

on Israel at this critical time. We must stand with them. We must support them and their right to protect and defend the safety of their people and the sovereignty of their nation.

The Israeli Government just announced the decision to appoint an independent public commission to review the circumstances surrounding the flotilla raid. This commission will be headed by a retired Israeli judge and will include two Israeli experts in international law and two high-ranking foreign observers. This action demonstrates Israel's commitment to act within the law and to hold itself accountable in good faith to the international community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STEWART WINSTEIN

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sorrow at the news of the death of my friend, Stewart Winstein, from Rock Island, Illinois.

Stewart was one of the most respected and admired leaders in my community and built a strong reputation for local activism, public service, and the belief that politics could be a driving force for positive change in the lives of everyday Americans. It's a legacy that will be sorely missed in Rock Island, the city that Stewart loved and called home.

As a child of the Great Depression, Stewart and his family faced great poverty. It was a powerful influence on him and I'm sure formed much of his success as an attorney and a founding force of the Rock Island Democratic Party.

As one of the greatest advocates for working men and women that I knew, I think his legacy will be that he wanted to make sure that other families didn't have to face economic hardships that he knew too well. And as many in the Quad Cities can attest, whether it was working people or the vast number of clients he represented, it is a legacy of great success.

Stewart had a huge impact on my life. He was a valuable teacher who led by example, and I learned by witnessing firsthand the contributions he made to the Democratic Party, numerous charities and local government. Above all, I was proud to call Stewart my friend. My thoughts go out to Stewart's family, especially his beloved son, Arthur.

□ 1030

GROWING DEMOCRATS' PROGRAMS

(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. Mr. Speaker, the dire warnings of economists and the vivid lessons of Greece

and of other debt-burdened European countries which are collapsing under their cradle-to-grave welfare systems have done nothing to restrain the Democrats in Washington. They have failed to heed the warnings from abroad, and they continue to simply declare their out-of-control spending as emergency spending to try to cover up their fiscal irresponsibility.

As a constitutional conservative with grave concerns about the Democrats' out-of-control spending, I support a different plan. I say balance the budget; cut the deficit; pay down the debt; fire the czars; and grow the economy.

With President Obama in control, the term "GDP" has taken on a whole new meaning—growing Democrats' programs.

JOSH CONFERENCE

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

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, we are 2 weeks into the hurricane season, and already the first tropical depression has formed in the Atlantic. If one of these storms were to strike the Gulf of Mexico, with millions of barrels of oil on top, the results would be disastrous to the communities along the gulf.

To make sure our region is prepared to deal with the effects that a hurricane or a tropical storm could have, this past Monday I held a joint oil spill-hurricane planning conference in Bay County, Florida. The conference brought together representatives from Federal and State emergency response agencies, and it brought together military leaders and key local stakeholders to discuss the hazards associated with a hurricane's impact on the oil spill and to discuss the threats posed to our area by having oil propelled inland.

Working together, we identified several planning and action items that need to be taken to better brace for the effects that a storm would have on our communities now that there is oil in the Gulf of Mexico. I plan to deliver these action items to the President and to urge him to incorporate these recommendations into a Federal hurricane preparedness and response plan so that our communities and people can be better protected.

North Florida is already feeling the significant economic and environmental distress from the BP oil spill. It is our responsibility to take steps to safeguard our region.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5297, SMALL BUSINESS JOBS AND CREDIT ACT OF 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1448 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1448

Resolved, That during further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5297) to create the Small Business Lending Fund Program to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make capital investments in eligible institutions in order to increase the availability of credit for small businesses, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1436, it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution as though they were the last two amendments printed in part C of House Report 111-506.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1448.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1448 is a structured rule, providing for further consideration of H.R. 5297, the Small Business Lending Fund Act. It provides for the consideration of two amendments which were initially cleared as PAYGO-compliant but which were subsequently deemed to violate PAYGO after the first rule was adopted. These amendments have been revised to comply with PAYGO rules, and this rule treats them as part of yesterday's rule.

Mr. Speaker, in 2008, after years of lax regulation and Wall Street roulette, our Nation's economy fell off a cliff. Within a matter of months, many Wall Street giants fell, and they took the livelihoods of thousands of small businesses with them. Since that time, we have taken bold action to stabilize the economy, to invest in economic growth, and we are in the process of putting in place new rules to protect against the casino-like atmosphere that existed on Wall Street.

Yet for small businesses, they are still feeling the pinch. Accessing capital to build, to grow, to diversify, and to hire new employees remains a pressing challenge. In September of 2008, there was an earthquake on Wall Street, and the aftershocks are still being felt on Main Street. The purpose of this bill is to help those small businesses deal with the aftershocks of that credit crunch from a year and a half ago.

The underlying bill, the Small Business Lending Fund Act, establishes a process for community banks to lend responsibly to small businesses. Because of a mistake, two of my colleagues, Representative SCHRADER and

Representative MILLER, were precluded from offering their amendments as reported in yesterday's rule. This rule merely allows for the consideration of their modified amendments so we can perfect this legislation and get our Nation's small businesses back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 days ago, I came before this body in opposition to a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 5297, a bill affectionately known as "TARP III." At that time, I expressed concern over the cost of this bill and over the ruling Democrats' lack of ability to run this House in an orderly fashion. My presence here today is testament to these concerns.

If the process for considering this legislation and accompanying amendments had been more thoroughly vetted, we could have avoided meeting today altogether, but apparently, in their zeal to add to the budget-busting TARP III legislation, some flawed amendments were found to violate the Democrats' cherished PAYGO rules.

Yesterday, it was discovered that two amendments—Miller No. 46 and Schrader No. 14—were not PAYGO-compliant. H.R. 5297 is being paid for with the savings in H.R. 5486, but due to the timetables used for those savings, the amendments failed to meet the first 5-year window of PAYGO. The rule did not contain any PAYGO waivers. Therefore, the amendments now need to either be redrafted or they need to have the PAYGO rules waived.

Despite the pledge made in a document entitled, "A New Direction for America," when then-Minority Leader PELOSI promised "bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate, consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives," it's worth mentioning that there were 57 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee for H.R. 5297. Of those, 37 were Democrat; 17 were Republican, and three were bipartisan. Of those 57 submitted, there were 17 amendments made in order, only one of which was Republican.

Therefore, I recommend voting against this rule, not only in opposition to the underlying legislation, but also in protest of the partisan process for which it is being considered.

Mr. Speaker, while the ruling Democrats claim the underlying TARP III bill is about helping small businesses, it is really just another bank bailout. The bill is intended to give the appearance that they're doing something. It appears the ruling liberal Democrat regime has completely given up on even trying to pretend they are capable of budgeting or of even governing this country. Certainly, the ruling Democrats would be better served on focusing on passing a budget than on considering the bill before us today.

So what is the next step for the Democrats?

In an apparent effort to help shield their vulnerable Members from having to endure their unconscionable approach to budgeting during an election year, the ruling Democrats are now planning to forgo the annual congressional budget process altogether, this during a time when voters are looking for real solutions and accountability. How is that for leadership?

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the Republican whip, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the YouCut program continues to pick up steam across the country as the American people reject the spend now-pay later philosophy that has long dominated Washington.

This week's YouCut winner was developed by my colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ). It would amend Federal law to allow for the expedited sale of wasteful and unaffordable Federal properties, saving taxpayers up to \$15 billion. President Obama, himself, in a directive released the day after Mr. CHAFFETZ's YouCut proposal was unveiled, indicated his support for selling unneeded properties.

Today, my colleagues on our side of the aisle join together and call upon the House to support this easy, straightforward way to reduce spending.

Let us remember then-Senator Obama's 2006 words of support for removing barriers to the disposal of excess Federal property. He said, Regardless of what side of the aisle we sit on, we all agree we are in dire financial straits, and we need to manage our assets in the most cost-effective way possible to close the gap.

Mr. Speaker, America is at a crossroads. It is time for us all to act together in a bipartisan fashion to stop the runaway spending and to get our fiscal house in order. I urge the body to defeat the motion of the previous question so that we can actually begin to change the culture here in Washington against the runaway spending.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the whip, but I think what we've got to do is to just talk about reality here.

The reality is, when George Bush left office in January of 2009, this country was losing 780,000 jobs per month. Last month, we gained 400,000 jobs. That's a swing of over 1.1 million jobs per month. Yet, on top of that, not only did the Bush administration leave this country in a terrible lurch with jobs; it left this country with a terrible lurch and with a terrible deficit of \$1.3 trillion.

The Republicans would have America have mass amnesia, to forget where we

were. In 2007, we spent \$141 billion in Iraq. Today, they're telling us, Hey, let's sell off part of the country to pay our debts. We were spending \$141 billion in Iraq and not paying for it. This year, we're going to draw that down to \$65 billion. Republicans would have us forget.

Let's talk real money. I agree: we should never be wasting money in this country. Every dollar should be worthwhile and real, but we're going to spend \$77 billion less in Iraq than under George Bush and at the end of the Republican rule of Congress.

So here we've improved employment by some 1.1 million jobs per month. We were left with a terrible deficit by President Bush of \$1.3 trillion. We are drawing down Iraq and are saving real money. Then they come up with an advertising program of YouCut to sell assets of this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues from across the aisle always fail to mention that, in the last 2 years of the Bush administration, Democrats were in charge of Congress. The President can't spend any money. Only the Congress can spend money. So they conveniently leave out the fact that, when they took over Congress, our economy was doing great, absolutely great. From the moment they took over Congress in January of 2007, things started going downhill. The \$1.3 trillion deficit came about as a result of the spending, spending, spending by our colleagues from across the aisle. They've lost touch with the real world.

□ 1045

The other thing my colleague points out is 400,000 jobs were created last month. He fails to mention that almost all of those jobs were created by the census hiring temporary people who will no longer be employed after the end of this year. So they're government jobs.

The American people are seeing through these tales they're being told by our colleagues across the aisle of how wonderful they have made the economy. They know that we have a 9.7 percent unemployment rate. They know that the deficit for the Republican-led Congress from 1996 to 2007 was only \$1.2 trillion in 12 years. This Democrat Congress racked up in 2 years a \$3.2 trillion deficit. My goodness. The American people, again, can see through this, Mr. Speaker. They're not going to be fooled by this rhetoric.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. As Members of Congress, our constitutional mandate is to be responsible stewards of the taxpayer dollars and assets. With the debt at \$13 trillion and counting, this House and government have failed miserably in the task. During times of fiscal uncertainty, savvy businesses identify excess and underperforming assets and eliminate them. Our government must do the same. The American people agree.

This week's winning YouCut proposal would incentivize Federal agencies to identify and eliminate underutilized Federal buildings and structures. According to OMB Director Peter Orszag, the Federal Government has 69,000 buildings and structures that meet this criteria. The total value of this excess property is nearly \$19 billion. The one-time sale of these properties would generate substantial revenues to fill short-term budget gaps. The long-term savings would have a more substantial impact. A leaner real estate portfolio would allow the Federal bureaucracy to function effectively and efficiently, and most importantly, the taxpayers will no longer be on the hook for underused, sometimes vacant Federal properties.

Current law prohibits the disposing of wasted property and cashing in on the savings. Most surplus property must be offered—often at no cost—to other government agencies, to State and local governments, to nonprofit organizations and others. Only at the end of this process is property offered at a competitive public sale. Federal taxpayers have missed opportunities to generate revenue and to reduce the deficit. For example, the Federal Government has conveyed, at no cost, a building in Los Angeles for a mob museum. A mob museum. Land in Massachusetts was conveyed for a public high school, where tuition is over \$29,000 a year. And a building in Florida the Federal Government now leases back at a cost of over \$100,000 a year.

The proposal would direct OMB to sell these properties and transfer 80 percent of the proceeds to reduce the Federal debt. This would result in approximately \$15 billion in debt reduction. The remaining 20 percent of the proceeds would act as an incentive to agencies to quickly dispose of the excess property.

Even President Obama is starting to appreciate the need. On June 10, he issued a Presidential memorandum to department heads directing them to "accelerate efforts to identify and eliminate excess properties." He went on to say, "Both taxpayer dollars and energy resources are being wasted to maintain these excess assets." We seem to be in agreement with the President. We urge the Democrats to join us.

Today, Congress can carry out the wishes of the American people, can support the President's effort to trim the Federal portfolio and take significant steps in getting our fiscal house back in order. I urge my colleagues to support this proposal. It's just common sense.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would remind the Speaker and others that we're here on the small business lending bill, not on Mr. CHAFFETZ's proposal or any proposal like that. It may have merit at another time when that bill, itself, is brought forward, but we're here to talk about the small business lending bill, which provides community banks, smaller banks with funds to make cred-

it available to the small businesses on Main Street that were hurt by the crash on Wall Street. So I would just remind the Speaker as to what this bill, the underlying bill, is.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps my colleague across the aisle needs to be reminded we're actually here to debate because of two amendments that violate their vaunted PAYGO, which means we are talking about the deficit and we are talking about the sorry economy that the Democrats have brought to this country.

Now I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

We have been told that this is the time the majority wanted us to discuss this proposal by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), and so that's why we're doing this at this time.

And I want, first of all, to commend Mr. CHAFFETZ for his proposal, which would save taxpayer money and which would potentially help cut into the huge deficit, the huge debt that we have, in a very significant way. As he mentioned, we have a national debt of over \$13 trillion now. The Congress recently voted to raise the debt limit to \$14.3 trillion. That's an incomprehensible figure. But what it means is that in a few short years we're not going to be able to pay all of our Social Security, veterans' pensions, and civil service pensions and all of the things we promised our own people with money that will buy anything. The Congress in those years will not politically be able to come in and cut the benefits, but they'll just print more money. And then people will find that their pensions that they were counting on will buy a third or a half of what they expect.

This is an issue that I have been interested in for quite some time, when I found out as far back as 1999 that the Bureau of Land Management had identified 3 million acres that they did not want because it was difficult to manage, inaccessible, unnecessary, and expensive. And so I introduced legislation in both the 106th and 107th Congresses to dispose of some of this property to gain some money for the Federal Government.

The Federal Government today owns approximately 30 percent of the land in this country. State and local governments and quasi-governmental agencies own or control another 20 percent. So, in other words, you have half the land in some type of public ownership. Yet we keep taking more and more, a few million more acres each year off of the tax rolls. At the same time that the schools and the police and everybody come to us wanting more money, we keep decreasing the tax rolls.

It sounds great for a politician to create a park, but we've created so

many parks now at the Federal, State, and local levels that we can't even begin to get the use out of them to justify these parks unless our people somehow find a way to go on permanent vacations. And then, USA Today reported that there are 1,667 land trusts and there are 1,400 nature conservancies, all taking over more and more land, so much that USA Today on its front page reported that they're taking over approximately 6.2 million acres a year, equivalent to half the size of the State of New Jersey each year, adding to—constantly adding to that hundreds of millions of acres that are already under some type of Federal, State, or local ownership, decreasing the tax rolls.

I introduced a bill with my colleague from the other side, DENNIS MOORE, in the last Congress, called the Federal Real Property Disposal Enhancement Act. The Office of Management and Budget had found 21,000 Federal properties that the Federal Government no longer wanted worth \$18 billion, and \$9 billion of those were real property assets that the Federal Government wanted to dispose of. But it's so complicated and so bureaucratic to dispose of it at this present time that it's cheaper for these agencies to keep this property that they're not even using.

Jim Nussle, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget at that time, in the last Congress, recently sent me a letter and endorsed the bill that I had introduced in the Congress and that Senator TOM CARPER, a Democrat from Delaware, and Senator TOM COBURN had introduced in the Senate. The goal of the OMB was to dispose of \$9 billion in unneeded real property.

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

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Director Nussle wrote at the time I introduced that bill with Congressman MOORE, he said, "To reach this objective, I believe we must improve and streamline the current process that Federal agencies face in disposing of real property assets. Therefore, I applaud your introduction of H.R. 3049, which would establish a 5-year pilot program for expediting the disposal of properties no longer needed by the Federal Government."

We've got to wake up, Mr. Speaker, and realize that private property is a foundation of our freedom and our prosperity. Yet we're slowing doing away with it in this country, and we need to reverse this trend. And this action by Mr. CHAFFETZ will help start that process and save taxpayer money.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would just quote from a letter we received from the Independent Community Bankers of America: On behalf of the 5,000 members of the Independent Community Bankers of America, we strongly support passage of the proposed Small Business Lending Fund Act of 2010.

We're here on the rule to allow for that bill to go forward, and I would

like to remind the Speaker and others that that's the purpose of the hearing today.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to my friend from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

I remember back in the movie, "The American President," there's one scene where Michael Douglas' character is being criticized by one of his staff members, and he says, Is the view pretty good from the cheap seats?

I have to sit here and say, my colleagues, the view is pretty good from the cheap seats. Because if you think back upon what we inherited, those of us who are now trying to pull that car out of the ditch, which is also the economy, and try to improve things for the American people, how deep in that ditch it was. And we're talking about 700,000 jobs lost per month. We're talking about an inherited projected deficit of \$10 trillion. That's what the Obama administration and this Congress has been trying to repair.

Now, what has been the response from our colleagues on the other side? It has been solely, Well, this isn't a good idea; this isn't a good idea; this isn't a good idea. We're spending too much money. Blah, blah, blah. Let's cut taxes. Well, we tried that. Been there, done that, and that's what brought us to the ditch.

Now what have we done in this Congress? What have we done to take that car out of the ditch and get it back on the road? We have taken, by every measure possible. We passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. We put \$300 billion back in the hands of the American taxpayers. That's something that our colleagues on the other side neglect to mention, that that money—most of that money, or 40 percent of the so-called stimulus package, went back to the American taxpayers to spend.

I have the privilege of cochairing the Congressional Task Force on American Competitiveness. Two days ago, we had a forum here. We have had people from companies as large as General Electric and Ford to very small startups. Without an exception, every one of those businesspeople said that we would be in such worse shape were it not for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. You can imagine all of the progress or much of the progress they had made in sustaining or growing their businesses was attributable to support given through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and that the government has to continue to play a role.

One reason they said was very interesting. In the global economy, we are not necessarily competing in a free market atmosphere. We're competing with a lot of State-supported industry. So, for instance, when General Electric, which is bringing back 400 jobs from China to my district to build an energy-efficient hybrid water heater, they did it because support through the

Recovery Act enabled them to make that difference that they were trying to balance—the economics—because of a State-supported system in China. The support they got through the Recovery and Reinvestment Act made up that difference and now they are bringing 400 jobs back.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. YARMUTH. They are bringing back 400 jobs. They are planning to bring back more jobs, again, because of the government's help. Now, as I said at the outset, there are two ways to approach this decline. We can say the government has no role. We can say all the government should do is get out of the way and the private forces will recover the economy. As I said, been there, done that. It hasn't worked.

The steps that we have taken, the steps that we propose to take in this Small Business Act, the subject of this rule, are steps that we believe are worth trying, that will be an affirmative effort to grow jobs in the small business segment of the economy to make capital available, to provide tax incentives—yes, to my friends on the other side, tax incentives—to motivate small business operators to grow their businesses, to start new businesses. These are the steps that this Congress and this administration are taking to grow the economy. It is better than sitting in the cheap seats and saying we want to go back to the agenda that put us in the ditch.

□ 1100

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, you know, the gentleman from Colorado reminds us to stay on the topic, but then he yields to someone who spends most of his time blaming a person who is not even any longer in office. That is the theme of our colleagues across the aisle. No sense of responsibility or accountability on their part.

They passed the disastrous stimulus, which all it did was put us deeper into debt. It hasn't done anything to help the economy. They talk about more government control. Well, what about the MMS department? They were the ones who were supposed to be checking out whether what BP was doing was okay. They signed off on all the permits and let them drill. That's what growing the government does for us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. has lived beyond its means for too long, and it will take commonsense ideas to restore responsible spending in Washington. But we can start by identifying what we need to fulfill the duties of the Federal Government and eliminate everything else.

The Federal Government is the largest property owner in the U.S. According to the OMB, we have \$18 billion in assets that we do not need. Rather

than selling unnecessary assets, like the American people do to live within their means, the Federal Government gives property free of charge to other government entities and nonprofits, including a building in Las Vegas to use as a mob museum.

The American people have spoken. We cannot continue ignoring our debt. I urge my colleagues to stand with the folks at home to use common sense and vote to sell excess Federal property and take a necessary step toward a sustainable future.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I remind my friend from Kansas that when you cut taxes for the wealthiest people in America, you prosecute two wars without paying for them, and you fail to police Wall Street so that it becomes a big casino and results in a crash leaving this country in terrible debt, and you turn a budget upside down, those are the policies that bring a country and bring small businesses to their knees. The country, because of various steps taken, has come out of the terrible dip of the last months of the Bush administration to where we're adding jobs.

We have a long way to go. We lost millions of jobs, and many small businesses were hurt in the process. The purpose of the bill that is to be voted on today is about providing funding to smaller banks so that small business will have credit, and people will get back to work. Providing a platform for small business to really get back on its feet and put the people back to work, so many of whom lost their jobs in this recession that was caused by the tax cuts, the two wars without payment, and failing to police Wall Street.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, every time my colleague wants to blame the economy on the former President, I'm going to remind him that the Democrats were in control of this Congress the last 2 years that President Bush was in office. You can talk all you want to about what the job numbers were in the last month of the Bush administration. The Democrats were in control of Congress, and they caused the problem.

I now yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, my eloquent colleague, from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. When we talk about Wall Street, one of the things that really gets me is, if you look at the numbers and why there wasn't more reform of Wall Street, what we find out is that actually both to the Obama campaign running for President and to our friends across the aisle, the executives on Wall Street, despite what sometimes seems the conventional wisdom, the executives on Wall Street give to the Democrats and to the Obama campaign four to one over Republicans. It's an amazing thing to see. And if you look at that, then you begin to understand a little better why there may be games being played, but there was no real reform of Wall Street that was going on.

And that also brings up the issue of British Petroleum. Some might wonder, why in the world would the President of the United States wait all these weeks—week after week after week after week—to even meet with British Petroleum, to even call them down. Well, they've gotten pretty rough on them here lately in talking. But actually, it turns out the more you dig—it's kind of like Wall Street—it turns out British Petroleum was this administration's greatest ally in fighting what was an invented problem: Global warming. It turns out the planet may have been cooling in the last few years. The snow down in South Africa recently points toward that as well.

But British Petroleum was meeting with Senator KERRY, and they were pushing this global warming bill. They needed an oil company to help get this ridiculous bill that was being pushed, the so-called energy bill, they needed an oil company to give them credibility. So, of course, they didn't want to come down on them. Of course, they want to talk about Wall Street and getting tough on the fat cats, but as far as doing anything, it's just talk. That's why Goldman Sachs had their biggest profit in their whole company's history last year as the Democrats controlled the House, the Senate and the White House. And I'm trying to dig. We found some contracts, but I would like to know just how much of that was government money coming from this Congress and this administration into the coffers still of Goldman Sachs. It's still flowing there. And the contracts indicate that.

As far as the oil spill, you've got companies and countries around the world willing to help. President Bush, for all the criticism, actually within 3 days of the Katrina hurricane, had suspended the Jones Act so foreign countries could send ships and send help and go ahead and give us all the assistance they could. This administration still has not suspended the Jones Act. We had the Netherlands within days—man, they know something about building barrier islands and dikes and things like that. This administration said, Oh, no. We don't want that, allowing millions and millions and millions of dollars to pile up. And then you look in a little deeper, and you find out, Oh, gee.

After the President said that about the cozy relationship that existed between big oil and the regulators, it turns out the very person that we were told by the Inspector General who knew the most about that price adjustment language being pulled out of offshore leases in 1998-1999 left the Clinton administration when they went out; so they couldn't really talk to them to investigate what had happened. It turns out, she works now with the Department of the Interior, with the Minerals Management. Go figure.

There is a mess going on. There are a lot of things we can do to quit killing jobs. Those 700,000 jobs were being lost

when the Democrats had this majority, and compassion does not equal giving away money.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time does each side have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 19 minutes. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 8½ minutes.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would ask my friend from North Carolina how many more speakers she may have.

Ms. FOXX. We have at least two more speakers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I just would say, again, reading from the letter from the Independent Community Bankers of America. The Act, which is the Small Business Lending Fund Act, the Act would offer capital to interested community banks to increase small business credit. We urge the House to pass this legislation. The Nation's 8,000-strong community banks are well positioned to leverage this fund and have established relationships with small businesses in their communities to get credit flowing. On down it says, Notably, leveraging the \$30 billion funds with community banks would potentially support many times that amount in loan volume to small businesses, as much as \$300 billion in additional lending.

By reducing the dividend costs on the capital investment as lending increases, this program helps to ensure more community banks have both the incentive and greater capacity to increase total loans to small businesses. That's the purpose of this rule, to pass the underlying bill, which is to increase credit to small businesses and get them back on their feet and help continue to add jobs, as we have over the course of the last 14 or 15 months. When we were at the very depth of the recession, in January 2009, the last month of the Bush administration, losing 780,000 jobs; in April, where we gained 290,000 jobs; in May, 400,000 jobs. That's what this is about, putting people back to work, getting this country back on a strong financial footing.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlelady from North Carolina yielding me the time.

We are here today to talk about a rule that would qualify certain amendments to solve a procedural problem, a mistake that the majority party made here. But why not use this rule as an opportunity to something really more, to help solve and resolve ongoing problems. One could look at the far map that I have of the United States over there. Everything that is in red is land and property owned by the Federal Government. Ronald Reagan looked at that and said, You never see something like that this side of the old Soviet

Union. Think about that. One out of every three acres of this country is owned and controlled by the Federal Government. And I hate to say this, but in 2007, OMB did a study and said that, of that, \$18 billion worth of that property is excess. It is useless. It is needless.

This year, Peter Orszag updated that report and said there are 14,000 buildings that the Federal Government owns that are excess, and 55,000 buildings that are underutilized and not necessary. When I first came here, The Washington Post did an editorial that said, Until the District of Columbia can get hold of all the excess land and buildings owned by the Federal Government and put those to economic use, the economy of Washington, D.C., would never grow.

Those of us in the West have been saying that for a long time. In fact, this year, I introduced two land transfer bills. In each bill, both the Forest Service and the BLM as well as the Army Corps of Engineers owned land that they did not use, they did not need, they didn't even know about it. One parcel of land was sold to the Federal Government in the 1940s for \$1, and the Forest Service did not know they had that land.

The local officials understood that this land is useless, and these buildings are useless, and thus, they are put to some kind of profitable need. The D.C. bureaucrats, though, said their policy is no net loss of land or real estate. In fact, the only way they will give up something is if they get more in return. That is pure insanity. Use this rule to go against the excesses of land and the excess buildings that we have so that we can send a true message to the business community and the money lenders who have money to invest in this economy that we really are serious about the debt by taking all of the excess and using it to pay down the debt, that we are serious about building a business climate here that will encourage people to invest in this company, and do that first by saying, We will retire our excess property and use it to build down and take down this debt.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I, again, remind everyone that the rule and the bill are about small business lending. Again, I would refer to the letter from the independent community bankers. ICBA believes the proposed Small Business Lending Fund Act supports their recommendations, and this fresh program approach will attract a broader spectrum of community banks to boost small business lending and job growth. We applaud the new program focused on getting funds to Main Street's small businesses using Main Street community banks.

We're here to try to get money to small businesses throughout the country using the smaller community banks, regional banks. The purpose is to get them back on their feet, get them growing. We're not here to talk

about selling off assets of America. We're here to talk about getting small businesses back on their feet.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Georgia, Dr. PRICE.

□ 1115

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentelady for yielding and for her leadership on issues of the utmost importance to the American people.

My friend says we are not here to talk about the debt that has been created in this Nation; we are here to talk about money. We are here to talk about the taxpayers' money. And this bill, this underlying bill that is being discussed right now spends another \$33 billion. That is right, Mr. Speaker, another \$33 billion of hard-earned money from the American taxpayer. But it can't come from the American taxpayer, because we have so much deficit right now. So it needs to come from where, China or Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of what is going on here in Washington. Just this week the American people said in a survey that the greatest threat to this Nation, which they believe had been terrorism, is now debt. Debt. What they are saying to us is stop the madness. So what the Republicans have done, in an attempt to be fiscally responsible and try to encourage our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop the madness, is to institute the YouCut program.

It is at republicanwhip.house.gov/YouCut, and this week's winner, these are the American people going to this Web site saying stop the madness, cut in this area, this week's winner will save \$15 billion by selling excess Federal property, property that is not being used right now, sell it for \$15 billion.

Every single week we try to identify those programs, those areas of the Federal Government that are recklessly spending the hard-earned taxpayers' money. And this week, there are five more new nominees that will be announced.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to go to the Web site, republicanwhip.house.gov/YouCut, and vote for whether or not they want to prohibit hiring of new IRS agents to enforce the new health care law, saving \$10 billion, whether they want to terminate exchanges in the Whaling and Trading Partners program, another \$90 million in savings.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Or you vote to terminate taxpayer-subsidized political party conventions. That is right, Mr. Speaker, we spend tens of millions of dollars paying for Democrat and Re-

publican party conventions. That is crazy.

Or you could vote to require collection of unpaid taxes from Federal employees, a billion dollars we could save there; or to terminate the funding for the NDIC, \$440 million.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not just about whether or not we are acting responsibly here. It is what we are doing with the hard-earned taxpayer money. We are talking about money here, and this bill that you are talking about spends an extra \$33 billion that we do not have. In fact, there is money appropriated already through the TARP program, over \$500 billion of money available. You could use some of that if you wanted to be fiscally responsible. But, Mr. Speaker, we have seen that kind of leadership out of the majority party.

Mr. Speaker, the YouCut program allows the American people to assist in those things that they believe are wasteful in our Federal Government. This bill is an opportunity through the PC to be able to cut the excess Federal property.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would remind my friend, at the height of the Iraq war we spend \$141 billion, as we draw troops down to \$65 billion, a savings of \$76 billion a year. That is money. These things we can find other places to spend where there is wasteful spending, \$76 billion in Iraq. That is what this Congress is finding. That is what this President has found. Instead of going into war and not paying for it, \$76 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

I know the American people who are watching this must have their heads spinning because all we have heard for a year and a half now from our colleagues on the other side was TARP was a disastrous program; TARP is a disastrous program. They are running ads against us in our districts about how horrible TARP was: so and so voted for TARP. And yet here we have someone who is advocating that we take money from TARP and give it to small businesses. I actually think that is a good idea. I am for that.

But I want to clarify something because he is misstating the impact of the underlying bill. This bill does not add anything to the deficit. This bill is paid for, and the \$30 billion in loan facilities that we are actually making available to small banks throughout the country actually generates a surplus for the Treasury. That is a profit maker for the Treasury. There is no cost unless the money is actually borrowed. And if it is borrowed and paid back with interest, then the taxpayers actually benefit.

So it is one to thing to talk about deficits and argue about who is responsible and so forth, but to actually misstate the actual facts about the underlying bill here is a little bit disingenuous.

I would like to make one more comment. My friend from North Carolina mentioned earlier, you keep blaming the former President. No, we actually keep blaming the former 12 years of Republican control of the Congress because that is the period of time in which the really disastrous policies for the economy were implemented and were approved: the two tax cuts that mostly went to wealthiest Americans; the \$7 trillion projected debt because of the unfunded prescription drug plan; and, of course, the war funding.

I know that the President, President Bush, dealt for 2 years with a Democratic Congress. We did have control of the Congress, but we sure didn't have a veto-proof Congress. And every time we wanted to implement a policy or change the President's budget, he threatened a veto. So, yes, we did have control of the Congress, but we didn't have control of the Nation's economy. But for 12 years, the Republican Congress did. For 6 years of that, they had control of all three branches of government. That is when the true damage was done.

We have an important piece of legislation that will help small businesses create jobs.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

You know, my colleagues across the aisle talk about trying to create jobs. I will point out to my colleague that trying isn't doing it. What happens is you pass the stimulus to create jobs, omnibus appropriations to create jobs, auto bailouts to create jobs, health care, cap-and-trade, all of those things to create jobs. You are trying, but you are not doing. What you are doing is you are creating government jobs.

This is the chart that the American people want to look at: how many government jobs you are creating. You have also created a deficit in 2 years three times the size of the deficit that Republicans created in 12 years. You are so selective in how you talk about history. Clinton was President for part of that time. You say he had a surplus at the end of his term; but you never give Republicans credit for that. But then you talk about our being in charge of the Congress. You know, you are very selective with your statistics. But you have tried and you've failed. You have not created jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I want to make sure that the record is clear that the amendments that are presented in today's rule are in full compliance with the PAYGO rule, and that is why we are proceeding with this second rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and extraneous material be printed in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that I can amend the rule to allow all Members of Congress the opportunity to vote to cut spending. Republican Whip ERIC CANTOR really launched the YouCut initiative which gives people an opportunity to vote for Federal spending they would like to see Congress cut. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have cast their votes, and this week they have directed their Representatives in Congress to consider H.R. 5535.

According to the Republican whip YouCut Web site: "The Office of Management and Budget estimated in 2007 that the Federal Government is holding \$18 billion in real property it does not need. Rather than selling this property, however, Federal law usually requires that it first be offered, often at no cost, to other government agencies, to State and local governments, to nonprofits, and others. The Federal Government has conveyed at no cost: a building in Las Vegas that is intended to house the mob museum; land in Massachusetts for a private high school where tuition is over \$29,000 a year; and a building in Florida that the Federal Government now leases back at a cost of over \$100,000 a year. This proposal would amend Federal law to require an expedited process for selling unneeded Federal property with 80 percent of the proceeds used to reduce the deficit."

In order to provide for consideration of this commonsense legislation, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, small businesses cannot grow if credit is not available to them. Over the course of the last year and a half, credit has tightened substantially. This bill provides for a loan fund to small community banks and regional banks so that they can work with their small businesses throughout the country. This is not focused on Wall Street, but is focused on Main Street so we can get small businesses really back strong and prosperous and hiring people back so that this country is on a full and vibrant financial footing.

I would just remind the Speaker, we have strong support from a whole variety of organizations with respect to the bill: the National Small Business Association, the Small Business Majority, the National Association of Realtors, the Independent Community Bankers of America, the American Bankers Association, and a number of other organizations.

Our Nation's small businesses have waited long enough for much-needed capital, so we won't make them wait

any longer. This credit crunch has taken its toll, but now it is time to focus on Main Street.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1448

OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole house on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5535) to establish a pilot program for the expedited disposal of Federal real property. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(e) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5535.

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

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

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

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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 1448, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 1429.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 368]

YEAS—241

Ackerman	Baldwin	Bishop (GA)
Adler (NJ)	Barrow	Bishop (NY)
Altmire	Bean	Blumenauer
Andrews	Becerra	Bocieri
Arcuri	Berkley	Boren
Baca	Berman	Boswell
Baird	Berry	Boucher

Boyd	Hinojosa	Perlmutter	Gingrey (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Roe (TN)	Dicks	Kucinich	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Perriello	Gohmert	E.	Rogers (AL)	Dingell	Langevin	Reyes
Braley (IA)	Hodes	Peters	Goodlatte	Mack	Rogers (KY)	Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Richardson
Brown, Corrine	Holden	Peterson	Granger	Manzullo	Rogers (MI)	Donnelly (IN)	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez
Butterfield	Holt	Pingree (ME)	Graves (GA)	Marchant	Doyle	Doyle	Lee (CA)	Ross
Capps	Honda	Polis (CO)	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Driehaus	Levin	Rothman (NJ)
Capuano	Hoyer	Pomeroy	Griffith	McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen	Edwards (MD)	Lewis (GA)	Royal-Allard
Cardoza	Inslee	Price (NC)	Guthrie	McClintock	Roskam	Edwards (TX)	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	Israel	Quigley	Hall (TX)	McCotter	Royce	Ellison	Loeb sack	Rush
Carney	Jackson (IL)	Rahall	Harper	McHenry	Ryan (WI)	Ellsworth	Ryan (OH)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rangel	Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Scalise	Engel	Lowey	Salazar
Castor (FL)	(TX)	Reyes	Heller	McMorris	Schmidt	Eshoo	Lujan	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Johnson (GA)	Richardson	Hensarling	Rodgers	Schock	Etheridge	Lynch	T.
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez	Herger	Mica	Sensenbrenner	Farr	Maffei	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kagen	Ross	Hunter	Miller (FL)	Sessions	Fattah	Maloney	Sarbanes
Clay	Kanjorski	Rothman (NJ)	Issa	Miller (MI)	Shadegg	Filner	Markey (CO)	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kaptur	Royal-Allard	Jenkins	Miller, Gary	Shimkus	Foster	Markey (MA)	Schauer
Clyburn	Kennedy	Ruppersberger	Johnson (IL)	Minnick	Shuster	Frank (MA)	Marshall	Schiff
Cohen	Kildee	Rush	Johnson, Sam	Mitchell	Simpson	Fudge	Matheson	Schrader
Connolly (VA)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ryan (OH)	Jones	Moran (KS)	Smith (NE)	Garamendi	Matsui	Schwartz
Conyers	Kilroy	Salazar	Jordan (OH)	Murphy, Tim	Smith (NJ)	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (GA)
Cooper	Kind	Sánchez, Linda	King (IA)	Myrick	Smith (TX)	Gordon (TN)	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Costa	Kissell	T.	King (NY)	Neugebauer	Stearns	Grayson	McDermott	Serrano
Costello	Klein (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Kingston	Nunes	Sullivan	Green, Al	McGovern	Sestak
Courtney	Kosmas	Sarbanes	Kirk	Nye	Terry	Green, Gene	McIntyre	Shea-Porter
Critz	Kucinich	Schakowsky	Kline (MN)	Olson	Thompson (PA)	Grijalva	McMahon	Sherman
Crowley	Langevin	Schauer	Kratovil	Paul	Thornberry	Gutierrez	McNerney	Sires
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schiff	Lamborn	Paulsen	Tiahrt	Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)	Skelton
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schrader	Lance	Pence	Tiahrt	Halvorson	Melancon	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lee (CA)	Schwartz	Latham	Petri	Tiberi	Hare	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Levin	Scott (GA)	LaTourette	Pitts	Turner	Harman	Miller (NC)	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)	Latta	Platts	Upton	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Space
Davis (TN)	Lipinski	Scott (VA)	Lee (NY)	Poe (TX)	Walden	Heinrich	Minnick	Speier
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Serrano	Lewis (CA)	Posey	Westmoreland	Higgins	Mollohan	Spratt
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Sestak	Linder	Price (GA)	Whitfield	Himes	Moore (KS)	Stark
DeLaunt	Lowey	Shea-Porter	LoBiondo	Putnam	Wilson (SC)	Hinche y	Moran (VA)	Stupak
DeLauro	Lujan	Sherman	Lucas	Radanovich	Wittman	Hinojosa	Murphy (CT)	Sutton
Deutch	Lynch	Shuler	Luettkemeyer	Rehberg	Wolf	Hirono	Murphy (NY)	Tanner
Dicks	Maffei	Sires	Lummis	Reichert	Young (AK)	Hodes	Murphy, Patrick	Teague
Dingell	Maloney	Skelton				Holden	Nadler (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Markey (CO)	Slaughter				Holt	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Donnelly (IN)	Markey (MA)	Smith (WA)	Barrett (SC)	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)	Honda	Neal (MA)	Tierney
Doyle	Marshall	Snyder	Brown (SC)	Inglis	Taylor	Hoyer	Nye	Titus
Driehaus	Matheson	Space	Childers	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Wamp	Inslee	Oberstar	Tonko
Edwards (MD)	Matsui	Speier	Gutierrez	Mee k (FL)	Young (FL)	Israel	Obey	Towns
Edwards (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt				Jackson (IL)	Olver	Tsongas
Ellison	McCollum	Stark				Jackson Lee	Ortiz	Van Hollen
Ellsworth	McDermott	Stupak				(TX)	Owens	Vislosky
Engel	McGovern	Sutton				Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Walz
Eshoo	McIntyre	Tanner				Kagen	Pascrell	Wasserman
Etheridge	McMahon	Teague				Kanjorski	Pastor (AZ)	Schultz
Farr	McNerney	Thompson (CA)				Kaptur	Payne	Waters
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (MS)				Kennedy	Perlmutter	Watson
Filner	Melancon	Tierney				Kildee	Perriello	Watt
Foster	Michaud	Titus				Kilpatrick (MI)	Peters	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Tonko				Kilroy	Peterson	Weiner
Fudge	Miller, George	Towns				Kind	Pingree (ME)	Welch
Garamendi	Mollohan	Tsongas				Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Polis (CO)	Wilson (OH)
Gonzalez	Moore (KS)	Van Hollen				Kissell	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Gordon (TN)	Moran (VA)	Velázquez				Klein (FL)	Quigley	Wu
Grayson	Murphy (CT)	Vislosky				Kosmas	Rahall	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Murphy (NY)	Walz						
Green, Gene	Murphy, Patrick	Wasserman						
Grijalva	Nadler (NY)	Schultz						
Hall (NY)	Napolitano	Waters						
Halvorson	Neal (MA)	Watson						
Hare	Oberstar	Watt						
Harman	Obey	Waxman						
Hastings (FL)	Olver	Weiner						
Heinrich	Ortiz	Welch						
Herseth Sandlin	Owens	Wilson (OH)						
Higgins	Pallone	Woolsey						
Hill	Pascrell	Wu						
Himes	Pastor (AZ)	Yarmuth						
Hinche y	Payne							

NOT VOTING—12

□ 1202

Messrs. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, FRANKS of Arizona, ROGERS of Alabama and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 179, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 369]

AYES—237

Aderholt	Brown-Waite,	Dahlkemper	Ackerman	Boswell	Connolly (VA)
Akin	Ginny	Davis (KY)	Adler (NJ)	Boucher	Conyers
Alexander	Buchanan	Dent	Altmire	Brady (PA)	Cooper
Austria	Burgess	Diaz-Balart, L.	Andrews	Braley (IA)	Costa
Bachmann	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Arcuri	Brown, Corrine	Costello
Bachus	Buyer	Djou	Baca	Butterfield	Courtney
Bartlett	Calvert	Dreier	Baird	Capuano	Critz
Barton (TX)	Camp	Duncan	Baldwin	Cardoza	Crowley
Biggert	Campbell	Ehlers	Barrow	Carnahan	Cuellar
Bilbray	Cantor	Emerson	Bean	Carney	Cummings
Billirakis	Cao	Fallin	Becerra	Carson (IN)	Davis (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Flake	Berkley	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Blackburn	Carter	Fleming	Berman	Chandler	Davis (IL)
Blunt	Cassidy	Forbes	Berry	Chu	Davis (TN)
Boehner	Castle	Fortenberry	Bishop (GA)	Clarke	DeFazio
Bonner	Chaffetz	Fox	Bishop (NY)	Clay	DeGette
Bono Mack	Coble	Franks (AZ)	Blumenauer	Cleaver	DeLaunt
Boozman	Coffman (CO)	Frelinghuysen	Bocchieri	Clyburn	DeLauro
Boustany	Cole	Gallegly	Boren	Cohen	Deutch
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Garrett (NJ)			
Bright	Crenshaw	Gerlach			
Broun (GA)	Culberson	Giffords			

NOES—179

Aderholt	Cassidy	Graves (MO)
Akin	Castle	Griffith
Alexander	Chaffetz	Guthrie
Austria	Coble	Hall (TX)
Bachmann	Coffman (CO)	Harper
Bachus	Cole	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett	Conaway	Heller
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Hensarling
Biggert	Culberson	Herger
Bilbray	Dahlkemper	Herseth Sandlin
Billirakis	Davis (KY)	Hill
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Hunter
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Blunt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jenkins
Boehner	Djou	Johnson (IL)
Bonner	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Bono Mack	Duncan	Jones
Boozman	Ehlers	Jordan (OH)
Boustany	Emerson	King (NY)
Boyd	Fallin	Kingston
Brady (TX)	Flake	Kirk
Bright	Fleming	Kline (MN)
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Kratovil
Brown-Waite,	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Ginny	Fox	Lance
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Latham
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Burton (IN)	Gallegly	Latta
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Lee (NY)
Calvert	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Camp	Giffords	Linder
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Cantor	Gohmert	Lucas
Cao	Goodlatte	Luettkemeyer
Capito	Granger	Lummis
Carter	Graves (GA)	

Lungren, Daniel E.	Paulsen Pence	Sessions Shadegg	Brady (PA) Brady (TX)	Gallegly Garamendi	Lummis Lungren, Daniel E.	Roskam Ross	Shimkus Shuler	Titus Tonko
Mack	Petri	Shimkus Shuler	Brady (IA) Braley (IA)	Garrett (NJ) Gerlach	Lungren, Daniel E. Lynch	Rothman (NJ) Roybal-Allard	Shuster Simpson	Towns Towns
Manzullo	Pitts	Shuster Shuler	Bright Broun (GA)	Gingery (GA) Giffords	Mack Maffei	Roybal-Allard Royce	Simpson Sires	Tsongas Turner
Marchant	Platts	Shuster Simpson	Brown, Corrine Brown-Waite,	Gingery (GA) Gohmert	Maffei Maloney	Ruppertsberger Rush	Skelton Slaughter	Upton Van Hollen
McCarthy (CA)	Poe (TX) Posey	Smith (NE) Smith (NJ)	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Gonzalez Goodlatte	Maloney Manzullo	Ryan (OH) Ryan (WI)	Smith (NE) Smith (NJ)	Van Hollen Velázquez
McCauley	Price (GA) Putnam	Smith (TX) Stearns	Buchanan Burgess	Goodlatte Gordon (TN)	Manzullo Marchant	Ryan (WI) Salazar	Smith (TX) Smith (WA)	Visclosky Walden
McClintock	Radanovich Rehberg	Taylor Terry	Burton (IN) Butterfield	Granger Graves (GA)	Marchant Markey (CO)	Salazar Sánchez, Linda T.	Snyder Space	Walz Wasserman
McCotter	Reichert Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA) Thornberry	Buyer Calvert	Graves (MO) Grayson	Markey (MA) Marshall	Sánchez, Linda T. Sanchez, Loretta	Space Sarbanes	Wasserman Schultz
McHenry	Rogers (KY) Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt Tiberi	Calvert Camp	Grayson Green, Al	Marshall Matheson	Sánchez, Loretta Sarbanes	Sarbanes Speier	Wasserman Schultz
McKeon	Rohrabacher Rooney	Turner Upton	Camp Campbell	Green, Al Green, Gene	Matheson Matsui	Sarbanes Scalise	Speier Spratt	Wasserman Schultz
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen Roskam	Walden Westmoreland	Cantor Cao	Green, Gene Griffith	Matsui McCarthy (CA)	Scalise Schakowsky	Spratt Stark	Watt Watson
Rodgers	Royce Ryan (WI)	Whitfield Wilson (SC)	Cao Capito	Grijalva Guthrie	McCarthy (NY) McCaul	Schakowsky Schauer	Stark Stearns	Watt Waxman
Mica	Royce Ryan (WI)	Whitfield Wilson (SC)	Capito Capps	Guthrie Gutierrez	McCaul McClintock	Schauer Schiff	Stearns Stupak	Weiner Weisman
Miller (FL)	Scalise Ryan (WI)	Whitfield Wilson (SC)	Capps Capuano	Gutierrez Hall (NY)	McClintock McCollum	Schiff Schmidt	Stupak Sutton	Welch Welch
Miller (MI)	Schmid Ryan (WI)	Whitfield Wilson (SC)	Capuano Cardoza	Hall (NY) Hall (TX)	McCollum McDermott	Schmidt Schock	Sutton Tanner	Welch Welch
Miller, Gary	Schmid Ryan (WI)	Whitfield Wilson (SC)	Cardoza Carnahan	Hall (TX) Halvorson	McDermott McGovern	Schock Schwartz	Tanner Taylor	Welch Westmoreland
Mitchell	Schock Ryan (WI)	Whitfield Wilson (SC)	Carnahan Carney	Halvorson Hare	McGovern McHenry	Schwartz Scott (GA)	Taylor Teague	Westmoreland Whitfield
Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner Young (AK)	Young (AK) Sullivan	Carney Carson (IN)	Hare Harman	McHenry McIntyre	Scott (VA) Sensenbrenner	Teague Terry	Whitfield Wilson (OH)
Murphy, Tim			Carson (IN) Carter	Harman Harper	McIntyre McKeon	Sensenbrenner Serrano	Terry Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC) Wittman
Myrick			Carter Cassidy	Harper Hastings (FL)	McKeon McMahan	Serrano Sessions	Thompson (CA) Thompson (MS)	Wilson (SC) Wittman
Neugebauer			Cassidy Castle	Hastings (FL) Hastings (WA)	McMahan Rodgers	Sessions Sestak	Thompson (MS) Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC) Wittman
Nunes			Castle Castor (FL)	Hastings (WA) Heinrich	Rodgers McMorris	Sestak Shadegg	Thompson (PA) Wolf	Wilson (SC) Wittman
Olson			Castor (FL) Chaffetz	Heinrich Heller	McMorris Rodgers	Shadegg Shea-Porter	Thornberry Tiahrt	Wilson (SC) Wittman
Paul			Chaffetz Chandler	Heller Hensarling	Rodgers Meeks (NY)	Shea-Porter Sherman	Tiahrt Tiberi	Wilson (SC) Wittman
			Chandler Chu	Hensarling Herger	Meeks (NY) Melancon		Tierney Young (AK)	Young (AK)
			Chu Clarke	Herger Herstein Sandlin	Melancon Mica			
			Clarke Cleaver	Herstein Sandlin Higgins	Mica Michaud			
			Cleaver Clyburn	Higgins Hill	Michaud Miller (FL)			
			Clyburn Coble	Hill Himes	Miller (FL) Miller (MI)			
			Coble Coffman (CO)	Himes Hinchey	Miller (MI) Miller (NC)			
			Coffman (CO) Cohen	Hinchey Hinojosa	Miller (NC) Miller, Gary			
			Cohen Cole	Hinojosa Hirono	Miller, Gary Minnick			
			Cole Conaway	Hirono Hodes	Minnick Mollohan			
			Conaway Connolly (VA)	Hodes Holden	Mollohan Moore (KS)			
			Connolly (VA) Conyers	Holden Holt	Moore (KS) Moran (KS)			
			Conyers Cooper	Holt Honda	Moran (KS) Moran (VA)			
			Cooper Costa	Honda Hoyer	Moran (VA) Murphy (CT)			
			Costa Costello	Hoyer Hunter	Murphy (CT) Murphy (NY)			
			Costello Courtney	Hunter Inslee	Murphy (NY) Murphy, Patrick			
			Courtney Crenshaw	Inslee Israel	Murphy, Patrick Myrick			
			Crenshaw Critz	Israel Issa	Myrick Nadler (NY)			
			Critz Crowley	Issa Jackson (IL)	Nadler (NY) Napolitano			
			Crowley Cuellar	Jackson (IL) Jackson Lee	Napolitano Neal (MA)			
			Cuellar Culberson	Jackson Lee (TX) Jenkins	Neal (MA) Neugebauer			
			Culberson Cummings	Jenkins Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer Nunes			
			Cummings Dahlkemper	Johnson (GA) Johnson (IL)	Nunes Nye			
			Dahlkemper Davis (AL)	Johnson (IL) Johnson, E. B.	Nye Oberstar			
			Davis (AL) Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B. Johnson, Sam	Oberstar Obey			
			Davis (CA) Davis (IL)	Johnson, Sam Jones	Obey Olson			
			Davis (IL) Davis (KY)	Jones Jordan (OH)	Olson Oliver			
			Davis (KY) Davis (TN)	Jordan (OH) Kagen	Oliver Ortiz			
			Davis (TN) DeFazio	Kagen Kanjorski	Ortiz Owens			
			DeFazio DeGette	Kanjorski Kaptur	Owens Pallone			
			DeGette Delahunt	Kaptur Kennedy	Pallone Pascrell			
			Delahunt DeLauro	Kennedy Kildee	Pascrell Pastor (AZ)			
			DeLauro Dent	Kildee Kilpatrick (MI)	Pastor (AZ) Paul			
			Dent Deutch	Kilpatrick (MI) Kilroy	Paul Paulsen			
			Deutch Diaz-Balart, L.	Kilroy Kind	Paulsen Payne			
			Diaz-Balart, L. Diaz-Balart, M.	Kind King (IA)	Payne Pence			
			Diaz-Balart, M. Dicks	King (IA) King (NY)	Pence Perlmutter			
			Dicks Dingell	King (NY) Kingston	Perlmutter Perriello			
			Dingell Djou	Kingston Kirk	Perriello Peters			
			Djou Doggett	Kirk Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peters Peterson			
			Doggett Donnelly (IN)	Kirkpatrick (AZ) Kissell	Peterson Petri			
			Donnelly (IN) Doyle	Kissell Klein (FL)	Petri Pingree (ME)			
			Doyle Dreier	Klein (FL) Kline (MN)	Pingree (ME) Pitts			
			Dreier Driehaus	Kline (MN) Kosmas	Pitts Platts			
			Driehaus Duncan	Kosmas Kratovil	Platts Poe (TX)			
			Duncan Edwards (MD)	Kratovil Kucinich	Poe (TX) Polis (CO)			
			Edwards (MD) Edwards (TX)	Kucinich Lamborn	Polis (CO) Pomeroy			
			Edwards (TX) Ehlers	Lamborn Lance	Pomeroy Posey			
			Ehlers Ellison	Lance Langevin	Posey Price (GA)			
			Ellison Ellsworth	Langevin Larsen (WA)	Price (GA) Price (NC)			
			Ellsworth Emerson	Larsen (WA) Larson (CT)	Price (NC) Putnam			
			Emerson Engel	Larson (CT) Latham	Putnam Quigley			
			Engel Eshoo	Latham LaTourette	Quigley Radanovich			
			Eshoo Etheridge	LaTourette Latta	Radanovich Rahall			
			Etheridge Fallin	Latta Lee (CA)	Rahall Rangel			
			Fallin Farr	Lee (CA) Lee (NY)	Rangel Rehberg			
			Farr Fattah	Lee (NY) Levin	Rehberg Reichert			
			Fattah Finer	Levin Lewis (CA)	Reichert Reyes			
			Finer Flake	Lewis (CA) Lewis (GA)	Reyes Richardson			
			Flake Fleming	Lewis (GA) Linder	Richardson Rodriguez			
			Fleming Forbes	Linder Lipinski	Rodriguez Roe (TN)			
			Forbes Fortenberry	Lipinski LoBiondo	Roe (TN) Rogers (AL)			
			Fortenberry Foster	LoBiondo Loeb sack	Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY)			
			Foster Foxx	Loeb sack Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (KY) Rogers (MI)			
			Foxx Frank (MA)	Lofgren, Zoe Lowey	Rogers (MI) Rohrabacher			
			Frank (MA) Franks (AZ)	Lowey Lucas	Rohrabacher Rooney			
			Franks (AZ) Frelinghuysen	Lucas Luetkemeyer	Rooney Ros-Lehtinen			
			Frelinghuysen Fudge	Luetkemeyer Lujan	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Fudge	Lujan				

NOT VOTING—16

Barrett (SC)	Johnson (GA)	Sullivan
Brown (SC)	King (IA)	Velázquez
Capps	Meek (FL)	Wamp
Childers	Moore (WI)	Young (FL)
Hoekstra	Pomeroy	
Inglis	Roe (TN)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1209

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 369, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF FLAG DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1429) celebrating the symbol of the United States flag and supporting the goals and ideals of Flag Day, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

YEAS—418

Ackerman	Barrow	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Bartlett	Blackburn
Adler (NJ)	Barton (TX)	Blumenauer
Akin	Bean	Blunt
Altmire	Becerra	Bocieri
Andrews	Berkley	Boehner
Arcuri	Berman	Bonner
Austria	Berry	Bono Mack
Baca	Biggert	Boozman
Bachmann	Bilbray	Boren
Bachus	Bilirakis	Boswell
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Boustany
Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Boyd

NOT VOTING—14

Alexander	Hoekstra	Sullivan
Barrett (SC)	Inglis	Wamp
Boucher	Meek (FL)	Wu
Brown (SC)	Moore (WI)	Young (FL)
Childers	Schrader	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1218

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a Joint Resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution recognizing the 60th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War and reaffirming the United States-Korea alliance.

SMALL BUSINESS JOBS AND CREDIT ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1436 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5297.

□ 1218

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5297) to create the Small Business Lending Fund Program to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make capital investments in eligible institutions in order to increase the availability of credit for small businesses,