

taken by the Vietnamese Government to unlawfully seize church property which has belonged to the parish for over 100 years.

And I ask myself, why have we not put this country, Vietnam, on the list of countries of particular concern, those who prosecute and persecute religious beliefs? I find it absolutely appalling that the Vietnamese Government continues to get away with these human rights violations, and we should do something about it.

In 2010 I hope that the United States will finally take a stand and show the world that this behavior is unacceptable. It is time for Vietnam to be held accountable.

HAITI

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, the devastating earthquake which hit Haiti last night is something that pains all of us.

The millions of Haitian Americans in this country and people who care about Haiti all over the world need to see what we can do to get aid as quickly as possible to the beleaguered people of Haiti.

The earthquake was 7.0 on the Richter scale, the largest earthquake ever to hit Haiti. And this comes on top of devastating hurricanes a little more than a year ago. The people of Haiti are going to need the United States to help.

As chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I will leave no stone unturned to try to get aid to people of Haiti. And I know that President Obama and Secretary Clinton have already made statements and promised and pledged lots of aid.

Probably thousands upon thousands of people are devastated and killed, and this is going to touch all of us. So I call on this House, I call on the American people, I call on our government to do whatever we can to send aid to help the beleaguered people of Haiti. Now is the time.

I urge the American people to listen, to send donations to those organizations that can get aid in as quickly as possible. Money donations are probably what is needed right now. Only the United States is in a very, very unique position. And, again, we want to tell the Haitian people that the United States of America, the U.S. Congress is there with you. We will leave no stone unturned to try to save lives.

The next 72 hours is crucial in terms of saving lives, in terms of preventing any kind of epidemics, in terms of keeping food going and the water clean and making sure that there is no disease, looting, things like that. We need to do everything we can. I know we will. And, again, we will leave no stone unturned.

As chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I know that our

committee will be right in there with our sleeves rolled up and do everything we can to help the people of Haiti.

VETO MESSAGE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 64, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 12, 2010, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 64) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of January 12, 2010, at page H11.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 64.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I am the only speaker for our side of the aisle and I plan to be brief. So I will yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for the purpose of debate only.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I wanted to rise in support of the position taken by my friend, Mr. OBEY. He didn't say what that position was exactly; so I am assuming that we are going to vote "no," that we are going to support the President's veto. And I think, on our side, we fully support this issue.

I find it a bit ironic that here we are having to defend the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress on a joint resolution that was originally sent to the President to respect his constitutional prerogatives.

Under Article I, section 7 of the Constitution, the President has up to 10 days to review legislation before deciding whether to sign it into law. However, when a continuing resolution is to keep the government functioning if the appropriations bill is set to expire, the continuing resolution is sent to the President to give him the opportunity to review the appropriations bill. As a matter of courtesy to the President, Congress, on a bipartisan basis, traditionally submits a short-term "signing" CR to preserve the President's ability.

That is exactly what the situation here is today. Basically, it is a moot question other than the constitutional requirements. And so we are here to say to my friend Mr. OBEY and to you, Madam Speaker, that assuming that Mr. OBEY is going to recommend a "no" vote, we are going to also vote "no."

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman from Florida has summed up the situation pretty well.

In December, the House and Senate passed a 5-day continuing resolution in order to give the President time to sign the Defense appropriations bill. The President received the CR and the Defense appropriations bill on the same day, December 19. He signed the Defense bill, thereby avoiding the need for the stopgap funding in the CR.

Since the President signed the Defense appropriations measure quickly, I agree that the CR was not needed to keep the government open.

The President sent the CR back to the House, as the gentleman indicated, with his veto. But in that veto message, he suggested in some ways that he had, in fact, pocket vetoed the legislation.

But the fact is clear that the Congress was here to receive a message, and we do not consider it a pocket veto. Therefore, we feel that the appropriate action to be taken is to sustain the veto and take this action to demonstrate that, in our judgment, a pocket veto is not appropriate, that the President exercised a regular veto and it should be treated as such.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I fully support my friends on the other side of the aisle taking action to protect the constitutional prerogatives of the legislative branch in this matter.

As the gentleman from Florida stated, it is ironic that the executive branch has chosen to use an action taken by the Congress as a courtesy to them against this very body. I think this should give all of us pause when we are faced with similar situations in the future.

As the gentleman from Florida has stated, the Constitution allows the President to take some time to review the legislation sent to him. However, when we are dealing with appropriations bills and operating under a continuing resolution to keep the government running, sometimes timelines don't match up neatly. As a matter of courtesy to the President, Congress on a bipartisan basis traditionally transmits a short term "signing" CR to preserve the President's ability to review final appropriations bills without triggering a government shutdown.

That is exactly what occurred in this situation. The Congress did not send the President the final defense appropriations bill until December 19, the day the existing CR was to expire, leaving the President no time to review the defense bill unless he wanted to shut the Department of Defense down. So, the Congress unanimously passed and transmitted a short term CR solely as a matter of courtesy. The President could have easily followed his

predecessors' practice and signed both bills. The substantive effect would have been the same as it is today.

But that is not what the President chose to do. So we are here today, as the Congress, to deal with the first veto issued by President Obama.

Is it a veto based over substantive policy disagreements like President Bush's veto of stem cell legislation, or President Clinton's veto of legislation lifting the arms embargo for Bosnia and Herzegovina?

No, it is not. It is a veto that simply uses a now moot piece of legislation to re-ignite a battle between the legislative and executive branches dating back to the Nixon administration, a battle that the courts have generally sided in favor of the legislative branch.

I hope that in the future the President will exercise his veto power on substantive issues important to the American people such as vetoing bills that continue us on a path of reckless government spending.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

In accordance with the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings will be postponed.

□ 1045

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

SUPPORTING CONTINUED POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN UKRAINE

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 981) supporting continued political and economic development in Ukraine.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 981

Whereas in 1991, Ukraine re-established its independence, and began the process of developing democratic institutions and a market economy;

Whereas the Ukrainian people bravely demonstrated their desire for a free, democratic, and prosperous country through non-violent protest during the 2004 Orange Revolution;

Whereas the United States and Ukraine have a strong relationship, as evidenced by the United States-Ukraine Charter on Strategic Partnership, signed in December 2008

by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice with the objective of expanding cooperation on defense, trade, energy, democratic development, and cultural exchange;

Whereas during the July 2009 visit of Vice President Biden to Kyiv, the United States and Ukraine agreed to create the Strategic Partnership Commission to help implement the Charter, which held its inaugural meeting in Washington, DC, on December 9, 2009, during the visit of the Ukrainian Foreign Minister;

Whereas a strong, sovereign, independent, democratic, and economically prosperous Ukraine is important to the interests of the United States and to achieving peace, prosperity and stability in Europe;

Whereas Ukraine has been a staunch partner of the United States and NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) allies, as demonstrated by Ukraine's participation in the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan and the NATO Training Mission in Iraq and by NATO's declaration at the Bucharest Summit in April 2008 that Ukraine will become a member of the Alliance;

Whereas the United States and the European Union provide assistance to help Ukraine foster peace and security, strengthen its democratic institutions, further economic growth, and counter HIV/AIDS and other deadly diseases;

Whereas the United States, the United Kingdom, and Russia gave security assurances to Ukraine in the Budapest Memoranda of December 5, 1994, following Ukraine's commitment to eliminate all nuclear weapons from its territory and its accession to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear weapons state as well as the entry into force of the START Treaty;

Whereas the Joint Statement on the Expiration of the START Treaty issued by the United States and Russia on December 4, 2009, affirmed that "the assurances recorded in the Budapest Memoranda will remain in effect after December 4, 2009";

Whereas, as Vice President Biden stated when he was in Kyiv, the effort to reset the United States relationship with Russia "will not come at Ukraine's expense," and "the more substantive relationship we have with Moscow, the more we can defuse the zero-sum thinking about our relations with Russia's neighbors.;"

Whereas Ukraine and the Ukrainian people have suffered from the world financial crisis, and the government has sought and received assistance from international financial institutions, but still needs to overcome internal political and economic stalemates that prevent it from fulfilling its requirements and hinder its ability to achieve greater financial stability;

Whereas Ukraine will hold a presidential election on January 17, 2010, with a possible run-off election on February 7, 2010, if needed;

Whereas the initial 2004 presidential elections in Ukraine were marred by widespread irregularities, including fraud, intimidation, falsification of results, and media bias; and

Whereas it is vital for Ukraine's democratic development that the 2010 elections be free, fair, transparent, and untainted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms the strong relationship between the United States and Ukraine, and encourages continued efforts to implement the provisions of the United States-Ukraine Charter on Strategic Partnership;

(2) expresses its support for the efforts of the Ukrainian people to consolidate democratic institutions, rule of law, respect for human rights, and economic reforms;

(3) recognizes the suffering of the Ukrainian people due to the downturn in the world economy, and supports measures by the international financial institutions to assist Ukraine;

(4) urges all parties in Ukraine to seek resolution of disputes and to take active measures to enable necessary political and economic reforms;

(5) urges the Government of Ukraine and all political parties to ensure that the 2010 election is conducted freely, fairly, transparently, and without manipulation;

(6) encourages the Government of Ukraine and all political parties to welcome the participation of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and other international election monitors, cooperate fully with them, and provide them unimpeded access to all aspects of the election process; and

(7) reiterates its enduring support and friendship for Ukraine and the Ukrainian people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

This Sunday, Ukrainians will go to the polls to elect a new President. The successful conduct of these elections is important to our country, the United States. As Vice President BIDEN said during his visit to Kiev last summer, "we consider Ukraine to be a vital European partner for advancing stability, prosperity, and democracy on the Continent."

Six years ago, the Orange Revolution demonstrated the Ukrainian people's desire for freedom, democracy, and prosperity. Since that time, Ukraine has made great strides in developing a vibrant civil society, an open and free press, and a government accountable to its citizens. We welcome the government's registration of over 450 international observers for the elections, including from the OSCE and the International Republican Institute. We would take this means and opportunity to urge all parties in the elections to cooperate fully with the observers and ensure the elections are conducted without manipulation.

The United States and Ukraine have a strong bond, not least due to the fact that over 1 million Americans trace their roots back to Ukraine. These ties were solidified in the Charter on Strategic Partnership, which was signed in December of 2008 and which outlined numerous areas of engagement and cooperation. Last month, the Strategic