

CAP-AND-TAX

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, today's Los Angeles Reuters article states, "U.S. electricity prices are likely to rise 15 to 30 percent if a national cap on carbon dioxide emissions is instituted, according to a report by Moody's Investors Services."

You've heard us talk a lot about a cap-and-tax. The burden of this carbon regime will be a tax on carbon use, pushing the cost on us, the middle class, the poor. And the debate here is we, on our side, we do not want to cap our economy and trade away our jobs. And that's what this regime will do.

This was after the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. A mine in my district, Peabody No. 10 in Kincaid, Illinois, because of the Clean Air Amendments, well, it was actually 1,200 miners lost their jobs.

This is what will happen if we pursue a cap-and-tax regime that caps our economy and trades away our jobs. We will fight this to the end.

BARRING DALAI LAMA FROM PEACE CONFERENCE IN SOUTH AFRICA

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is a shame and a disgrace that the Dalai Lama will not be permitted to attend a peace conference in South Africa this week.

How could a nation, once a symbol of the power of reconciliation, be so wrong today? How could the home of Albert Lituli and Nelson Mandela and other men and women of courage deny their brotherhood with one simple man of peace?

Madam Speaker, I am afraid that this says something very troubling about the leadership of South Africa. It says that they are willing to sacrifice the cause of justice on the cross of trade and monetary gain with China.

Today, I stand with former President F.W. de Klerk, Archbishop Desmond Tutu and others around the world who condemn this unnecessary act.

THE BUDGET AND THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE

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

Mr. PENCE. Yesterday, the President of the United States took to prime time television in defense of a budget proposal that spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much, and the American people know it. Our Nation is beginning to understand that the President's proposed the most fis-

cally irresponsible budget in the history of our Nation.

It comes at such a difficult time for our country. I recently met firsthand with families in my district who are facing these difficult times with courage and sacrifice.

The leaders of Rushville, Indiana, were sitting down around a kitchen table at a farm last week, practicing the kind of fiscal restraint and determination necessary to make it through these difficult times, and the people in all of our Nation want Washington to do likewise. They want us to put our fiscal house in order with fiscal responsibility and a commitment to grow.

The President's budget increases spending and raises taxes on almost every American household and small business, and invites record deficits, and adds roughly \$1 trillion to our national debt every year for the next 10 years.

The American people know there's a better way. In the coming hours, Republicans will unveil a better solution to pass a budget bill based on fiscal responsibility and the principles of growth.

TAX CUTS

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

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, to my colleagues here on the floor, give me a break. That's exactly what the American taxpayer has asked for, and that's what this Congress has delivered.

Over the last 3 months that I have been here in the Congress, here in the United States Capitol, we have made permanent the \$800 Making Work Pay tax cut for American middle-class families. We've expanded the child tax credit. We've made the investment into alternative energy, the tax cuts that are going to help grow green energy jobs here in the United States and in my district in Ohio. We've made those part of our package that we've rolled out.

This stimulus package and economic recovery bill that was passed by this Congress provides the largest tax cut for American middle-class families and for small businesses in this country. This was the right step. We can already begin to see the signs of economic recovery on the horizon.

We've got a long way to go, but the package we introduced and passed in this Congress is going to be the right track, and we need to put our country back on track. That's what the American taxpayers have asked for, and that's what we're giving them, a break.

THREAT FROM IRAN IS REAL

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, the threat from Iran is real. It endangers Israel, our greatest ally in the Middle East, many of our NATO allies in Europe, and indeed, the United States of America herself.

The President has said that Iran with nuclear weapons would be a "game changer," and last week he sent a video message to the people of Iran. What was contained in the message was not as striking as what was left out.

The President did not call on the Iranian Government to give up uranium enrichment. He did not insist that the Iranian Government stop arming Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza. He did not insist that the Iranian Government stop threatening Israel.

What he did do was call for a "new beginning," without saying much more. Israeli President Shimon Perez also appealed to the people of Iran before making clear that the country would be run by religious fanatics.

I urge the President to rely more on our friends in the Middle East, who deal with Iran on a daily basis, and less on Youtube and sports metaphors.

The United States must make clear that we support Israel, their President, and their new prime minister in their continuing struggle with Iran and its misguided leaders.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 146, OMNIBUS PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2009

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 280 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 280

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 146) to establish a battlefield acquisition grant program for the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

For the purpose 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. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 280.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 280 provides for consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 146, the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009. The rule makes in order a motion by the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 146, the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009. The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources.

Madam Speaker, today, people across the country are looking to this body to pass this important bill. We have an historic opportunity to protect and preserve land across the country for future generations. Our grandchildren and their grandchildren will be able to enjoy national parks around the country.

In Maine, my district, like so many other areas around the country, we cherish the natural beauty that surrounds us, and we have worked hard to preserve it. When I was the Senate majority leader in the State of Maine, I sponsored the biggest land bond bill in State history to preserve our open spaces for the public.

Time and again, the people of my State have voted to invest in public land that will be protected for generations to come, and we value the full variety of uses of that land, whether it be hiking, camping, kayaking, hunting, or fishing.

We are here today to consider the Senate amendments to H.R. 146, the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009. These amendments provide us with the opportunity to strengthen our National Park System, improve forest health, facilitate better management of our public lands, and increase the quantity and quality of the water supply in numerous local communities.

This is not the first time this body has voted on this legislation. On March 11, a bipartisan majority of the House voted in favor of the Omnibus Lands Management Act. Unfortunately, it narrowly failed to obtain the two-thirds vote to pass the House. Last year, the majority of the bills that make up this package were passed out of the House but were held up in the Senate by a threatened filibuster.

Finally, this year the Senate voted twice—each time overwhelmingly in favor of this package. Our time to send this legislation to the President's desk is long overdue.

This package will provide protection to historic and cultural resources that include the sacred ground of American battlefields. In addition, it will protect our forests, our water, our network of trails. It will add to our National Park System and provide land that we can all enjoy.

By finally passing this legislation today, we will designate over 2 million acres of land as wilderness. This means that when our grandchildren want to take their families to see what America looked like in its wild state, they will be able to. And they will be able to explore these lands because we are not closing off or preventing access to land.

Instead, the wilderness designation helps manage the various uses, and this legislation recognizes that some areas are better suited for some kinds of recreation than others.

This act also provides protection to historic sites like the Harriet Beecher Stowe House in my State of Maine, where this courageous abolitionist wrote "Uncle Tom's Cabin." Future generations will be able to see and use this site and others protected by this legislation.

This legislation before us is a product of bipartisan efforts that recognize how critical it is to conserve our land and ensure that the American people have access to that land. Land is one of our most precious resources and we must do our part, not only for our use but for future generations.

This legislation protects areas for outdoor recreation. It preserves land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities. Not only does this package protect some of the most environmentally significant and scenic land in the country, it also provides protection for our Nation's water resources and keeps our Wild and Scenic Rivers undammed and free flowing.

Taken as a whole, this package is truly landmark legislation. The amendments incorporate bipartisan bills introduced by the last Congress—39 by Democrats and 36 by Republican Members of the House.

Finally, as good a piece of legislation as I think this is, the debate before us is simply on the rule to debate the underlying bill. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle may argue that this did not go through regular order, or this limits second amendment rights, or that it somehow excludes our honored returning vets from accessing public lands, but all of those arguments are simply untrue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. No, I won't.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this very important public lands bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the best thing about what has been happening in this session of Congress, I think, is that the American people are paying close attention to what is going on here, and I certainly hope that they are

paying close attention to the debate on this rule today because it's an important rule that we are debating and it's an important bill that is going to be voted on.

Process is important, I think, although people say most folks don't pay attention to it. But what the majority has done, it's taken a very, very bad bill and used every possible maneuver to it to keep us from really debating this bill, from voting on amendments, and from dealing with this bill in an open way.

I want to say that I am a big supporter of national parks. I often say that I think the Federal Government's number one job is national defense, but I think there is an important role in this country for preserving land for all people to use.

So I am a supporter of national parks. When I travel around the country, those are the places that I like to go.

We are debating the rule, but the underlying bill, I think, is going to harm our country and harm Americans in many ways. We are going to be restricting Americans' right to the second amendment in this country. We are going to be restricting people with disabilities from using the very lands that they think they should be able to use. We are going to be restricting our disabled veterans from being able to use the parks and areas that are being set aside. We are going to be trampling on the important issue of eminent domain.

Many people are opposed to this bill. We even have the ACLU along with several other groups saying that they are opposed to this bill and have serious reservations about it.

But it's going to be rammed through, like so many other things have been rammed through in this session of Congress, and it's setting the tone for how the majority is operating in this Congress at this time.

We are even told that even though 100 of these bills—there are 160 bills in this one bill—even though 100 of them have never been debated by either body, because the Senate okayed this, then it's okay with us.

I suspect that later on in this session I'm going to hear my colleagues who made that comment make a very, very different kind of comment.

So I am very concerned about this rule. I think it is a bad underlying bill. I think the rule is bad because it cuts off debate. But this is the modus operandi of the majority in this session.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 8 minutes to a former member of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the total blockade erected by House Democrat leaders to any amendments being offered on this over 1,200-page bill, this \$10 billion omnibus lands package.

This bill is a monster bill created by the Senate, stacking together more than 170 pieces of different legislation. Over 100 of these bills have never been voted on in the House.

The legislative strategy behind the creation of this omnibus bill was to make a bill—apparently like AIG—that is too big to fail.

Of course, the bill does contain some worthwhile provisions, including a few that I offered. But if we were wise, if we were wise in this House, our recent experiences with TARP and the stimulus package would serve as a cautionary tale about the need for deliberation before passing gargantuan bills.

Last week, for example, Congress loudly expressed indignation about the Wall Street bonuses. But now we learn that restrictions on bonuses were in the original legislation but they were stripped out in the final bill by someone in Congress, specifically in the Senate.

And yet here we are again, about to ensure that another far-reaching bill will move through the House, unexamined, and it with no opportunity for amendment.

However, there are many areas in this bill that need improvement. I filed, Madam Speaker, just 10 amendments with the Rules Committee on the most serious areas of concern.

Let me highlight just a few of them: Ensuring protection of our border security; producing American-made energy that will create new jobs; ensuring public access to Federal lands—and I will talk about that more in a moment—and restoring Americans' second amendment rights while on Federal lands. This was struck down last Thursday by a judge here in D.C.

On the need to protect our borders, do we know what effect the enhanced environmental restrictions under this bill will have on border security? No, we do not.

The Senate has stricken out an amendment by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona to the National Landscape Conservation System bill that was adopted in this House last April, 414-0. This unanimously approved House amendment stated, "Nothing in this act shall impede any efforts by the Department of Homeland Security to secure the borders of the United States." The Senate stripped this provision from the bill and now that protection is gone.

I filed an amendment with the Rules Committee to restore this provision as it reflects the unanimous House position, as well as another amendment to apply this border security protection language to the entire omnibus bill.

We must ensure that provisions in this bill do not ban the use of vehicles and other technology to patrol and secure our border. But this rule we are debating doesn't allow any amendments to be debated or voted on by this House.

The force behind denying any amendment to the omnibus bill is so great, so

great, that the House is apparently willing to fall over and play dead on border security. We don't even know who is responsible for deleting this amendment in the Senate.

If this bill becomes law without fixing this border security loophole, I fear we will likely look back in the future and say, Well, we really should have kept that safeguard in and not let the Senate strip it out, just like the Senate stripped out the AIG provision that we railed against last week.

The price Americans pay to fill up their cars is starting to go up again, yet H.R. 146 prohibits American-made energy production on Federal lands—production that would create new jobs in these difficult economic times. Our Nation can't afford to shut down the creation of jobs and we can't afford to become even more dependent on foreign oil.

The omnibus bill even locks up Federal lands from renewable energy production, including wind and solar. Again, amendments that I filed to address these issues were rejected by the Rules Committee.

As written, Madam Speaker, the omnibus bill prevents and bans public access to Federal lands in many ways. The recreational riding of bicycles and motorbikes is prohibited in over 2 million acres of public land. Wheelchair access to wilderness areas is effectively banned as well.

Madam Speaker, let me explain. Federal law does not ensure that wheelchairs capable of use in outdoor natural areas are allowed. It only permits wheelchairs that are "suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area."

Madam Speaker, I know there's a great deal that politicians disagree on, but I hope that we can agree on this fundamental fact: Nature is outdoors. Wilderness areas and national parks are located outside, and wheelchairs and similar devices that allow the disabled access to outdoor natural areas is not allowed under existing law or this omnibus bill.

Furthermore, current law expressly says that accommodation for wheelchairs or the disabled in wilderness areas is not required. Therefore, the disabled act reigns.

Public lands should be available for public enjoyment. That includes disabled. Yet access for disabled veterans and all disabled Americans is not protected by this omnibus.

I proposed several amendments to address these shortcomings, including explicit protections for bicycle access, existing motorized recreational vehicle access, as well as an amendment for access for disabled and disabled veterans on lands covered in this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate our friend from Pasco, the ranking

member of the Resources Committee, for his very hard work on this issue, and to report to the House, unfortunately, the fact that the Rules Committee last night, after a very, very contentious debate, on a party-line vote, decided not to allow the very thoughtful amendments that Mr. HASTINGS has brought forward to be considered.

It's interesting to note, if my friend would continue to further yield, that we in the last week or two have been dealing with the aftermath of the 1,100-page stimulus bill that was brought before us.

□ 1045

We know that last week we spent all of our time trying to figure out a way around the \$167 million in bonuses that were provided to AIG executives. Everyone was up in arms about this, and people are still pointing fingers to determine how it is that that measure got into the stimulus bill.

Well, one of the things that we found is that unintended consequences continue to come forward and we, thanks to Mr. HASTINGS' efforts, found an unintended consequence. I have to say, Madam Speaker, for many, many years we, as Republicans, have been maligned, maligned regularly by our friends on the other side of the aisle for trying to pull the rug out from under seniors, starving children, and the disabled. I would not dream of standing here arguing that there is any Member of this House, Democrat or Republican, who would want to deny the disabled access to wilderness areas. But I know this, a problem was raised.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington's time has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Let me say, and I thank both of my colleagues for their kindness, but let me say, Madam Speaker, as we look at this challenge which has been such a great one, there is no one, as I said, who would want to deny any disabled person access, Democrat or Republican, even though we are regularly accused of such heinous acts and have been for many, many years.

But Mr. HASTINGS found the unintended consequence here, and last night in the Rules Committee we came forward and said here is a way to deal with this challenge. We want to ensure that people who are disabled have access to our wilderness areas. And again, Mr. HASTINGS had two amendments. We offered them, and on a party-line vote he was denied an opportunity to offer those amendments.

Again this gets to this point, Madam Speaker, we are in this era of bipartisanship as put forward by Speaker PELOSI, a great desire to listen to the input provided by Members regardless

of political party; and here we have a commonsense package of amendments that will deal with something that no one wants to allow happen, and yet Members of the Republican Party were in fact shut out from having a chance to offer those amendments whatsoever. And I believe it is a very sad day for this institution and the Committee on Rules that such action would take place.

I thank my friend for yielding and thank him again for his very hard work on this important issue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Madam Speaker, there is another issue. I offered an amendment with Mr. BISHOP of Utah dealing with the second amendment rights, and he will speak to that. But I want to tell the House that this is an issue to correct a Federal judge's decision from last week that bans the use of firearms under State law on certain Federal lands. We can rectify that without slowing this bill down at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. We can rectify this, Madam Speaker, by defeating the previous question. If we defeat the previous question and allow a motion to amend the rule to take up the amendment that I offered dealing with the second amendment, then we can add that to the package and this House will have an opportunity to vote on that.

The reason I bring this up, while 2 weeks ago the House put in the Altmire amendment, at that time the nonrestriction on gun ownership on Federal lands was in place until the judge struck it down. This corrects that, and it needs to be corrected. We can correct it today by defeating the previous question and allowing us to amend the rule to take up my amendment on the second amendment.

I urge Members when we get to that point to vote "no" on the previous question so we can amend the rule to take up this issue on gun rights that Mr. BISHOP will talk about later.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy in permitting me to speak on the rule and support for the underlying bill.

This morning marks hopefully the culmination of 7 years of work that I have been involved with in the State of Oregon to preserve one of our special places, the Mount Hood wilderness. It has been a bipartisan effort. Indeed, I hiked around Mount Hood with my good friend and colleague, GREG WALDEN, 5 years ago now, with our staff. We have had countless meetings with stakeholders, with Native Americans,

with cyclists, with all of the special interests that care about this icon of Oregon, Mount Hood. And it took us a lot of hard work to reach the sweet spot where we had bipartisan support. We actually got it through the House once, and it stumbled in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, it is too important for us to start down this trail of starting to tweak the legislation now, because I have watched the Mount Hood wilderness be tied up in Senate politics and procedural activities for a half-dozen years now. I strongly urge that we support this underlying bill and be able to bring in millions of acres of America's special places to give them wilderness designation.

I want to thank my friend, GREG WALDEN; the dean of our delegation, PETER DEFAZIO; and in the other body, Senator WYDEN; former Republican Senator Smith; and new Senator MERKLEY. All of us have joined together on this landmark legislation for Mount Hood. I see my good friend and colleague Congressman MINNICK from Idaho here. This is a journey in Idaho that Representative SIMPSON has been working on for years as well. Members should come together and pass this legislation.

The rule does matter. We have watched one single Member of the other body tie up critical wilderness legislation for years. We have got it through the Senate, finally. We have broad bipartisan support for special places all across America. I strongly urge that we resist the temptation to tinker with this bill now. I would like to think that my colleague on the other side of the aisle is offering this from the purest of motives, but the fact is that we have watched delay and amendment foul up the wilderness legislation procedurally for a half-dozen years.

By approving this rule, approving this legislation, we can move forward with these protections for special places all across America. And then we can go back and deal with any unresolved issues. Heaven knows, I want to make sure that we take care of issues that relate to cyclists, for instance. Vote for the rule, vote for the bill, and get on with business.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, yesterday I went to the Rules Committee and offered an amendment to the Omnibus Public Lands bill that would have saved 80,000 jobs and over \$2.2 billion worth of income in my district by ending the regulatory drought that currently plagues the San Joaquin Valley. Surprisingly, the Rules Committee said "no" to saving 80,000 jobs despite bipartisan support.

My amendment would have temporarily removed the restrictions the Endangered Species Act places on Federal and State water pumps in the California Bay-Delta, allowing water to be moved from northern and central Cali-

fornia to farming families in my district and to millions of urban Californians in the southern portion of the State. Pumping and storing more water is necessary if we want to relieve the devastating drought in California. Yet, the Rules Committee didn't consider the billions of dollars and jobs it would save to be worthwhile.

The way this legislation has been put together and shuttled through Congress is atrocious. The majority has sprinkled a few meritorious provisions in an effort to buy votes around what is otherwise damaging legislation.

This bill blocks millions of acres from new oil and gas leasing and all other business activity. Further, the bill designates more than 2 million acres as wilderness acres, permanently restricting public access. The Federal Government already owns 30 percent of the total land area of the United States. It doesn't need any more.

Though I will not vote for the Omnibus Public Lands bill for the serious reasons previously stated, there are some supportable measures in the bill. The Tuolumne Me-Wuk Land Transfer Act, the Madera Water Supply Enhancement Act, and the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement are three examples.

The Madera Water Supply Enhancement Act creates an underground water bank in my district which is desperately needed in the San Joaquin Valley to mitigate the effects of drought and the onerous Endangered Species Act regulations.

I also support the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement, resolving a 20-year lawsuit that threatened the water supply for farmers in the San Joaquin Valley. The San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement gave my agricultural constituents something they did not previously have: a seat at the negotiating table. Before the settlement, a Federal judge was going to decide how much water farmers would lose in order to restore a salmon fishery. By giving farmers a voice in the solution, the settlement prevents an agricultural disaster and gives the agricultural community some control over their water future. Additionally, all 22 water districts of the Friant Water Users Authority have consistently voted in support of the settlement. The settlement is a product of hardworking folks who simply want to continue growing food to feed this great Nation with a safe, reliable, and efficient water supply. I believe we have accomplished that goal in this settlement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield another 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I support these portions of the Omnibus Public Lands Act, and believe that they should be passed on their own merit. However, for reasons stated above, I cannot support the overall package and urge my colleagues to vote again this rule that did not allow

a vote to save 80,000 jobs and over \$2 million in income in California at no cost to the taxpayers.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Omnibus Public Lands bill under consideration, as well as the rule.

This bipartisan and bicameral effort has taken a lot of work, and it has been a long and twisting road. But we have before us today a widely supported piece of legislation that benefits our Nation from Florida to Alaska, Texas to Minnesota, and, indeed, my district in Colorado.

I was lucky enough to grow up in Boulder, Colorado, hiking in Mount Sanitas, the Flat Irons, and Flagstaff Mountain—all areas under public management. This bill will protect and defend some of America's truly great public lands so that children all across the country can grow up enjoying our environment and interacting with our ecosystems, just like I did when I was a kid.

It will also finally give Rocky Mountain National Park, a prized jewel in Colorado, the wilderness designation it deserves. The Rockies, rising high above Denver and our surrounding communities, are visited by local residents and international adventurers who come to be surrounded by our awe-inspiring landscapes and diverse ecosystem.

These visitors sustain Colorado communities like Estes Park and Grand Lake, communities that rely on tourism and recreation jobs, and will be well served by this bill.

Furthermore, the National Landscape Conservation System, the wild and scenic rivers and national heritage areas that this bill codifies, will enrich our country many times over. Just as Rocky Mountain National Park and the Indian Peaks Wilderness have enriched the culture and history of Colorado, the National Landscape Conservation System will enrich our country.

This bill's passage is long overdue. It will preserve landscapes, educate generations, enrich lives and support local communities. We have addressed any reasonable concerns that have been posed, and at long last it is time for this bill to become law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important piece of legislation. I thank Chairman RAHALL for his leadership on this bill, Representative PINGREE for her leadership on the rule, and I look forward to sending this bill to the President.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now would like to yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

□ 1100

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, this new bill and the amendments

to the bill cover 177 different issues, 100 of which were obviously never discussed in the House before. I think it is important to note that the chairman of this committee, Mr. RAHALL, the Democrat chairman, would not have done this. On each of the issues we actually did discuss, he went through regular order. There were hearings. There was a markup. They brought them individually to the floor for debate.

This bill is in this condition not because there were Senate filibusters, for indeed some of these provisions have sat over in the Senate for as long as 2 years. This bill—this concoction—is here simply because the Senate failed to do their job. They did not hold hearings. They did not hold markups. They did not bring these issues to the floor in a regular manner. They lumped them all together.

And now it is almost humorous to watch the contortions that the Democratic Party is going to go through to try and stifle any kind of debate or change in this bill. Originally it came to us as a suspension in a situation in which it could not be amended, could not have a motion to recommit, even though it did somehow get an amendment on it. Now it is coming back to us in a version of amendments to another Revolutionary War bill. They actually had a Civil War monument battlefield bill over there with a Republican sponsor. They could have at least made those amendments to that bill and appeared bipartisan. But nonetheless it is now here to us as the form of amendments with a closed rule so we can't talk about them again.

Now one of the amendments that got into this bill, even though it wasn't actually supposed to get into the bill, dealt with hunting rights. Mr. HASTINGS of Washington talked about that issue very briefly. Hunting is not the same thing as the second amendment. And we have special interests that went before a maverick judge who ruled that 8 months of study is not the same thing as a quick review. It is not long enough. And therefore that judge, in her own right, changed National Park Service policy that was designed to create consistency and created instead chaos.

If the Park Service rule had been left in place without this judge playing around with it, all public lands under the Department of the Interior would be treated the same way. The Bureau of Land Management does not prohibit against lawful concealed carry anywhere that it is allowed by States. The Forest Service doesn't do it either. Only the Park Service. And the Park Service changed their rule to make it in compliance with everything else and bring consistency. This judge changed it to chaos.

Now when we think about national parks, we think about Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, Zion and Bryce. But the National Park Service controls lands, they control roads and walkways. It is impossible to drive or jog without

going in and out of Park Service land which is never signed or notified, so no one really knows whether you are actually legally carrying a concealed weapon or not. We have had people who have been arrested, entrapped, on Park Service land for carrying a concealed weapon where if they had gone a couple of blocks further, they would be in Virginia territory where it was legal. That is ridiculous. That is silly.

Yet this provision is now done by judicial fiat, which means that the hunting amendment that was put in by the Democrats in the contortion of trying to get this bill through is now meaningless and it is insignificant, which is why Representative HASTINGS of Washington has an amendment to reverse that decision and bring consistency back to the Department of the Interior.

This is the proper time. It is the proper venue. It should have been made in order. It would have solved the problem.

I introduced another amendment in there to simply take four amendments that were passed by this House on the floor, bipartisan amendments, Republican and Democrat, that were voted in a bipartisan way and rejected by the Senate simply because the Senate said they didn't have the time to review what the House did. These were short amendments. If you wrote small, you could put them all on one page. It is wrong that the Senate rejects the work of this floor. This side of the Capitol is just as important as that side of the Capitol.

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It is just as important as that side of the Capitol. And what we do should be respected. That amendment should have been put in order so that what the House passed and what the House said should be part of this particular bill if indeed it is going to pass. There is no reason why we should have our amendments taken out and let the Senate simply do what it wants to because the Senate failed to work in an orderly process while they had these bills for years and years.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. MINNICK).

Mr. MINNICK. Madam Speaker, this legislation protects public lands in my home State of Idaho within the vast Owyhee Canyonlands. It is contained within one county in my district which is larger than five States and has only 12,000 hardscrabble residents, fewer people per square mile than any county in the continental United States.

Last summer, I had the privilege of spending several days floating a rarely visited upper stretch of the Owyhee River within the area this bill will protect. If passed, this bill will permanently protect as wilderness 517,000 stunning, unspoiled acres of my home State's landscape and would provide Wild and Scenic status to nearly 315

miles of its free flowing rivers. It will also guarantee that the ranching families who have protected this land for generations will continue on, with their grazing rights protected from the free-ranging ORVs which will be restricted to designated roads and trails.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. MINNICK. I salute my colleague in the Senate, MIKE CRAPO, who fostered a bipartisan collaborative process of ranchers, public officials, community leaders and conservationists to preserve our cherished Owyhees.

I urge my colleagues to support this historic legislation. I support the rule.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now would like to yield 1 minute to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

A couple of minutes ago, our friend from the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Oregon said, and I wrote it down, "We need to resist the temptation to tinker with this." Wow. I don't really have a category for that. Think about the experience that we're coming off of where this body failed to properly vet the stimulus package that ends up passing with an 1,100-page thud and all of a sudden people are unable to answer the simple question, did you read it or did you not read it? And we have an AIG debacle that has completely confused and created a great deal of consternation across the country.

Nearly half the bills that are being contemplated in this omnibus, Madam Speaker, have not been contemplated by the House, and that is considered "tinkering"? I think that this is acting as a coequal branch of government. And we ought not to give up this authority, we ought not to give up this responsibility, and we need to vote against this rule so that this House can do the right thing.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I reserve my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield 2 minutes to our colleague, Mr. FLEMING, from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina.

I want to speak out on this rule and certainly the underlying legislation for the omnibus public land bill. The Constitution of the United States has long been a thorn in the side of many activist judges in this country. Last week we witnessed another act of hostility towards the Constitution when a U.S. district judge single-handedly decided to recede one of our basic constitutional rights. The ruling by Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly eliminating a law-abiding citizen's right to carry a concealed weapon on Federal lands is a direct assault on the second amendment.

The right to bear arms was a founding principle of our democracy, and the second amendment spells out this principle in clear, unambiguous language

that requires no clarification or translation: "The right of the People to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Citizens should not lose this right just because they are standing or driving on Federal lands.

It is our responsibility in Congress to craft legislation that is in accordance with the Constitution. And we should not see cede this responsibility to an agenda-driven activist judge.

I urge my colleagues to join me in upholding and protecting this country's founding document by voting to restore Americans' second amendment rights on public lands.

"A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

Let us never forget the second amendment and its importance.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I reserve my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to Mr. NUNES, the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, around the world today, more than 1 billion people do not have access to water. Conflict rages among populations on every continent for the control of this vital resource. In the undeveloped world, violence and bloodshed often determine winners and losers. And, indeed, brutal dictators like Robert Mugabe have taken water from their own people as a means of control.

Most Americans would never believe our government is capable of such an act, the intentional drying up of entire communities. That is what the San Joaquin River Settlement does to central California.

Madam Speaker, the Democrat leadership in Congress clearly has no interest in the economic prosperity of the San Joaquin Valley and no compassion for those suffering due to manmade water shortages.

This legislation will ensure higher unemployment in a region nearing 20 percent unemployment. The poverty you are creating is unprecedented. This body's cruelty in the face of suffering is beyond belief.

If this Congress isn't capable of delivering water to people, perhaps we can ask the United Nations for help. Maybe they would be willing to deliver water, distribute humanitarian aid and rebuild the San Joaquin Valley you seem so committed to destroying.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and vote "no" on this bill.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I continue to reserve my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Maine if she is prepared to close.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Yes. I am the last speaker for this side. I will reserve my time until the gentlewoman has closed for her side and yielded back her time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 4 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. I must urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can amend this rule to restore Americans' second amendment rights on public lands and wildlife refuges. In January, with overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle, the Federal Government announced a commonsense policy to allow citizens legally to carry concealed firearms in national parks and wildlife refuges in accordance with State law.

Last week, House and Senate leaders added an amendment, sponsored by Representative JASON ALTMIRE, to the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act that protects hunting and fishing on certain parts of Federal land. It clarified that the States have the authority to manage fish and wildlife. In short, the Altmire amendment made certain that Americans kept their second amendment right to carry concealed firearms on public land.

However, in an arbitrary reversal of sound policy on March 19, a U.S. district judge single-handedly decided to block this commonsense policy to allow citizens to carry concealed firearms in national parks and wildlife refuges in accordance with State laws. As Ranking Member HASTINGS said, "There is now a giant hole in the Altmire language." Americans' constitutional second amendment rights are again in jeopardy, and I call on the Democrats in charge to amend this rule so Congress can protect these rights as we were sent here by our constituents to do.

For months, Democrats in the House and Senate have done everything in their power to block the House from voting on any amendments to this enormous 1,200-page, \$10 billion bill which combines over 160 land bills, most of which have never had hearings in either the House or the Senate.

This bill contains hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars in new spending and locks up additional public land which may have energy resource potential. Many of the bills rolled into this package are controversial and ambiguous, yet in a series of hasty maneuvers to silence dissent, the Democrats have worked to marginalize rather than engage the healthy debate our constituents deserve on these bills.

With this new court ruling, Americans' second amendment rights would be in jeopardy on all Federal land, including 2 million new acres of land designated as "wilderness areas" under this bill. Today, there are 708 federally imposed "wilderness areas" totaling 107 million acres of land in 44 States. If this bill is enacted, the amount of Federal wilderness areas will exceed the amount of all developed land in the United States. If Congress does not take action to protect every American's constitutional rights now, it won't be long before these rights are in jeopardy on even more land.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I call on the Democrats in charge to fulfill their obligation to the American people by restoring their second amendment right to carry concealed firearms on public lands in accordance with State law.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and defeat the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, let me be clear on two things. Nothing in this bill in any way limits or restricts access as defined by the ADA. Nothing in H.R. 146 changes the status quo in regards to regulation of hunting, fishing and recreational activities in designated areas.

I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from the National Rifle Association supporting the Altmire amendment to the omnibus public land management bill.

□ 1115

I will also submit for the RECORD a full editorial in today's New York Times, and I would like to read briefly from that editorial.

"This bill establishes three new national park units and protects more than 1,000 miles of wild and scenic rivers and streams from development. But what makes it a memorial piece of legislation are provisions giving permanent wilderness status, the highest layer of protection the law can confer, to 2 million acres of public land in nine States ranging from California and Oregon to Virginia. This would be the largest addition to the nation's store of protected wilderness, now about 107 million acres, since 1994.

"The bill has broad bipartisan support in Congress and the country at large. But after surviving a threatened filibuster in the Senate in January, it failed by two votes in the House, partly for complex parliamentary reasons and partly because some House Members felt that not all the measure's moving parts (the bill is really 160 smaller bills wrapped into one big one) had been properly vetted in committee.

"This is a defect that afflicts many omnibus bills. It is also true, however, that every single provision in the bill is a product of long and intense negotiations stretching back years on the State and local level, and the product, that is, of consensus.

"The measure is now back in the House after a second trip through the Senate. It has been approved each step of the way. Its most controversial provision for a road through a wildlife refuge in Alaska has been revised for the better. It now gives the Secretary of the Interior the power to veto the road if he feels it would cause excessive environmental damage."

The New York Times closes by saying, "The House should honor all of this work, as well as the country's need for protected open space, by approving this worthy measure."

This legislation has been through the House and the Senate numerous times in one form or another. The items in the bill have been thoroughly vetted. Most, if not all the House provisions have had extensive hearings, committee markups and been passed by the full House. The bill is a bipartisan product that contains language sought by Members on both sides of the aisle. That was reflected in the last week's suspension vote of 282-144 here in the House. The Senate vote was 77-20. Any changes at this point would require that the bill goes back to the Senate, where further action is very unlikely. It is time to pass this widely supported bipartisan legislation and send it to the White House for the President's signature. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INSTITUTE FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION,

Fairfax, VA, March 10, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,

Republican Leader, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER BOEHNER: On behalf of the National Rifle Association, I am writing to express our support for the Altmire amendment to S. 22, the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009. The Altmire amendment would ensure that the provisions of S. 22 will not be used to close lands that are currently open to hunting, fishing, trapping, target shooting and other forms of traditional recreation. In addition, the amendment clarifies that the states retain the authority to manage resident fish and wildlife.

Encroaching development and the increasing population demand for open space has resulted the closure of federal lands that were once open to traditional forms of recreation, such as hunting and target shooting. Whether it is the closure of a trail that served as the access point for a generations-old hunting camp or the closure of large areas to target shooting, the sportsman's way of life has been under attack. There are those who would exacerbate this situation by attempting to use land designations to further close federal lands to sportsmen. This is why the Altmire amendment is necessary.

The Altmire amendment has already been applied to the National Landscape Conservation System Act within S. 22. It is critical to extend this protection for sportsmen to other areas of the bill, specifically Titles V and VIII pertaining to Rivers and Trails and National Heritage Areas, respectively. This is precisely what the Altmire amendment would do.

While the NRA takes no position on S. 22 as a whole, the meaningful protections provided by the Altmire amendment are critical to preserve access for sportsmen and the authority of the states to manage resident wildlife populations. For these reasons, we support its inclusion in S. 22.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

CHRIS W. COX,
Executive Director,
NRA-ILA.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 25, 2009]

A BILL WHOSE TIME HAS COME

Maybe, just maybe, with a little nudge from Speaker NANCY PELOSI and other House Democrats, Congress will at last push a historic omnibus public lands bill over the finish line, perhaps as early as Wednesday.

The bill establishes three new national park units and protects more than 1,000 miles of "wild and scenic" rivers and streams from development. But what makes it a memorable piece of legislation are provisions giving permanent wilderness status—the highest layer of protection the law can confer—to two million acres of public land in nine states ranging from California and Oregon to Virginia.

This would be the largest addition to the nation's store of protected wilderness—now about 107 million acres—since 1994.

The bill has broad bipartisan support in Congress and the country at large. But after surviving a threatened filibuster in the Senate in January, it failed by two votes in the House—partly for complex parliamentary reasons and partly because some House members felt that not all of the measure's moving parts (the bill is really 160 smaller bills wrapped into one big one) had been properly vetted in committee.

This is a defect that afflicts many omnibus bills. It is also true, however, that every single provision in the bill is the product of long and intense negotiations stretching back years on the state and local level—the product, that is, of consensus.

The measure is now back in the House after a second trip through the Senate. It has been improved each step of the way. Its most controversial provision—for a road through a wildlife refuge in Alaska—has been revised for the better; it now gives the secretary of the interior the power to veto the road if he feels it would cause excessive environmental damage.

The House should honor all this work, as well as the country's need for protected open space, by approving this worthy measure.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 280 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

After "concur in the Senate" strike "amendments" and insert "amendment to the title and concur in the Senate amendment to the text with the amendment specified in section 2".

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. 2. The amendment to the text referred to in section 1 is as follows: At the end of title XIII, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

"SEC. 13007. FIREARMS IN NATIONAL PARKS AND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES.

"Except as provided in section 930 of title 18, United States Code, a person may possess, carry, and transport firearms within a national park area or national wildlife refuge area in accordance with the laws of the State in which the national park area or national wildlife refuge are, or that portion thereof, is located".

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.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2009.

Chairwoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER,
House Rules Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN SLAUGHTER: It is with deep personal regret that I learned of comments you made about my truthfulness at yesterday's Rules Committee hearing in describing the lack of access that disabled Americans and disabled veterans will have on federal lands covered under H.R. 146, the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act of 2009.

Having served on the Rules Committee for twelve years, I take particular exception to the fact you chose to direct your comments

at me only after I departed the hearing following my appearing before you as a witness for an hour. If there were doubts about the accuracy of what I stated, courtesy and fair play would mean allowing me the opportunity to rebut your accusations with the facts.

The facts show that my amendments to ensure access for the disabled and disabled veterans on federal lands in this bill are very much needed. As written, the Omnibus Lands Bill prevents and bans public access to federal lands in many ways. The recreational riding of bicycles and motor bikes is prohibited on over 2 million acres of public land. Wheelchair access to wilderness areas is effectively banned as well. Federal law does not ensure that wheelchairs capable of use in outdoor, natural areas are allowed—it only permits wheelchairs that are "suitable for use in an indoor pedestrian area." Wilderness areas and national parks are located outdoors, not indoors. Wheelchairs and similar devices that allow the disabled access to outdoor, natural areas are not ensured under existing law or this Omnibus bill. Furthermore, current federal law expressly says that accommodations for wheelchairs or the disabled in Wilderness areas are not required.

Public lands should be available for public enjoyment, and that includes for the disabled. Yet, true access for disabled veterans and all disabled Americans is not protected in this Omnibus. I proposed two amendments to explicitly ensure access for the disabled and disabled veterans to lands covered in the Omnibus bill. As you know, these amendments were blocked by you and Democrat Members of the Rules Committee.

I regret the inaccurate, false statements made about my truthfulness, and that such comments were made only after I left the hearing room. But what I most seriously regret is that the Rules Committee under your leadership refused to ensure true access for the disabled and disabled veterans for public lands in the Omnibus bill.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Ranking Republican Member,
House Natural Resources Committee.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and 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 yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM ACT OF 2009

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 383) to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (division A of Public Law 110-343) to provide the Special Inspector General with additional authorities and responsibilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 383

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. AUDIT AND INVESTIGATION AUTHORITIES.

Section 121 of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (division A of Public Law 110-343) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

"(4)(A) Except as provided under subparagraph (B) and in addition to the duties specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), the Special Inspector General shall have the authority to conduct, supervise, and coordinate an audit or investigation of any action taken under this title as the Special Inspector General determines appropriate.

"(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any action taken under section 115, 116, 117, or 125."; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking "subsection (c)(1)" and inserting "subsection (c)(1) and (4)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) The Office of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program shall be treated as an office included under section 6(e)(3) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) relating to the exemption from the initial determination of eligibility by the Attorney General."

SEC. 3. PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES.

Section 121(e) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (division A of Public Law 110-343) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting "(A)" after "(1)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), the Special Inspector General may exercise the authorities of subsections (b) through (i) of section 3161 of title 5, United States Code (without regard to subsection (a) of that section).

"(ii) In exercising the employment authorities under subsection (b) of section 3161 of title 5, United States Code, as provided under clause (i) of this subparagraph—

"(I) the Special Inspector General may not make any appointment on and after the date occurring 6 months after the date of enactment of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program Act of 2009;

"(II) paragraph (2) of that subsection (relating to periods of appointments) shall not apply; and

"(III) no period of appointment may exceed the date on which the Office of the Special Inspector General terminates under subsection (k)."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(5)(A) Except as provided under subparagraph (B), if an annuitant receiving an annuity from the Civil Service Retirement and