

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would remind the gentleman as well on the other side that it was a Republican-controlled Congress and a Republican President who allowed us to get \$11 trillion in debt when the last Democratic-controlled White House had a \$5.6 trillion projected surplus.

So, now that the facts are straight, I just want to be clear that this legislation is about amending the Federal bankruptcy codes, which have already been used to exempt furniture, musical instruments, jewelry, and other household goods, to be allowed to exempt people's heirlooms, their firearms, that have been passed on from generation to generation.

I believe that the majority of Americans agrees with the Second Amendment—the constitutional right that we have to bear arms. We have continually upheld its validity for hundreds of years because, in many cases, a family's guns are heirlooms, treasured pieces of family history, which should not be subjected to financial hardship. I spoke of my grandfather's M1 carbine that has been handed down to me now through two successive generations.

One fact, one principle this country was founded upon was the ability of our people to provide their own protection. Bearing this in mind and this historical perspective, we respect the rights of gun owners as a shared value we see amongst Democrats and some Republicans. It is not a Republican or a Democratic issue but a foundational value of American ideals. We must protect the rights guaranteed to us by our Founding Fathers no matter what financial circumstances a citizen must face.

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5827, the Protecting Gun Owners in Bankruptcy Act of 2010. As a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, I believe that owning a gun is a right and that this right extends to all people, including those in bankruptcy.

After declaring bankruptcy, people are often denied their Constitutionally protected rights by being forced to relinquish their firearms. While other property, such as televisions, radios, china, crockery, and appliances, is protected from repossession, firearms are not. If owning a gun is a right, shouldn't guns be protected from repossession just as other property is protected?

Right now, only 10 states have laws that protect gun owners from firearm repossession during bankruptcy. Currently, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is not one of these 10, so I support this bill because I believe that my constituents' Second Amendment rights, as well as the Second Amendment rights of all Americans, should be protected during bankruptcy.

This is a good bill and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the

rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5827, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1940

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AN END TO CHINESE HOSTILITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the ongoing maritime conflict in the South China Sea and the need for the United States to support long-term sovereignty of the Vietnamese people. Given this conflict will destabilize trade and peace in this region, this is a matter of great importance for all of us in this esteemed body.

Since the summer of 2009, reports of maritime disputes in the South China Sea have risen. I continue to hear of aggression from Chinese ships and submarines interfering with the freedom of navigation of neighboring Asian countries. I also hear of aggressive actions being taken towards United States interests as well, and this is particularly troubling and unacceptable.

According to reports, China has committed aggressive maritime acts against Southeast Asian countries including Japan, the Philippines, Taiwan, Malaysia, and especially the people of Vietnam.

China claims vast ocean territory that includes many islands and extends into much of the South China Sea. If we were to look at the map of the South China Sea, we see that China is here, Vietnam is here, the Philippines is here, and Malaysia is located here. And China, being the farthest away from the Paracel Islands, as well as the Spratly Islands, claims to have dominion over all of them. These claims, along with their aggressive presence,

has caused tensions between the people of Southeast Asia and China to grow.

The conflict in the South China Sea is hindering free navigation of these waters, which could negatively affect commercial interests and regional security. This would directly affect the livelihoods of peaceful people in these nations. The time has come for the United States to take a strong stance against China's harassment before these actions escalate into hostile confrontation.

China's hostile relationship has been reported to have gone so far as to commit aggressive actions towards Vietnamese citizens. As a Vietnamese American, I am especially interested in the territorial integrity of my native country. And I am concerned to hear reports outlining aggressive actions towards Vietnamese citizens, especially fishermen, that have resulted in injuries, damages to their fishing vessels and, in severe cases, death.

The goal of the United States diplomacy should be to recognize the tensions in this region and to concentrate on first alleviating this tension. The United States should strongly consider advocating for China's release of disputed territories like the Spratly and Paracel Islands and to ensure multilateral dialogue and action to resolve the ongoing maritime dispute.

What is the basis for China's aggression?

Many experts ascribe China's aggression toward its neighbors as stemming from its ever-increasing appetite for energy. There is no question China continues to seek additional sources of energy, particularly across Africa, where their influence continues to grow.

According to reports, China's oil consumption is expected to double over the next 25 years, from 7.2 million barrels per day in 2006 to 15.3 million barrels per day in 2030.

China's natural gas consumption is expected to more than triple in that same period of time, from 2 trillion cubic feet in 2006 to 6.8 trillion cubic feet in 2030.

It has been reported that, in addition to substantive fishing resources, the disputed areas contain oil and natural gas reserves. Further, the islands are in China's pathway as their economy continues to expand. This may be why China is racing to secure its maritime territory, to secure these areas for their oil and natural gas exploration, and to assist in their economic expansion.

However, credible reports indicate that China has claimed lands beyond Taiwan, which may point to China's intention of expanding its power over a much larger area, in direct conflict with the interests of its neighbors.

While some explain China's territorial behavior as strategic to secure their access to energy resources, others strongly believe China's intentions may be going further to gain territory to impose its influence.

What is certain, however, is that while China appears to be negotiating,