

Conyers	Jackson Lee	Neal (MA)
Cooper	(TX)	Neugebauer
Costa	Jenkins	Nunes
Costello	Johnson (IL)	Nye
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Obey
Crowley	Jones	Olson
Cuellar	Jordan (OH)	Olver
Culberson	Kagen	Ortiz
Cummings	Kanjorski	Owens
Dahlkemper	Kaptur	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pascarell
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Pastor (AZ)
Davis (KY)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Paul
Davis (TN)	Kilroy	Paulsen
DeFazio	Kind	Payne
DeGette	King (IA)	Pelosi
Delahunt	King (NY)	Pence
DeLauro	Kingston	Perlmutter
Dent	Kirk	Perriello
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peters
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kissell	Peterson
Dicks	Klein (FL)	Petri
Dingell	Kline (MN)	Pingree (ME)
Doggett	Kosmas	Pitts
Donnelly (IN)	Kratovil	Platts
Doyle	Kucinich	Poe (TX)
Dreier	Lamborn	Polis (CO)
Driehaus	Lance	Pomeroy
Duncan	Langevin	Posey
Edwards (MD)	Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)
Edwards (TX)	Larson (CT)	Putnam
Ehlers	Latham	Quigley
Ellison	LaTourette	Rahall
Ellsworth	Latta	Rangel
Emerson	Lee (CA)	Rehberg
Engel	Lee (NY)	Reichert
Eshoo	Levin	Reyes
Etheridge	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez
Fallin	Lewis (GA)	Roe (TN)
Farr	Linder	Rogers (AL)
Fattah	Lipinski	Rogers (KY)
Filner	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
Flake	Loebach	Rohrabacher
Fleming	Lofgren, Zoe	Rooney
Forbes	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Fortenberry	Lucas	Roskam
Foster	Luetkemeyer	Ross
Fox	Lujan	Rothman (NJ)
Frank (MA)	Lummis	Roybal-Allard
Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Frelinghuysen	E.	Rush
Fudge	Mack	Ryan (OH)
Garamendi	Maffei	Ryan (WI)
Garrett (NJ)	Maloney	Salazar
Gerlach	Manzullo	Sanchez, Loretta
Giffords	Marchant	Sarbanes
Gingrey (GA)	Markey (CO)	Scalise
Gohmert	Markey (MA)	Schakowsky
Goodlatte	Marshall	Schauer
Gordon (TN)	Matheson	Schiff
Granger	Matsui	Schmidt
Graves	McCarthy (CA)	Schock
Grayson	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Green, Al	McCaul	Scott (VA)
Green, Gene	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Grijalva	McCollum	Serrano
Guthrie	McCotter	Sessions
Gutierrez	McDermott	Sestak
Hall (NY)	McGovern	Shadegg
Hall (TX)	McHenry	Shea-Porter
Halvorson	McIntyre	Shimkus
Hare	McKeon	Shuler
Harman	McMahon	Shuster
Harper	McMorris	Simpson
Hastings (FL)	Rodgers	Sires
Hastings (WA)	McNerney	Skelton
Heinrich	Meeks (NY)	Slaughter
Heller	Melancon	Smith (NE)
Hensarling	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Herger	Michaud	Smith (TX)
Hersteth Sandlin	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Higgins	Miller (MI)	Snyder
Hill	Miller (NC)	Souder
Himes	Miller, Gary	Space
Hinchey	Miller, George	Speier
Hinojosa	Minnick	Spratt
Hirono	Mitchell	Stark
Hodes	Mollohan	Stearns
Holden	Moore (KS)	Stupak
Holt	Moore (WI)	Sullivan
Honda	Moran (KS)	Sutton
Hoyer	Moran (VA)	Tanner
Hunter	Murphy (CT)	Taylor
Inglis	Murphy (NY)	Teague
Inslie	Murphy, Patrick	Thompson (CA)
Israel	Murphy, Tim	Thompson (MS)
Issa	Nadler (NY)	Thompson (PA)
Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Thornberry

Tiahrt	Velázquez	Westmoreland
Tiberi	Visclosky	Whitfield
Tierney	Walden	Wilson (OH)
Titus	Walz	Wilson (SC)
Tonko	Waters	Wittman
Towns	Watson	Wolf
Tsongas	Watt	Woolsey
Turner	Waxman	Wu
Upton	Weiner	Yarmuth
Van Hollen	Welch	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—26

Barrett (SC)	Johnson (GA)	Schrader
Bilbray	Lynch	Scott (GA)
Boehner	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Boyd	Myrick	Terry
Campbell	Price (GA)	Wamp
Davis (AL)	Radanovich	Wasserman
Gallegly	Richardson	Schultz
Gonzalez	Ruppersberger	Young (AK)
Griffith	Sanchez, Linda	
Hoekstra	T.	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1648

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4715, CLEAN ESTUARIES ACT OF 2010, WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-463) on the resolution (H. Res. 1248) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4715) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 49

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 49.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1549

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my cosponsorship from H.R. 1549.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 610

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 610, a bill originally introduced by Representative Wexler of Florida, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct initiated an investigation into allegations related to earmarks and campaign contributions in the Spring of 2009.

Whereas, on December 2, 2009, reports and findings in seven separate matters involving the alleged connection between earmarks and campaign contributions were forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics to the Standards Committee.

Whereas, on February 26, 2010, the Standards Committee made public its report on the matter wherein the Committee found, though a widespread perception exists among corporations and lobbyists that campaign contributions provide a greater chance of obtaining earmarks, there was no evidence that Members or their staff considered contributions when requesting earmarks.

Whereas, the Committee indicated that, with respect to the matters forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics, neither the evidence cited in the OCE's findings nor the evidence in the record before the Standards Committee provided a substantial reason to believe that violations of applicable standards of conduct occurred.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics is prohibited from reviewing activities taking place prior to March of 2008 and lacks the authority to subpoena witnesses and documents.

Whereas, for example, the Office of Congressional Ethics noted that in some instances documents were redacted or specific information was not provided and that, in at least one instance, they had reason to believe a witness withheld information requested and did not identify what was being withheld.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics also noted that they were able to interview only six former employees of the PMA Group, with many former employees refusing to consent to interviews and the OCE unable to obtain evidence within PMA's possession.

Whereas, Roll Call noted that "the committee report was five pages long and included no documentation of any evidence collected or any interviews conducted by the committee, beyond a statement that the investigation 'included extensive document reviews and interviews with numerous witnesses.'" (Roll Call, March 8, 2010)

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee included in their investigation any activities that occurred prior to 2008.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee interviewed any Members in the course of their investigation.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee, in the course of their investigation, initiated their own subpoenas or followed the Office of Congressional Ethics recommendations to issue subpoenas. Therefore be it:

Resolved, That not later than seven days after the adoption of this resolution, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall report to the House of Representatives, with respect to the activities addressed in its report of February 26, 2010, (1) how many witnesses were interviewed, (2) how many, if any, subpoenas were issued in the course of their investigation, and (3) what documents were reviewed and their availability for public review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Arizona will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

TAX DAY

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, Republicans want Americans to believe that they are the party of tax cuts. Sure, they are—tax cuts for the rich. In these tough times, their brand of tax relief wouldn't help Sue and John, working parents who are raising three kids and who are trying to make ends meet.

Yet this Congress knows that America's future can't be based on huge tax cuts for the wealthy. We have to give real tax relief to real working Americans, and that is just what we've done. We've done it for 95 percent of working families, saving them up to \$800 a year. We've done it by making it easier for young families to buy their first homes, saving up to \$8,000, and we've done it by making it easier for parents to save up to \$2,500 to pay for college. This Congress has passed 25 different tax cuts, saving American families over \$800 billion, and more relief is on the way.

The overheated rhetoric of the minority is not based on reality. By any measure, taxes are lower today than they were under their leadership.

RESPONSIBLE USE OF THE AMERICAN TAX DOLLAR

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, every American must file their income taxes by midnight tomorrow, and they understand that the United States Congress determines how much of their hard-earned money is taken for Federal taxes and how it is spent.

Since the Democratic majority and the Obama administration have been in charge of taxing the American people, we've seen a massive increase in taxes of \$670 billion and counting. Here are just a few examples:

Taxes on American families and businesses that don't purchase government-approved health care, taxes on medical devices, such as pacemakers and artificial limbs, taxes on businesses that provide pharmaceutical coverage for retirees, even taxes on those who go to tanning salons.

Yet, with all of these massive tax increases, the Democratic and Obama spending spree drove the Federal budget deficit to over \$1.4 trillion last year and has driven it to nearly \$1.6 trillion this year. To keep this spending spree going, they will be looking for even higher taxes. Just recently, one of the President's top economic advisers proposed a European-style value added tax that would hit every American, rich and poor.

Enough is enough. It is long past time that this Congress and this administration realized that we cannot tax and spend our way back to prosperity. How about a tax policy that we can believe in for a change? Let's get spending under control and reduce the tax burden on the American people.

NATION-BUILDING HERE AT HOME

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, after 8 long years, hundreds of billions of dollars of deficit spending and, most importantly, thousands of our brave soldiers killed or wounded, it is past time to reexamine our strategy in Afghanistan.

Instead of nation-building in Afghanistan, I believe we should be doing some more nation-building here at home. The American people deserve accountability in terms of how and when our troops will be returned to their families and in terms of how taxpayer dollars are being spent.

Today, Congressman WALTER JONES and I introduced legislation that would require the President to provide a plan and a timetable for drawing down our forces in Afghanistan and to identify any variables that could require changes to that timetable. I should

note that the bill does not set a specific date for withdrawal. The bill would safeguard U.S. taxpayer dollars by ensuring all U.S. activity in Afghanistan be overseen by the Inspector General.

We must aggressively go after al Qaeda and its allies wherever they are, but I am not convinced that a long-term occupation of Afghanistan in support of a corrupt, incompetent government is in our best national security interests.

I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THE HANDS OF TERRORISTS

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, two Middle Eastern newspapers reported today that Syria has transferred scud missiles to a terrorist group in Lebanon. This repeats actions by Iran and Syria in 2006 when they gave cruise missiles to Hezbollah. It shows that the Syrians and Iranians have no wish to control their arsenals. They will transfer any weapon they own to terrorist groups. These reports tell us two things:

First, the U.N. army that we sent to Lebanon in 2006 is an utter failure that makes no effort to stop the largest missiles from deploying next to their very own U.N. camps. Second, it shows that, once Iran makes nuclear weapons, it will transfer them to terrorists like Hezbollah and who knows who else.

THE IRANIAN NUCLEAR THREAT

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of great concern about the Iranian nuclear threat. As dozens of foreign leaders meet here in Washington to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, I am deeply worried that we are allowing the greatest potential nuclear threat in the world to go unchecked. Iran has repeatedly threatened to wipe Israel off the map. They have threatened to destabilize the entire Middle East and, with that, the entire global community.

In his last visit to the United States, former Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon said that a nuclear Iran "represents as great a threat to the United States, to Europe and to the entire Middle East as it does to Israel."

The rest of the world should not expect Israel to do its dirty work. I agreed with that then. I agree with it now.

If we want to avoid a nuclear Iran—and I believe we must—and if we want to ensure that Israel does not have to take matters into its own hands, we must immediately enact strong, effective economic sanctions that make it