everything.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I will yield.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Let me just reiterate his last point. I agree with that. In fact, I made that observation when we were in committee on this. I just have a problem with wild and scenic designations that I've pointed out.

But I just wanted to correct a little bit because you and I worked very hard on the rural school issue. I was on the Rules Committee at that time, and I know my friend from California heard me over and over on that. Let's just go back in history. It was a Forest Policy Act that caused that to happen. It was a Republican Congress that put the rural school program in place. So, you know, finger-pointing is not going to get us anywhere.

I know that when you took over, the Senate, for example, had passed the rural school bill, something like 92-3. I forget the exact figure, but it was overwhelming, and it was never taken up by your House leadership. Now, it eventually got done, but it does have a date, and we're going to have to come back and revisit it. The point of all of this debate is that the end result, this is only a very small acreage, but we are going to forever take it out of potential logging. That is what the issue is.

And so I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I just wanted to clarify that particular point because he and I did work on that rural school problem along with our colleague from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN). He is very much involved with that.

So I appreciate the gentleman yielding. We will have more discussion on this issue when, if, this rule passed. I certainly hope it doesn't pass because then we can, you know, go and do the right thing. But, at any rate, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield the gentleman from Oregon 1 additional minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The gentleman is correct, and he did work hard to help with the renewal of the county schools, and my colleague from Oregon, GREG WALDEN, was a partner in that effort. But the fact is that, you know, when you controlled everything, it died. The program died. And we were so desperate that at the end of the Congress GREG

and I came and sat here on the floor till 2 o'clock in the morning, so at the end of that Congress we could offer a unanimous consent request to move that program forward and fund it, and the objection came from your side of the aisle again.

So, unfortunately, you know, there are some hard facts here. You are right. The original legislation was passed when the Republicans controlled the House. Bill Clinton was President. We had a bipartisan agreement to help the counties, but when there was a later opportunity, nothing happened.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, you said I had 3 minutes. There's so much to say in so little time.

I do want to point out—and it's in the RECORD, it's easy for people to check out—that the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee in the 1960s defeated bringing up civil rights legislation until the Speaker of the House increased the membership on the Rules Committee, so that the increased Democrats could vote with the Republicans to bring the civil rights legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so an amendment can be added to the rule. The amendment to the rule would provide for separate consideration of H. Res. 554, a resolution to require that legislation and conference reports be posted on the Internet for 72 hours prior to consideration by the House. It does not affect the bill made in order by the rule. The amendment to the rule provides that the House will debate the issue of reading the bill within three legislative days. It does not disrupt the schedule.

This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. As Members of Congress, we ought to agree that, regardless of the legislation brought before us, we should always have the opportunity to read and understand the legislation before we vote. The American public agrees with this commonsense position. A recent survey by Rasmussen Reports found that 83 percent of Americans say legislation should be posted online and available for everyone to read before Congress votes on it. The poll also found that this is not a partisan issue; 85 percent of Republicans, 76 percent of Democrats, and 92 percent of unaffiliated voters, favor posting legislation online prior to it being voted on.

Mr. Speaker, we're elected to Congress to represent our constituents. How are we supposed to determine what's right for our fellow Americans if we have to vote on something before we even have time to read it?

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can have this debate and do the right thing for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, we've heard quite a debate today. The debate was about designating a wild and scenic river in Oregon. But it has gone far, far afield from there. We've heard about the deficit. We've heard about jobs. We've heard about the Civil Rights Act and who was responsible for passing the legislation that did that historic. We've heard quite a lot that doesn't have anything to do with the reason we are here today, and that, Mr. Speaker, is designating the Molalla River as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, which will help ensure that social, cultural, and economic benefits of the area will be preserved.

For several years, an alliance of over 45 organizations has been dedicated to river restoration efforts and protecting the area from destructive acts. And the local community around the Molalla has asked for this designation. It is now up to Congress to act on behalf of the citizens and the communities at hand to preserve the river's historic, scenic, and recreational values; to protect the river's water quality and its free-flowing character; and ensure that Americans and Oregonians can enjoy the original character of this river for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's a good bill. The bill deserves strong support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I ask for that support. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 908 OFFERED BY MS. FOX OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 921

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Mr. Owens (to rank immediately after Mr. Murphy of New York).

(2) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—Mr. Owens (to rank immediately after Mr. Luján).

(3) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Garamendi (to rank immediately after Mr. Griffith).

(4) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—Mr. Garamendi.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on H. Res. 908; adopting House Resolution 908, if ordered; and suspending the rules on S. 1599.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be considered as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2781, MOLALLA RIVER WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House