

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 and 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